

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD
Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Graham Thrussell on 01243 534653
Email: gthrusell@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 Chichester West Sussex on **Tuesday 8 January 2019 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

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

1 **Chairman's Announcements**

The chairman will:

- make any specific announcements for this meeting and
- advise of any late items for consideration under agenda item 13 (a) or (b)

Apologies for absence will be taken at this point.

2 **Approval of Minutes** (pages 1 to 18)

The Cabinet is requested to approve as a correct record the minutes of its meeting on Tuesday 4 December 2018, a copy of which is circulated with this agenda.

3 **Declarations of Interests**

Members will make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests which they have in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.

4 **Public Question Time**

In accordance with Chichester District Council's scheme for public question time and with reference to standing order 6 in part 4 A and section 5.6 in Part 5 of the Chichester District Council *Constitution*, the Cabinet will receive any questions which have been submitted by members of the public in writing by 12:00 on the previous working day. The total time allocated for public question time is 15 minutes subject to the chairman's discretion to extend that period.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL

5 **Adoption of the Chichester Local Plan Site Allocation Development Plan Document** (pages 19 to 21)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its three appendices in the agenda supplement and to make the following recommendation to the Council:

That the submitted Local Plan Site Allocation Development Plan Document 2014-2029, amended to include all the main modifications recommended by the planning inspector to make the Plan sound, together with other more minor modifications already agreed with the inspector, be adopted and published (including any consequential and other appropriate minor amendments) in accordance with regulation 26 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012.

6 **Corporate Pay Review** (pages 23 to 30)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its appendix and to make the following recommendations to the Council:

- (1) That the proposed New Reward Scheme (NRS) be adopted with effect from 1 April 2019.
- (2) That the budget allocation of £303,500 per annum to support the NRS, funded by the £300,000 annual budget that has previously been set aside to support the pay review, with the £3,500 shortfall added to the revenue base budget 2019-2020, be approved.
- (3) That the release of up to £360,600 from previously earmarked reserves to fund salary protection costs during the three-year period 2019-2020 to 2021-2022 be approved.

7 **Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan** (pages 31 to 34)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its nine appendices in the agenda supplement (appendix 2 is in three parts) and to make the following resolutions and also recommendations to the Council:

A – RESOLUTIONS BY THE CABINET

- (1) That the new project proposals for 2019-2020 as set out in appendices 1 to 9 to the agenda report be agreed.
- (2) That it be noted that the Gigabit and the Depot resurfacing and Drainage projects will be subject to full Project Initiation Document approval.

B – RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL

- (1) That it be agreed that the Corporate Plan approved in January 2018 shall remain unchanged for the year 2019-2020.

- (2) That, subject to the Cabinet's agreement in the foregoing resolution (1) to approve the new project proposals for 2019-2020, the release of £246,000 from Chichester District Council's General Fund Reserve to fund the feasibility work and small projects identified in para 5.2 of the agenda report for 2019-2020 be approved and that £30,000 of this funding be released with immediate effect to allow for the Novium business plan feasibility work.

KEY DECISIONS

8 Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018 (pages 35 to 40)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its two appendices in the agenda supplement and to make the following resolution:

That the recommended response set out in appendix 2 to the agenda report be endorsed as Chichester District Council's response to the consultation on the draft Gatwick Airport Master Plan.

OTHER DECISIONS

9 Commissioning of West Sussex Community Advice Service (pages 41 to 44)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and to make the following resolutions:

- (1) That, subject to continued partner funding, the continuation of the Funding Partnership to commission a Community Advice Service across West Sussex for up to three years from April 2019 with West Sussex County Council as the lead authority be agreed.
- (2) That (a) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Communities, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, to agree the specification and signing of the contract and (b) the annual monitoring of performance be delegated to the Grants and Concessions Panel.

10 Land at Mill Road and Covington Road Westbourne - Community Trust Proposal (pages 45 to 51)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its two appendices and to make the following resolutions:

- (1) That the land to the rear of 50-56 Mill Road and the land at Covington Road Westbourne be declared surplus to requirements.
- (2) That it be noted that following the declaration in (1), the actions set out in section 5 of the agenda report are to be pursued by the officers under delegated authority.

11 **Recording of Committee Meetings** (pages 53 to 55)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and make the following resolution:

That the ongoing audio recording and publishing of the Council, the Cabinet, the Planning Committee, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee meetings online be approved.

12 **Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure Support** (pages 57 to 60)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and to make the following resolutions:

- (1) That, subject to continued partner funding, it be agreed that Chichester District Council participates in a funding partnership with West Sussex County Council, Clinical Commissioning Groups and other West Sussex district and borough councils to agree joint funding principles of West Sussex Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure Support services.
- (2) That (a) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Communities, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, to agree a service specification and signing of a three-year funding agreement and (b) the annual monitoring of performance be delegated to the Grants and Concessions Panel.

FINAL MATTERS

13 **Late Items**

- (a) Items added to the agenda papers and made available for public inspection
- (b) Items which the chairman has agreed should be taken as matters of urgency by reason of special circumstances to be reported at the meeting

14 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The Cabinet is asked in respect of agenda items 15 (St James Industrial Estate) and 16 (Staffing Matters) to make a resolution that the public including the press should be excluded from the meeting on the following grounds of exemption in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 namely (a) in the case of agenda item 15 Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) and (b) in the case of agenda item 16 Paragraph 1 (information relating to any individual) and because, in all the circumstances of the case in (a) and (b), the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

15 **St James Industrial Estate Chichester** (pages 61 to 66)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its two appendices in

the agenda supplement, which are confidential exempt* material with a restricted circulation to Chichester District Council members and relevant officers only (printed on salmon-coloured paper), and to make the following resolutions and the recommendation to the Council:

A – RESOLUTIONS BY THE CABINET

- (1) That the PID for the part refurbishment and part replacement of units at St James Industrial Estate be approved.
- (2) That the fact that the site is no longer reserved to accommodate relocation needs relating to the Southern Gateway project as indicated in section 4.8 of the agenda report be noted.

B – RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That the allocation of £5,225,000 of New Homes Bonus Reserves for this project, inclusive of temporary loss of revenue as referred to in section 8.4 of the agenda report, be approved.

*[**Note** The ground for excluding the public and press during this item is that it is likely that there would be a disclosure to them of ‘exempt information’ of the description specified in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972]

16 Staffing Matters

The Cabinet is requested to consider in the second agenda supplement the agenda report and its two appendices, which are strictly confidential exempt* material with a restricted circulation to Chichester District Council members and a very limited number of officers only (printed on salmon-coloured paper), and to make the recommendations to the Council set out in section 3 of the agenda report.

*[**Note** The ground for excluding the public and press during this item is that it is likely that there would be a disclosure to them of ‘exempt information’ of the description specified in Paragraph 1 (information relating to any individual) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972]

NOTES

- (1) The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any item of business wherever it is likely that there would be disclosure of ‘exempt information’ as defined in section 100A of and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.
- (2) The press and public may view the report appendices which are not included with their copy of the agenda on the Council’s website at [Chichester District Council - Minutes, agendas and reports](#) unless they contain exempt information.
- (3) Subject to the provisions allowing the exclusion of the press and public, the

photographing, filming or recording of this meeting from the public seating area is permitted. To assist with the management of the meeting, anyone wishing to do this is asked to inform the chairman of the meeting of their intentions before the meeting starts. The use of mobile devices for access to social media is permitted, but these should be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting. Those undertaking such activities must do so discreetly and not disrupt the meeting, for example by oral commentary, excessive noise, distracting movement or flash photography. Filming of children, vulnerable adults or members of the audience who object should be avoided. [Standing Order 11.3 of Chichester District Council's *Constitution*]

(4) A key decision means an executive decision which is likely to:

- result in Chichester District Council (CDC) incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the CDC's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates or
- be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards in the CDC's area or
- incur expenditure, generate income, or produce savings greater than £100,000

NON-CABINET MEMBER COUNCILLORS SPEAKING AT THE CABINET

Standing Order 22.3 of Chichester District Council's *Constitution* provides that members of the Council may, with the chairman's consent, speak at a committee meeting of which they are not a member, or temporarily sit and speak at the Committee table on a particular item but shall then return to the public seating area.

The Leader of the Council intends to apply this standing order at Cabinet meetings by requesting that members should *normally* seek his consent in writing by email in advance of the meeting. They should do this by noon on the day before the meeting, outlining the substance of the matter that they wish to raise. The word normally is emphasised because there may be unforeseen circumstances where a member can assist the conduct of business by his or her contribution and where the chairman would therefore retain his discretion to allow the contribution without the aforesaid notice.



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 2 at East Pallant House East Pallant Chichester West Sussex on Tuesday 4 December 2018 at 09:30

Members Present 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

Members Absent

Officers Present Mr M Allgrove (Divisional Manager for Planning Policy), Mr S Ballard (Senior Environmental Protection Officer), Mrs H Belenger (Divisional Manager for Financial Services), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Mrs L Grange (Divisional Manager for Housing), Mr A Gregory (Project Manager - Estates), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mr P Jobson (Taxation Manager), Mr P Legood (Valuation and Estates Manager), Miss H Nicol (Housing Delivery Manager), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Ms A Stevens (Divisional Manager for Environmental Protection), Mr G Thrussell (Legal and Democratic Services Officer) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

614 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mr A Dignum greeted the members of the public and Chichester District Council (CDC) members and officers and the two press representatives who were present for this meeting.

There were no apologies for absence and all members of the Cabinet were present.

There were no late items for consideration.

Mr Dignum had no specific announcements to make but he intimated that at the end of agenda item 5 (Financial Strategy and Plan 2019-2020) details would be given of some notable recent awards made to CDC (minute 618 below refers).

[**Note** Hereinafter in these minutes CDC denotes Chichester District Council]

[**Note** Minute paras 615 to 628 below summarise the Cabinet's discussion of and decision on agenda items 2 to 15 inclusive but on this occasion there is for technical reasons no audio recording of the meeting]

615 Approval of Minutes

The Cabinet received the minutes of (a) its ordinary meeting on Tuesday 6 November 2018 and (b) its special meeting on Wednesday 14 November 2018.

A copy of each set of minutes had been circulated with the agenda but subsequent to publication minor clarifications to the text of each set of minutes had been made and it was those versions of the minutes (which are available to view online) which were approved by the Cabinet.

There were no changes to the minutes proposed at the meeting.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands to approve the aforesaid two sets of minutes without making any amendments.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of (a) the Cabinet's ordinary meeting on Tuesday 6 November 2018 and (b) the Cabinet's special meeting on Wednesday 14 November 2018 be approved without amendment.

616 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interests made at this meeting.

617 Public Question Time

There were no public questions submitted for this meeting.

618 Financial Strategy and Plan 2019-2020

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its three appendices in the main agenda supplement.

This item was presented by Mr P Wilding (Cabinet Member for Corporate Services).

Mrs H Belenger (Divisional Manager Financial Services) was in attendance for this matter.

Mr Wilding explained that the report updated the Financial Strategy and Plan for 2019-2020 and created the framework within which the council tax base was set (agenda item 8) as well as setting the scene for approval of the budget in early 2019. The backdrop to the strategy was one of increasing political uncertainty and reducing central government funding for local government. CDC was in the fourth and final year of its agreed settlement with central government, so there was

certainty over its government funding stream in 2019-2020. Retained business rates would continue to provide an increased proportion of CDC's funding. However, much of its other income, for example car parks and planning fees, was dependent on the state of the wider economy and so was much less predictable.

He drew attention to the following:

- (1) CDC's key priorities set out in appendix 1, one of which was to manage CDC's finances prudently and effectively. The Finance Strategy was linked to this specific corporate priority, as were also the key financial principles which underpinned CDC's financial planning approach listed in annex A.
- (2) The updated five-year financial model in appendix 2, which reflected the consolidated budget from the service areas, central government funding and the most up-to-date estimates for wider CDC activities including the commercial boards, and other planned savings.
- (3) The risks and opportunities estimates in section 4 of appendix 1. The key assumptions were:
 - (a) An assumed £5 increase in council tax (for a band D property) for each year in the five-year financial model (equivalent to approximately 3% increase per annum). The Council would make the decision in March 2019 as to the council tax level for 2019-2020 following the local government settlement.
 - (b) Recent quarterly revenue monitoring had identified some deterioration in car park and planning income and in recognition of this an adjustment of £300,000 had been built into the model for each year of the five-year period.
 - (c) A number of costs during the past year which could not be met from the Asset Replacement Programme and so were financed from reserves. An extra provision of £200,000 for asset replacement had therefore been included in the model for each year over the five-year period. A detailed review was underway and the precise amount required would be built into the annual budget.
 - (d) The provisional finance settlement for 2019-2020 and the outcome of the bids for participating in the pilot 75% Business Rates Retention Scheme for 2019-2020 were expected to be announced by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government on 6 December 2018. CDC was assuming no further reduction in overall local government funding but a shift to upper-tier councils (West Sussex County Council (WSCC)) to meet social care costs. It had, therefore, assumed a £500,000 reduction in government funding from 2020-2021 onwards.
 - (e) The New Homes Bonus (NHB) was being reduced but the shape of its future was uncertain. Significant reductions in the model beyond 2018-

2019 were assumed. CDC had never relied on this source of income to balance the budget given its attendant uncertainty and risk.

- (4) The five-year financial model contained many assumptions which would become more precise with time, so it would evolve and have changed by the time the Council considered it on 22 January 2019.
- (5) The anticipated resources position of CDC's reserves and assets in the medium term in appendix 3, demonstrating that CDC remained in a sound and sustainable financial state going forward.

Mr Wilding thanked Mrs Belenger and her team for their efforts in compiling the Financial Strategy and Plan.

Mrs Belenger did not add to Mr Wilding's presentation.

Mrs E Lintill (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services) commended the excellent report and emphasised the importance of maintaining during the next five years a position of non-dependency on reserves (third key financial principle in annex A to appendix 1).

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) emphasised the conservative financial principles and prudent assumptions which would underlie the budget, making particular reference to taking account of an anticipated lower income from planning and car parks, an augmented asset management programme, the retention of the NHB for unforeseen contingencies and recurring expenditure being met only out of current revenue.

In reply to specific points raised by members:

- Mr Dignum informed Mr R Barrow (Cabinet Member for Residents Services) that CDC was currently in negotiations with WSCC about recycling credits.
- Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services) summarised for Mrs Lintill how CDC's membership of the West Sussex Business Rates Pool (WSBRP) worked and the benefits derived from it eg in applying some of the funds for local infrastructure projects. Mr Dignum pointed out that CDC had an equal voice in the WSBRP. Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) cited some of the many examples of how WSBRP funding had been made available to and benefitted CDC: the Gigabit scheme, shop front grants and cycle-ways.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously to make the recommendation set out below.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

- (1) That the key financial principles and actions of the five year Financial Strategy set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report be approved.

- (2) That the current five year Financial Model detailed in appendix 2 to the agenda report be noted.
- (3) That, having considered the recommendations from the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee, the Minimum Level of the General Fund Reserves be set at £6.3m.
- (4) That the Director of Corporate Services be given delegated authority, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, to accept the government's offer to participate in the 75% localisation business rate pilot for 2019-2020, if the West Sussex councils' bid is successful or if not to revert back to the Coastal West Sussex existing pooling arrangement for the coming financial year.
- (5) That the current resources position as set out in appendix 3 to the agenda report be noted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS OF RECENT AWARDS MADE TO CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

As foreshadowed in his chairman's announcements (minute 614 above refers), at the end of this item Mr Dignum invited Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place) and Mr R Barrow (Cabinet Member for Residents Services) to give details of recent awards made to CDC as follows:

- (1) Mrs Hotchkiss said that CDC had received a Platinum Loo of the Year award for three of its public conveniences: Little London, Florence Road and Avenue de Chartres. The assessments were made with regard to 101 criteria and the award was recognised and supported by national tourist bodies. Such awards were not only very pleasing but very important since the quality of public conveniences was one of first and most obvious ways in which visitors formed an impression of a city or town. Mr J Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services) endorsed Mrs Hotchkiss's remarks.
- (2) Mr Barrow said that CDC's Litter Strategy launched in 2016 was a fine example of service areas working together: Residents Services, which he led and Environment Services, led by Mr Connor. He paid a special tribute to CDC's Public Relations team which had done a fantastic job in promoting the anti-litter campaign and securing widespread acceptance of its aims and local participation by Chichester District's communities in its implementation. As a result CDC's Against Litter campaign had been recognised by the Chartered Institute of Public Relations as the best community relations campaign of the year at the South of England and Channel Islands Pride awards, securing the gold award. The judges praised the strong community involvement in the campaign, as well as the reduction in litter. They also were impressed by the campaign's clear message – that littering is a crime and will be treated as one. He congratulated everyone who had played a part in the campaign and winning the award.

619 **Increasing the Provision of the Council's Temporary Accommodation at Freeland Close Chichester**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix, the Project Initiation Document (PID), in the main agenda supplement.

This item was presented by Mrs J Kilby (Cabinet Member for Housing Services).

Miss H Nicol (Housing Delivery Manager) and Mrs L Grange (Divisional Manager Housing) were in attendance for this matter.

Mrs Kilby said that during the preceding six months there had been an increase of more than 13% in the number of people who were homeless contacting CDC, which included many families. The existing emergency accommodation had been operating at full capacity for the past year and there had been problems trying to find suitable accommodation for larger families, with the consequent unfortunate result that it had been necessary to resort to bed and breakfast accommodation, often outside Chichester District. This was far from ideal for those involved, especially for families with young children. In December 2017 CDC had purchased a property adjacent to its existing temporary accommodation, since when it had been bought back into use to provide four one-bedroom flats as temporary accommodation while a full options appraisal to evaluate the most effective use of the property was undertaken. A budget of £15,000 had been approved for the full options appraisal and also a further £10,000 to progress the preferred option to the planning application stage. Since the Cabinet's approval of the initial PID in February 2017, it had become apparent that there were greater development opportunities on the site than originally anticipated. Following a full options appraisal it was proposed to demolish and rebuild the existing building and to provide a flexible property asset which could provide up to 21 units of additional short-term accommodation for homeless families and single vulnerable people. As a result, consultancy costs to bring a scheme to planning permission had risen to reflect the size and scope of the development: now £40,000 rather than the original estimate of £10,000. The cost to finalise the design after a grant of planning permission was estimated at £72,000. Accordingly it was proposed that the Council should be asked to approve the allocation of £102,000 from the Housing Investment Reserve, which would enable the scheme design to be fully developed to conduct the procurement and take all steps including seeking tenders up to the award of contract stage. Contractors' bids would be presented to the Cabinet following their receipt and analysis for an award of contract to be agreed. At that stage approval would be sought from the Council for funds to cover the costs of the redevelopment. The preferred option set out in the PID would give CDC an opportunity to provide many more units of flexible temporary accommodation, making it easier to house larger families. This project would make a real long-term difference to homeless families in Chichester District.

Miss Nicol and Mrs Grange did not add to Mrs Kilby's presentation.

Members expressed their full support for this initiative to alleviate homelessness, including the provision of flexible units for families of different sizes.

Mrs Grange, Miss Nicol and Mrs Kilby responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail with regard to:

- The situation if the grant application to Homes England (HE) (para 8.2 of the report) was not awarded: HE had indicated that the application had a very good prospect of success but if not the scheme was nonetheless financially viable.
- The contract with the developer would contain appropriate terms such as penalty and compensation clauses to ensure delivery of the redevelopment project in accordance with the timescale and to protect CDC's interests.
- The property would not be available to accommodate homeless individuals and families during the reconstruction period of November 2019 to October 2020 (stage 4 in section 10 of the PID). The timescale had been set as realistically as possible; it might be possible to advance the scheduled start date of November 2019 but not by very much.
- The risk of future increases in homelessness and how to extend homelessness provision would continue to be addressed as now via the close working relationship between CDC, its registered housing partners and Stonepillow. CDC did a lot more than many local authorities to provide for homeless people and it ensured wherever possible that families were not separated.

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) allowed Mrs L C Purnell (Selsey North), who was present as an observer, to address the Cabinet briefly. She commended the project and emphasised CDC's very good track record in preventing homelessness as much as accommodating those who were homeless. Mr Dignum endorsed the importance of that point.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously to make the resolutions and the recommendation set out below.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Project Initiation Document (PID) and timescales set out in the appendix to the agenda report be approved.
- (2) That the preferred option, option 3 set out in section 8 of the PID, be progressed to detailed design stage and a planning application being submitted and, following planning approval, the scheme design be finalised ready for invitation of tenders.
- (3) That the Director of Housing and Communities be authorised to conduct the procurement, invite tenders and take all steps up to, but not including, award of contract.

- (4) That the contactor bids be presented to the Cabinet following the receipt and analysis of tenders for award of contract.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That the allocation of £102,000 from the Housing Investment Reserve be approved to enable the scheme design to be finalised and submitted for planning approval.

620 Chichester Enterprise Centre

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its two appendices in the main agenda supplement.

This item was presented by Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place).

Mr A Gregory (Project Manager Estates) and Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place) were in attendance for this matter.

Mr Dignum said that the report via the appended post project evaluation reviewed how the Chichester Enterprise Centre (CEC) project had performed against the project initiation document. A brownfield site had now become one brought into active economic use to assist fledgling businesses and was an important revenue source for CDC. Despite challenging issues in construction, a significant underspend in construction costs was achieved (para 4.3 of the report). Of the CEC's 82 available units, 36 (44%) were currently occupied and nine were in use as workshops. The CEC's performance to date was very encouraging.

Mrs Hotchkiss commented that as a result of the £234,000 underspend of the capital budget the originally envisaged return on investment of 4.9% was now 5.15%.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously to make the resolution set out below.

RESOLVED

That the Post Project Evaluation (PPE) report in appendix one to the agenda report for the Chichester Enterprise Centre development be approved.

621 Determination of the Council Tax Base for 2019-2020

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its three appendices.

This item was presented by Mr R Barrow (Cabinet Member for Residents Services).

Mr P Jobson (Revenue Operations Manager) was in attendance for this matter.

Mr Barrow introduced the report by summarising the nature and purpose of, and the process (section 6 of the report) for, setting the tax-base for 2019-2020. He made particular reference to the parish grant allocation position (para 6.3 of the report).

Mr Jobson commented that the tax-base calculation for 2019-2020 had proved to be slightly more complex because some developers had found it more difficult to say when their developments would be completed and this was reflected in the calculation.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously to make the resolution set out below.

RESOLVED

That in order to comply with section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 the following resolutions be made:

- (1) No item of expenditure shall be treated as 'special expenses' for the purposes of section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
- (2) The resolution in (1) shall remain in force for the 2019-2020 financial year.
- (3) The calculation of Chichester District Council's tax-base for the year 2019-2020 be approved.
- (4) The amounts calculated by Chichester District Council as its council tax-base for the year 2019-2020 for its area and each part of its area shall be those set out in appendices 1 and 2 to the agenda report.
- (5) In order to offset some or all of the costs of council tax reduction to local precepting authorities (parish councils), a grant be distributed as outlined in appendix 3 to and described in para 6.3 of the agenda report.

622 Selsey Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix in the main agenda supplement.

This item was presented by Mrs S Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services).

Mr M Allgrove (Planning Policy Manager) was in attendance for this matter.

Mrs Taylor summarised the examination process and outcome. She advised that since the end of the examination and the release of the decision statement officers had needed to seek advice on technical legal points which had arisen.

Mr Allgrove advised that the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union in the *Sweetman* case (*People Over Wind, Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta* [2018] ECR 1-244) with regard to the Habitats Directive assessment had given rise to a complex, technical legal point for which there was no case law precedent and which had implications for the need for a strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of neighbourhood development plans (NDP). Previously the need for an SEA of the Selsey NDP had been screened out. Initial legal advice received by officers was that as a result of the *Sweetman* decision the need for an SEA now appeared to have

been triggered. In order to avoid any potential legal challenges to making the Selsey NDP it was proposed that the publication of the decision statement and the ensuing referendum should be delayed pending a definitive legal opinion that an SEA was not required or, if it was, an SEA had been undertaken. Accordingly the recommendation in paras 2.1 and 2.2 of the report had been amended by the introduction of a preamble as follows:

‘That subject to the completion of a satisfactory Strategic Environment Assessment or legal advice that states that this is not required:

- (1) The Decision Statement as set out in the appendix to the agenda report be published.
- (2) The examiner’s recommendation that the Neighbourhood Development Plan proceed to referendum, subject to modifications as set out in the Decision Statement, be approved.’

Mr Allgrove responded to questions on points of detail from respectively Mrs E Lintill (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services) and Mr R Barrow (Cabinet Member for Residents Services) as follows:

- It was not immediately apparent why the impact of the *Sweetman* judgment on the need for an SEA had not been raised by the examiner and officers would be contacting him to explain the decision to defer publication of the decision statement and a referendum until definitive legal advice had been received.
- The chairman of Selsey Town Council (STC) had been briefed by Mr Allgrove at a meeting the previous evening on the position. STC had also indicated that it did not wish to review its NDP to allocate further land, the need for which was identified in the Local Plan Review.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously to make the resolution set out below as amended on the advice of Mr Allgrove.

RESOLVED

That subject to the completion of a satisfactory Strategic Environment Assessment or legal advice that states that this is not required:

- (1) The Decision Statement as set out in the appendix to the agenda report be published.
- (2) The examiner’s recommendation that the Neighbourhood Development Plan proceed to referendum, subject to modifications as set out in the Decision Statement, be approved.

623 **Air Quality Modelling for Chichester District**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and (for members and officers only) its confidential exempt appendix.

This item was presented by Mr J Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services).

Mr S Ballard (Environmental Protection Manager) was in attendance for this matter.

Mr Connor made the following points in favour of the recommendation in paras 2.1 and 2.2:

- In common with all other district, borough, and unitary authorities, CDC had a specific duty regarding air quality, namely Local Air Quality Management.
- CDC had already declared three Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) ie areas which did not comply with the UK's health based air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide. The local emissions which contributed to these AQMA's were vehicle emission related.
- Air quality monitoring at Rumbolds Hill in Midhurst showed robust evidence for the need to declare an AQMA at that site. Monitoring in the Hornet in Chichester indicated that a further AQMA might be required.
- CDC's monitoring data was specific to the monitoring locations but air quality modelling was needed to understand the wider pollutant concentrations in the vicinity.
- Complex computer software was used to produce pollution contours ie in this case nitrogen dioxide, which helped to identify the precise area in which air quality did not comply with statutory standards, enabling CDC to set the shape and boundaries of the AQMA.
- Having declared an AQMA CDC was required to adopt an Air Quality Action Plan detailing its approach to tackling air pollution. The current AQAP was due to be rewritten and re-adopted in 2019.
- Air quality modelling also helped to establish the percentage pollution contribution from the different types of vehicles, which would help CDC to draw up the revised AQAP.

Mr Ballard did not add to Mr Connor's presentation.

Mr Ballard responded to questions on points of detail from respectively Mrs E Lintill (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services), Mr R Barrow (Cabinet Member for Residents Services) and Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) as follows:

- Only one of the three anticipated tenderers in fact submitted a bid, contractor B. Contractors A and C had intimated their interest in providing bids but in the event chose not to do so; in the case of contractor A, the reason given related to its decision to direct its resources to a national clean air project.
- Notwithstanding that (a) data had been acquired from the monitoring which had been undertaken for some time at Rumbolds Hill in Midhurst and The Hornet in Chichester and (b) air quality modelling using the services of a consultant was not mandatory, nonetheless the statutory guidance laid down that it was best practice for the boundaries of AQMAs to be defined by local authorities using a combination of monitoring and modelling data (para 6.1 of the report). This was the approach other councils followed in order to be best informed. Whereas the monitoring data at Rumbolds Hill was irrefutable, modelling would enable CDC to define clearly the extent of the AQMA.
- Whilst CDC had the power to undertake modelling for and to declare the establishment of an AQMA, it could not control or prevent vehicles which emitted diesel fumes from entering and driving through an AQMA. There were certain actions which CDC could take, including using the data it had collected to persuade West Sussex County Council and Highways England, which had the ultimate responsibility, to take appropriate and urgent action. CDC was also working on a potential supplementary planning document on air quality issues which could be used in conjunction with the emerging Chichester Local Plan Review: Preferred Approach.

With Mr Dignum's permission, Mr A Moss (Fishbourne and Leader of the Opposition), who was present as an observer, addressed the Cabinet. He endorsed the report very strongly. CDC had a duty to do whatever it could, for example to carry out even more monitoring and to be as assertive, proactive and robust as possible in improving air quality.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously to make the resolution set out below.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the appointment of consultant B to carry out air quality modelling pursuant to Chichester District Council's statutory Local Air Quality Management duties under the Environment Act 1995 be approved.
- (2) That a budget of £13,280 from reserves to fund the air quality modelling work be approved.

624 Custom and Self-Build Register New Burdens Grant

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report.

This item was presented by Mrs J Kilby (Cabinet Member for Housing Services).

Mrs L Grange (Divisional Manager Housing) was in attendance for this matter.

Mrs Kilby made the following points in presenting the report:

- New Burdens funding totalling £95,850 would have been received from the government by 2020 to cover the costs of additional resources required to set up and maintain a custom and self-build register and to ensure sufficient permissioned and serviced land was made available to satisfy demand.
- The Housing Delivery team set up the register two years ago and in 2018 a two-part register was introduced: part 1 was restricted to those with a local connection and those in part 2 did not count towards the assessment of local demand.
- The demand for custom and self-build needed to be carefully monitored and policy developed to ensure that CDC met its statutory duties.
- There were a number of pressures being faced by the Housing Service for which resources were required: the introduction of the Homeless Reduction Act 2018; the implementation of a new IT system; the extension of the Disabled Facilities Grant scheme; the potential development of Freeland Close (agenda item 6); research and policy work associated with a new Housing Strategy, a full review of the Allocations Scheme and alternative means of delivering affordable homes; preparing responses to the many government consultations; and preparing bids for funding from government.
- It was proposed, therefore, that the new burdens grant should be used to provide additional staffing resources to deal with this extra work.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously to make the resolution set out below.

RESOLVED

That delegated authority be given to the Director of Housing and Communities, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing Services, to spend the Custom and Self-Build New Burdens Grant set out in para 3.1 of the agenda report.

625 Litter and Fly Tip Action Plan

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report, its two appendices in the main agenda supplement and the amendments to appendix 2 reported in the third agenda supplement.

This item was presented by Mr J Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services) and Mr R Barrow (Cabinet Member for Residents Services).

Mrs A Stevens (Divisional Manager Environmental Protection) was in attendance for this matter.

Mr Connor made the following points:

- In response to the increasing cost to Chichester Contract Services of clearing litter and fly tips, the Cabinet approved CDC's Litter Strategy action Plan in September 2017.
- The delivery of the Action Plan was on target, with some very successful initiatives to date. The report outlined proposals for outstanding projects. The main outcome of the strategy continued to be making litter and fly-tipping socially unacceptable in Chichester District.
- This was a corporate project, driven by three departments: Environmental Protection, Chichester Contract Services and Public Relations (PR). The strategy had three themes: cleaning up Chichester District, better enforcement against offenders and sending a clear message that CDC was doing so.
- As year one was ending, the work had been very well received. The reputational value of the work to CDC was high. The public not only expected CDC to do this work but it placed great value on CDC having been so proactive in this respect.
- Throughout the first year various PR campaigns were regrouped and delivered under the new brand 'Against Litter', which theme ran through various campaigns, the main ones being: litter enforcement; 'adopt an area' (158 areas had been adopted by local communities); and the 'Green Dog Walker' scheme (300 plus had signed up).
- Enforcement action had been taken against fly-tippers and those who dropped litter and CDC continued to use these successes in publicity messages.
- The litter enforcement trial undertaken with East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) could be regarded as a success, as it had covered its costs and reduced the level of litter in the city centre.
- The second year would continue to focus on achieving behavioural change leading to fewer incidents of fly-tipping and littering, the two main areas of significant cost to CDC.
- A key part of the project was the continuation of litter enforcement. The report proposed continuing to work with EHDC for three years on the basis of two officers patrolling on three days of the week but allowing some flexibility in the number of patrols should littering drop significantly.

- It was also proposed to show a presence in areas where there was little litter by purchasing additional patrols on occasion as a precautionary measure at a cost of £10,000 over the three years, as shown in para 3.4 of the report, although that sum could possibly be reduced by income from penalty charges if any were incurred in those areas.
- The other key area was ensuring that the public and businesses received the right messages and it was proposed to put a new campaign together to tackle fly-tipping and litter on the roads. In order to develop this, a new part-time PR project officer was required at a cost of £13,300, with an additional funding requirement of £7,500 for materials.

At Mr Connor's invitation, Mr Barrow also commented on this item. He recalled his role in introducing the first stage of the action plan and chairing the member/officer working group. There was no doubt that the action plan had been a great success and the enforcement patrols had helped to convey the joint message that (a) littering was wholly unacceptable and (b) the community had an important part to play in not only reporting incidents of littering and fly-tipping but also securing behavioural change to eradicate this social scourge. He emphasised also the great importance of the reputational value to CDC of the action plan. He strongly supported the ongoing work and the proposed agreement with EHDC on the basis of scenario 3 in the second appendix. He enquired about enforcement in towns and villages, low littering areas compared with the city centre.

Mrs Stevens formally reported the amendments to the figures in scenario 3 in appendix 2 (page 70 of the main agenda supplement) which were circulated in the third agenda supplement. As a result there were consequential amendments to the second bullet point in para 8.1 of the report namely:

- In the fourth line, the figure of '£7,500' should be '£12,600'.
- In the fifth line, a full stop should be inserted after 'reduce'.
- In the fifth, sixth and seventh lines the words 'resulting in a risk that there will be a small cost to the Council of between £4,300 and £16,000 per year depending on the number of FPNs issued.' should be deleted.
- The aforementioned deleted words should be replaced with the following words as a new sentence after the sentence in the fifth line which now ended with 'as FPN numbers could reduce' and the final sentence which read 'This risk will be mitigated by the flexibility to reduce patrol days.', namely: 'If it reduces to five, there is a surplus of £800; if it reduces to four, there will be a small cost to Chichester District Council of £11,000.'

In reply to Mr Barrow's question about towns and villages, Mrs Stevens said that these areas had yet to be discussed but a proactive approach would be considered.

Mrs Stevens said with regard to the text changes to the report (fourth bullet point above) CDC's aim was to be cost neutral.

Members commended the action plan's evident success in securing improvements in the first year and expressed optimism about the ongoing work in the second and third years.

Mr Connor, Mrs Stevens and Mr Barrow responded to questions on points of detail from respectively Mrs S Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) and Mrs E Lintill (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services) as to:

- Project 2 in para 6.1 of the report. It was important to ensure that both tradespeople and householders were fully informed of their responsibilities in the proper disposal of trade waste. Where waste had been fly-tipped, all the circumstances of the case would be considered before deciding who should face penalties. CDC would choose to pursue where possible the offending tradespeople rather than householders.
- The education of children about tackling litter issues was vitally important. Item 6 in the action plan's first section (Sending a clear message), namely running the Waste Buster programme in five local schools each year, was marked as being delayed and dependent on a launch initiative by West Sussex County Council in 2019. If this could not be achieved, an alternative means of realising this objective would be considered by the member/officer working group. One option might be to use the part-time project officer post being recommended in para 3.2 of the report to undertake work with school children. Mr Barrow pointed out that the Waste Buster programme had been launched by the Inter Authority Waste Group (IAWG), of which he was a member, and its current focus was recycling and not waste. He had, however, requested the IAWG to consider extending the remit of Waste Buster. At the IAWG's next meeting he would pursue this and also the reported delay to Waste Buster schools programme, the fact of which he had been unaware.

With Mr Dignum's permission, Mr A Moss (Fishbourne and Leader of the Opposition), who was present as an observer, addressed the Cabinet. He highly commended the report and described the achievements and objectives as fantastic. This was a very important priority for CDC and it was important to ensure that future budget-setting meant that the programme paid for itself without the need (as had recently happened with some minor corporate plan projects) to call on reserves. He mentioned that during a recent weekend four large bags of litter had been collected from the Chichester College campus and this illustrated how necessary it was for CDC and other organisations to promote the anti-litter message.

Mr Connor replied that the action plan was now underway and the intention was certainly to finance the programme from the budget and not to have to resort to reserves. Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) added that in future years the litter and air quality (agenda item 10) schemes must be financed out of the base budget.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously to make the resolutions set out below, which incorporated the amendments made by the third agenda supplement.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the revised Litter and Fly Tip Action Plan attached as appendix 1 to the agenda report, as amended by the revisions in the third agenda supplement to the figures in appendix 2, be approved.
- (2) That expenditure of £13,300 funded from reserves be approved to enable the appointment of one part time Project Officer for one year to undertake communication initiatives relating to fly tipping and litter.
- (3) That expenditure of £7,500 funded from reserves be approved to provide resources to support publicity campaigns related to fly tipping and litter.
- (4) That £10,000 from reserves be approved to enable litter enforcement in low littering areas.
- (5) That the entering into an agreement with East Hampshire District Council on the basis of 'Scenario 3' as set out in appendix 2 to the agenda report, as amended by the revised figures in the third agenda supplement, be approved to provide litter enforcement for a period of three years, with the detail of the scheme delegated to the Director of Planning and the Environment and the Cabinet Member for Environment Services to finalise.
- (6) That the intention of the Chief Executive be noted to report to the Council her use of Article 10.02 constitutional delegation to discharge the enforcement functions detailed in paragraph 6.2 of the agenda report to East Hampshire District Council under powers granted to the authority under section 101 of the Local Government Act 1997.

626 Late Items

As stated during agenda item 1 (minute 614) there were no late items for consideration at this meeting.

627 Exclusion of the Press and Public

In order to consider the confidential exempt matter at agenda item 15 (Development of Land at Barnfield Drive Chichester), Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) first read out the resolution set out below, which was then duly proposed and seconded.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously to make the resolution set out below.

RESOLVED

That in accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (the Act) the public and the press be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of agenda item 15 (Development of Land at Barnfield Drive) for the reason that it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted that there would be disclosure to the public of 'exempt information' being information of the nature described in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act and because in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

628 Development of Land at Barnfield Chichester

The Cabinet received and considered the confidential exempt agenda report circulated to members and officers only.

The report was introduced by Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) and Mr P Legood (Valuation and Estates Manager).

Mrs J Kilby (Cabinet Member for Housing Services) welcomed the positive outcome.

Mr P Over (Executive Director and Deputy Chief Executive) responded to a comment by Mr S Oakley (Tangmere), who was present as an observer and had with Mr Dignum's consent briefly addressed the Cabinet on a point of detail.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously to make the resolution set out below.

RESOLVED

That it be noted that no action is to be taken in respect of the delegated powers granted at the Cabinet's meeting on 2 October 2018.

[Note The meeting ended at 11:01]

CHAIRMAN

DATE

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

8 January 2019

THE COUNCIL

22 January 2019

**Adoption of the Chichester Local Plan Site Allocation
Development Plan Document**

1. Contacts

Report Author

Tracey Flitcroft – Principal Planning Officer (Local Planning)

Telephone: 01243 534683 E-mail: tflitcroft@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Planning Services

Telephone: 01243 514034 E-mail: sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the submitted Local Plan Site Allocation Development Plan Document 2014-2029, amended to include all the main modifications recommended by the planning inspector to make the Plan sound, together with other more minor modifications already agreed with the inspector, be adopted and published (including any consequential and other appropriate minor amendments) in accordance with regulation 26 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012.**

3. Background

- 3.1 The Council has now received the report of the Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to examine the soundness of the proposed Site Allocation Development Plan Document 2014-2029 (DPD). The detailed conclusions that the Inspector has reached are not repeated in this report.
- 3.2 The final text of the DPD (including Main Modifications as set out in the Inspector's Report and Minor Modifications as set out in the Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications (February 2018) is included as Appendix 1.
- 3.3 The Inspector's report is attached as Appendix 2. It concludes that subject to a series of modifications the plan is sound. These are attached as Appendix 3. The changes shown are in either bold text (additions) or struck through text (deletions).
- 3.4 In addition, the Council produced a series of minor modifications which were consulted on in February 2018. Although these do not go to the heart of the DPD they should also be incorporated into the final version of the DPD. Due to the period of time that has passed since the examination, additional factual changes to the DPD

have also been made in line with Minor Modification MIN1 - *“Amend text to reflect any updates/changes required as a consequence of progress of the DPD or changes elsewhere in the DPD”*.

- 3.5 The DPD is the last document to be published that is associated with the current adopted Local Plan.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 The completion of this part of the plan-making process will provide a framework for the determination of planning applications and complete the requirements relating to the allocation of sites set out in the Site Allocation DPD.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 The main purpose of this report is to recommend adoption of the Site Allocation DPD together with the recommended main modifications, appended to the Inspector’s report which are considered necessary to make the plan sound.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 There are no realistic alternatives to consider as this is the final stage in the plan-making process for the Site Allocation DPD.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 Following adoption (which takes effect immediately on the resolution of the Council), the DPD, along with an ‘adoption statement’ and the sustainability appraisal report, must be published and made available for inspection. Parties involved in the process will also be notified. There will be a period of six weeks for legal challenge, although the DPD would remain in effect pending the outcome of any challenge.
- 7.2 The newly adopted Site Allocation DPD will have the status as comprising part of the Development Plan immediately following adoption. All decisions on relevant applications and appeals will need to be in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 7.3 There is no legal requirement for the Council to adopt the DPD; however, a considerable amount of resource has been expended on the process to date. There are no significant resource implications arising from the adoption of the DPD.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 This DPD has undergone a series of formal consultations in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and at each stage these have been reported to Cabinet and Council as appropriate and published. These consultations have attracted responses across all sectors of the community. Full details were included in the Statement of Consultation that was one of the core documents for the DPD examination.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

9.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out as part of the examination process. Whilst the adoption of the DPD will provide greater certainty in respect of planning matters, there may be sectors of the community who are disappointed with the Inspector's findings following objections that had been made.

10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		✓
Climate Change and Biodiversity A strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal has been undertaken.	✓	
Human Rights and Equality Impact An Equalities Impact Assessment has been prepared and this shows that the Plan has no adverse impacts.		✓
Safeguarding and Early Help		✓
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)		✓
Health and Wellbeing		✓
Other		✓

11. Appendices

11.1 Appendix 1 – Final text of the Site Allocation Development Plan Document (including Main Modifications as set out in the Inspector's Report and Minor Modifications as set out in the Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications (February 2018))

11.2 Appendix 2 - Inspector's Report on the examination into the Site Allocation Development Plan Document

11.3 Appendix 3 – Inspector's Main Modifications included with the Inspector's Report.

12. Background Papers

12.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

8 January 2019

Corporate Pay Review

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Andy Buckley - Corporate Improvement and Facilities Manager
Telephone: 01243 534785 E-mail: abuckley@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Peter Wilding - Cabinet Member for Corporate Services
Telephone: 01428 707324 E-mail: pwilding@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Cabinet recommends the proposed New Reward Scheme (NRS) to the Council for adoption with effect from 1 April 2019.**
- 2.2 That the Cabinet recommends that the Council approves the budget allocation of £303,500 per annum to support the NRS, funded by the £300,000 annual budget that has previously been set aside to support the pay review, with the £3,500 shortfall added to the revenue base budget 2019-2020.**
- 2.3 That the Cabinet recommends that the Council approves the release of up to £360,600 from previously earmarked reserves to fund salary protection costs during the three-year period 2019-2020 to 2021-2022.**

3. Background

- 3.1 At their meeting on 6 September 2016 the Cabinet considered a report setting out options available to Chichester District Council in response to an analysis of its pay grading structure, benchmarking of salaries and recruitment and retention trends in recent years.
- 3.2 Cabinet approved the option of a comprehensive review of posts on a service by service basis. The review would consist of two phases. The first phase was to undertake a job evaluation process for each separate role. The second phase was to analyse the evaluations and work with the Hay Group to provide a revised grading model.
- 3.3 The internal evaluation process was carried out to ensure that roles were evaluated fairly and consistently across the council, thereby ensuring that roles of equal value receive equal pay. The process ran from August 2017 to August 2018, and required the creation of new job profiles for every job role. These job profiles were evaluated using twelve staff who were trained by the Hay Group in the application of the scoring system. Each role was then evaluated by a panel of three evaluators, all of whom were independent to the role and service. The results of all panels were subject to an internal quality check before finally being reviewed by the Hay Group.

3.4 The revised grading structure was then developed with the aim of addressing recruitment and retention issues. Benchmarking analysis, coupled with known external recruitment difficulties, helped inform the development of a briefing document. This document was prepared in consultation with the Staff Side and defined the expectations and constraints for a new pay structure. The proposed NRS has been developed in response to that brief.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

4.1 A fair and consistent pay structure that rewards equal work with equal pay.

4.2 A pay structure that achieves the living wage.

4.3 A new reward structure that helps to recruit and retain staff to further improve the delivery of Chichester District Council services.

5. Proposal

5.1 In developing a new grading structure consideration had to be given to how much change Chichester District Council was willing to accept. The key decisions were:

5.1.1 Change should be kept to a minimum. The primary aim is to ensure that we are continuing to pay staff fairly through equal pay for equal work, rather than to create unnecessary upheaval through changing everybody's salary.

5.1.2 Once equal pay for equal value work has been addressed, the additional budget should be used to address the issues flagged by benchmarking and recruitment.

5.2 A new grading structure has now been developed that meets the specific needs of this Council. A summary of the changes to the existing structure can be found below.

Old Structure 1 April 19 (incl Cash Alt)			New Structure 1 April 19			Grade Differential 1 April 19	
Grade	Floor	Ceiling	Floor	Ceiling	Grade	Floor Change	Ceiling Change
1/2	£17,364	£19,171	£17,364	£19,171	A	£0	£0
3	£19,554	£21,166	£19,945	£21,166	B	£391	£0
4	£21,589	£23,836	£22,021	£23,836	C	£432	£0
5	£24,313	£26,317	£24,799	£26,317	D	£486	£0
6	£26,999	£29,636	£27,905	£30,507	E	£906	£871
7	£30,507	£33,799	£32,029	£35,934	F	£1,522	£2,135
8	£34,788	£38,813	£37,849	£41,675	G	£3,061	£2,862
9	£43,078	£47,928	£44,632	£49,416	H	£1,554	£1,488
10	£49,336	£54,120	£51,354	£55,167	I	£2,018	£1,047
11	£55,099	£61,795	£58,050	£62,867	J	£2,951	£1,072

5.3 To meet the ongoing need for a fair and consistent pay structure some staff will see an adjustment to their grade based on the evaluation process, whilst others may see changes to their terms and conditions as result of changes to the overall grading structure. A summary of all of those changes is included below. Please note these figures change regularly, but minimally, as staff turnover occurs and roles are filled on their new post-evaluation grades.

- Increases 182 (46.4%)
- Decreases 47 (12.0%)
- No Change 163 (41.6%)

5.4 As stated above 12% of staff will see a reduction in their total reward package, these staff will be subject to the Council's salary protection scheme whereby their pay will be fully or partially protected for a period of three years before fully reverting to their new terms and conditions. Please note the 12% figure was correct at the end of the evaluation process. The number of staff that will receive a reduction in their total reward package will be minimised as staff leave or roles change in the interim period.

5.5 It is important to note any reductions in pay are as a result of the evaluation process rather than as a result of the proposed NRS. All staff whose posts have been evaluated at least as high as their previous job will be paid the same, or more, in the proposed NRS than they were previously.

5.6 A total of 46% of staff will see an increase in their overall reward package. This could be as a result of their role being evaluated higher, so moving up one grade or two, or they may have been evaluated at the same level as before but the pay ceiling on their grade has increased as a result of the NRS.

5.7 A copy of the overall grading structure, including an explanatory note of the changes, can be found in appendix 1. The salary points are based on 2019-20 national pay (ie including the April 2019 2% pay award) and a comparison to the existing grading structure is included to help illustrate how staff may be affected.

5.8 If adopted, all affected staff will be written to and informed of their new terms and conditions before the end of January. Those new terms and conditions will then take effect from 1 April 2019.

5.9 Alongside the Pay Review a review of market supplements will also be undertaken to ensure that they are still relevant given the new reward structure and any recent moves in the appropriate employment markets. The results of this review will also be communicated to the relevant staff at the same time that they are informed as to the results of the pay review.

6. Alternatives Considered

6.1 £300,000 had been set aside within the annual revenue budget to support the corporate pay review. When deciding how that money could be targeted the following additional alternatives were considered.

- 6.1.1 Allocate the money evenly across the grades. This option would have ensured everyone got something, presuming their grade had remained at

least the same, but it would have failed to address the aims of the review by not addressing the recruitment and retention and benchmarking issues identified at particular grades.

- 6.1.2 Leave the underlying pay structure the same and instead only use market supplements to address specific issues. This option would have helped ease the recruitment and retention issues, but the benchmarking highlighted that Chichester had fallen behind the average public sector pay in the mid to high grades, therefore suggesting a change to the underlying pay structure, rather than a temporary fix using market supplements, was required. This option also was at risk of leaving a pay structure in place that was at risk of not being compliant with equal pay requirements.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 The cost to the revenue budget is estimated at £303,500 per annum. A provisional budget of £300,000 had already been included in the annual revenue budget to support the pay review, therefore an increase of £3,500 against that budgeted figure is now requested. This has been costed on the basis of all staff being at the top of their current grade and their proposed new grades, meaning there may be some variation from this figure in the short term depending on where staff members are placed within their grades. This estimate may be subject to some change as a result of any ongoing redesign of roles in the interim period, as well as any changes through the review of market supplements or from the Right of Review process where staff can appeal their proposed grades.
- 7.2 Chichester District Council's Pay Protection Scheme offers three years' full or partial protection to phase in the impact of a reduction in pay. The cost of this is estimated at £360,600 over three years to be funded from earmarked reserves (£160,300 in 2019-20, £120,200 in 2020-2021, and £80,100 in 2021-2022). This represents the worst case scenario as the costs will reduce if any affected staff leave during the three year period.
- 7.3 Chichester District Council have agreed with the Staff Side and Unison to vary staff contracts by way of a collective agreement, whereby nominated representatives formally signed the agreement on behalf of the workforce. This approach was the preferred option for all parties and minimises the amount of disruption and uncertainty for staff. By signing this agreement all sides were recognising that the process has been robust and fair both in terms of approach and its application.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 Staff and members have been kept informed of progress throughout the review. Regular updates have been provided through staff briefings, reports to the Joint Employee Consultative Panel and regular meetings with staff and Unison representatives.
- 8.2 Formal 30-day consultation with the Staff Side and Unison took place during November. As part of that process staff were written to on 1 November and provided with a copy of the proposed NRS and an explanatory note of the changes. Staff were asked to review the document and provide feedback through their branch

secretaries who were tasked with collating the responses and incorporating them, where appropriate, into the formal consultation response.

- 8.3 A formal response to the consultation document was received on 29 November 2018 and subsequently Chichester District Council has worked with the Staff Side and Unison to respond to queries and negotiate a collective agreement.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1 Chichester District Council has a corporate risk (CRR8) concerning staff skills, capacity and capability. This project has been identified as one initiative that will further reduce this risk in ensuring Chichester District Council is a fair and attractive employer, and are therefore able to recruit and retain the calibre of staff required to provide a good quality service to our customers.
- 9.2 The Cabinet will, however, be aware of the uncertainty this review may have upon staff and this will need to be carefully managed during implementation.

10. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		X
Climate Change and Biodiversity		X
Human Rights and Equality Impact This process and any associated changes have been and will continue to be undertaken in accordance with Human Rights, Equality and employment law legislation. The equalities impact by gender and pay band was analysed internally, and then externally by Unison, the recognised trade union on behalf of the staff side.	X	
Safeguarding and Early Help		X
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)		X
Health and Wellbeing		X
Other (please specify)		X

11. Appendices

- 11.1 Appendix 1 – New Reward Structure

12. Background Papers

- 12.1 Pay Review Equality Impact Assessment – available to view in an agenda supplement
- 12.2 The Cabinet July 2017 – Pay Policy Report – available to view on the committee pages of Chichester District Council’s website
- 12.3 Staff Side and Unison Consultation Document – a confidential exempt document (Paras 1 and 2) which is available to view in an agenda supplement by members and relevant officers only

This page is intentionally left blank

Old Structure				New Structure		
Old Grade	Spinal Point	Total Pay		New Grade	Step	Total Pay
1 / 2	4 to 17	£17,364 to £19,171	⇒	A	A1	£17,364
					A2	£18,426
					A3	£19,171
3	18 to 21	£19,554 to £21,166	⇒	B	B1	£19,945
					B2	£20,751
					B3	£21,166
4	22 to 25	£21,589 to £23,836	⇒	C	C1	£22,021
					C2	£22,911
					C3	£23,836
5	26 to 28	£24,799 to £26,317	⇒	D	D1	£24,799
					D2	£25,801
					D3	£26,317
6	29 to 32	£26,999 to £29,636	⇒	E	E1	£27,905
					E2	£29,636
					E3	£30,507
7	33 to 37	£30,507 to £33,799	⇒	F	F1	£32,029
					F2	£33,799
					F3	£35,934
8	38 to 42	£34,788 to £38,813	⇒	G	G1	£37,849
					G2	£39,782
					G3	£41,675
9 *	43 to 48	£43,013 to £47,863	⇒	H	H1	£44,632
					H2	£47,503
					H3	£49,416
10 *	49 to 54	£49,263 to £54,047	⇒	I	I1	£51,354
					I2	£53,263
					I3	£55,167
11 *	55 to 62	£55,026 to £61,722	⇒	J	J1	£58,050
					J2	£60,955
					J3	£62,867

* Salaries for existing grades 9, 10 and 11 are inclusive of cash alternative payments.

Explanatory Note

Previous benchmarking analysis, coupled with recruitment and retention issues, have identified that it is the middle to high grades that require targeted adjustments, especially the middle grades. The proposed new reward scheme addresses these issues and a summary of the proposed changes are shown below.

- Grades shortened to a maximum of 3 increments per grade.
- Ceilings on old grades 1 – 5 remain the same.
- Ceiling on old grade 6 increases by 1 spinal point.
- Ceiling on old grade 7 increases by 2 spinal points.
- Ceiling on old grade 8 increases by 3 spinal points.
- Ceiling on old grades 9 - 11 increase by 1 increment, and cash alternative allowance is incorporated into base salary.
- Non-statutory responsibility allowances, PRP and any historic premia payments that are no longer relevant will be removed.
- Existing market supplements that remain relevant will be reviewed and benchmarked using the NRS to ensure they are at the appropriate level.

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

8 January 2019

Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Andy Buckley - Corporate Improvement and Facilities Manager

Telephone: 01243 534785 E-Mail: abuckley@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Tony Dignum - Leader of the Council

Telephone: 01243 538585 E-Mail: tdignum@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the Council be recommended to agree that the Corporate Plan approved in January 2018 remains unchanged for the year 2019-2020.**
- 2.2. That the new project proposals for 2019-2020 as set out in appendices 1 to 9 to the agenda report be agreed.**
- 2.3. That, subject to the Cabinet's agreement in para 2.2 above, the Council be recommended to approve the release of £246,000 from Chichester District Council's General Fund Reserve to fund the feasibility work and small projects identified in para 5.2 of the agenda report for 2019-2020, and that £30,000 of this funding be released with immediate effect to allow for the Novium business plan feasibility work.**
- 2.4. That it be noted that the Gigabit and the Depot resurfacing and Drainage projects will be subject to full Project Initiation Document approval.**

3. Background

- 3.1. In January 2018, the Council agreed the new Corporate Plan for 2018-2021 with the following priority areas:
 - Improve the provision of and access to suitable housing.
 - Support our communities.
 - Manage our built and natural environments to promote and maintain a positive sense of place.
 - Improve and support the local economy to enable appropriate local growth.
 - Manage the council's finances prudently and effectively.
- 3.2. As part of the annual business planning cycle the Cabinet is asked to approve the outline major projects for 2019-2020. These take the form of Initial Project Proposal Documents (IPPDs) as defined in the Council's Project Management Guidance.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1. As part of the Council's annual business planning cycle, Cabinet is asked to consider the following IPPDs for potential new projects for 2019-2020:
- Depot resurfacing and drainage
 - East Beach Selsey land/asset opportunities
 - East Wittering and Bracklesham vision
 - Review of Chichester District Parking Strategy
 - Priory Park Phase 2 Option Appraisal
 - Novium business plan feasibility work
 - Gigabit expansion
 - Hyde asset management
 - Emerging Vision projects
- 4.2. Should the IPPDs be approved and the project costs exceed £50,000; have a significant impact or be relatively complex, a Project Initiation Document (PID) will be developed and considered by the Cabinet at a later date. The PID will set out the detailed project planning information, timescales, outcomes and business case for the project.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. The Cabinet is asked to approve the IPPDs set out in Appendices 1-9 which outline the key projects for the Council for the year 2019-2020. All of the projects contribute to the priorities and objectives within the agreed Corporate Plan.
- 5.2. The Cabinet is also recommended to Council approve funding from reserves to progress the development of projects as follows:
- (a) East Beach Selsey land/asset opportunities - £25,000 for professional fees to undertake an options appraisal of the possible opportunities for the land and property associated with the project.
 - (b) East Wittering and Bracklesham Vision - £27,000 to support the project through the engagement and initial projects, and to provide temporary support within the Place team on a two-year basis.
 - (c) Review of Chichester District Parking Strategy - £35,000 for technical support and expertise to assist with the revision of the strategy.
 - (d) Priory Park Phase 2 Options Appraisal - £10,000 to employ an architect to produce the design work required for the options appraisal.
 - (e) Novium business plan feasibility work - £30,000 to employ consultants to produce the feasibility work required to assess and inform the business plan.
 - (f) Emerging Vision projects
 - Northgate Car Park (Chichester) - £15,000 for designs and surveys.
 - Branding (Chichester) - £40,000 for consultants
 - Wayfinding (Chichester) - £30,000

- Wayfinding (Selsey) - £10,000
- Develop and host events (Selsey) - £2,000
- Wayfinding (Midhurst) - £10,000
- Admin Support (All) - £12,000

5.3. The gigabit and the depot resurfacing and drainage projects will be subject to full PIDs.

5.4. If approved, the projects will be included in the Council's workplan, as well as being monitored on the corporate performance and project monitoring system. This is reported to Members and the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) by exception.

5.5. It is proposed that the overarching Corporate Plan as approved in January 2018 remains unchanged for 2019-2020. Any minor amendments to performance indicators will be captured in the relevant service plans and monitored under the current performance reporting arrangements.

6. Resource and Legal Implications

6.1. The IPPDs include a preliminary indication of the resources required for each project. This allows all teams, including support services, to plan their resources for the coming year effectively, ensuring that all of the projects can be delivered. In the event that internal resources are insufficient the approved budgets enable one-off specialist resources to be engaged.

7. Consultation

7.1 Consultation on the draft 2019-2020 IPPDs was carried out with the SLT and Cabinet Members as part of Strategic Planning Days.

8. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

8.1. Clear and effective project planning ensures that projects are given the best chance of succeeding with coherent business cases providing Members with the right information to make informed decisions on the best use of the Council's resources.

9. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		X
Climate Change None at this stage, to be considered in more detail at PID stage.		X
Human Rights and Equality Impact None directly at this stage, impact assessments to be undertaken as PIDs develop if required		X
Safeguarding and Early Help		X
Health and Wellbeing		X

GDPR		X
Other		X

10. Appendices

Appendix 1 - Depot resurfacing and drainage IPPD

Appendix 2 - East Beach Selsey land/asset opportunities IPPD

Appendix 2(a) - East Beach Plan

Appendix 2(b) – East Beach Kiosk

Appendix 3 - East Wittering and Bracklesham vision IPPD

Appendix 4 - Review of Chichester District Parking Strategy IPPD

Appendix 5 - Priory Park Phase 2 Option Appraisal IPPD

Appendix 6 - Novium business plan feasibility work IPPD

Appendix 7 - Gigabit expansion IPPD

Appendix 8 - Hyde asset management IPPD

Appendix 9 – Emerging Vision projects

11. Background Papers

11.1. None

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

8 January 2019

Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Tim Guymer - Principal Planning Officer (Strategic Planning)

Telephone: 01243 534682 E-mail: tguymer@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Planning Services

Telephone: 01243 514034 E-mail: sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. **That the recommended response set out in appendix 2 to the agenda report is endorsed as Chichester District Council's response to the consultation on the draft Gatwick Airport Master Plan.**

3. Background

National Context

- 3.1. Air travel in the UK continues to make an important contribution towards facilitating economic growth as well as enhancing cultural and leisure opportunities. Balanced against these considerations is the increased scrutiny being given to the environmental impacts of air travel, as well as the potential impacts on nearby residents.
- 3.2. In recent years air travel has been brought into focus with the prevalence of low-cost passenger travel. This increases demand on the capacity of existing airports to accommodate this growth. This demand is forecast by the Government to grow from an estimated 267 million passengers in 2016 to a potential (unconstrained) demand of 495 million passengers by 2050.
- 3.3. Members will be familiar with the work undertaken by the Airports Commission to quantify the impact that these forecasts could have on the need for the expansion of airport capacity in the UK.
- 3.4. In December 2013, it published an interim report which concluded that there was a need for one additional runway to be in operation in the south east of England by 2030. Subsequent work by the Commission considered the potential to provide this additional capacity, including through a new airport in the inner Thames Estuary, expansion of Heathrow Airport and a second runway at Gatwick Airport. During the course of this work, the government consulted on the options available. A report setting out the comments of Chichester District Council (CDC) was considered by the Cabinet in January 2015.
- 3.5. The final report of the Commission in July 2015 recommended that the development of a new runway at Heathrow Airport was pursued as the preferred

option on the basis that it presented the strongest case and offered the greatest strategic and economic benefits.

- 3.6. In October 2016, the government confirmed that a new runway northwest of the existing Heathrow Airport was its preferred scheme. This preferred approach has been taken forward through the preparation of a new “Airports National Planning Statement: new runway capacity and infrastructure at airports in the South East of England” which was published in June 2018.
- 3.7. With the additional airport capacity unlikely to come forward before 2030, the need to make more intensive use of existing airport infrastructure has been recognised by government. A new general national aviation strategy is expected to be published by the government in 2019, which is anticipated to set out the government’s policy on this matter.
- 3.8. In advance of this, in June 2018 the government published ‘Beyond the horizon, the future of UK aviation – Making best use of existing runways’. This confirms that the government believes there is a case for airports to make best use of their existing runways.
- 3.9. Where airports wish to increase their potential passenger traffic movements by fewer than 10 million passengers per annum, it is envisaged that such applications can be taken forward through the existing provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Such applications will need to demonstrate how they will mitigate against environmental impacts, taking account of national policy and other local considerations, to be determined on a case by case basis.
- 3.10. Where applications involve an increase of 10 million or more passengers per annum (or deemed ‘nationally significant’), such applications would be considered as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under the Planning Act 2008 and would need to be considered by the Secretary of State.

Gatwick Airport

- 3.11. Gatwick Airport is currently the second busiest airport in the UK (behind Heathrow Airport) in terms of the total number of passengers. It represents a significant economic driver within the south-east region and a major employer. Its effects and impacts extend into the Chichester District administrative area both directly (principally through the routes of aircraft) and indirectly (through associated economic development and increased traffic on roads/public transport etc.)
- 3.12. The airport principally uses a single runway, served by two passenger terminals. A second standby runway, running parallel to the main runway, is only currently usable as an ‘emergency runway’ when the main runway is unavailable.
- 3.13. The use of the airport’s runways, and any planned expansion, has been controlled since August 1979 through a legal agreement between the owners of the airport and West Sussex County Council. This agreement was reached within the context of planning consent being granted for a significant expansion of the airport, including the building of the second North terminal which opened in 1988. The expected increased capacity of the airport with this provision was around 25 million passengers per annum.
- 3.14. The legal agreement is time-limited for a period of 40 years from its signing and expires in August 2019.

- 3.15. Despite the restrictions set out in the legal agreement, passenger traffic through Gatwick Airport had already risen to 33.8 million per annum in 2012 as a result of more efficient use of the existing infrastructure and new technologies.
- 3.16. In 2012, the current master plan was prepared by the airport owners. This expected passenger traffic to grow to 40.2 million passengers per year by 2021/22 through continued increase to the airport operations, and within the restrictions of the 1979 legal agreement. The 2012 master plan also looked further ahead to the year 2030 where up to 45 million passengers per annum were projected, principally by making use of unused capacity outside of peak periods. In reality, by 2018 passenger traffic at the airport had already grown to 45.7 million passengers per year and is expected to rise to 53 million passengers per annum by 2023. For reference, 102,000 tonnes of cargo travelled through Gatwick Airport in 2018 and is expected to increase.

Draft Gatwick Airport Master Plan 2018

- 3.17. It is in this context that the owners of Gatwick Airport have published a draft master plan (<https://www.gatwickairport.com/globalassets/business--community/growing-gatwick/gatwick-draft-master-plan-final.pdf>)
- 3.18. The draft master plan sets out the immediate priorities for Gatwick Airport for the period 2018-2022-2023. These are summarised as follows:
- Improved utilisation of existing runway through use of technology, improved processes and modifications to runway and taxiway infrastructure.
 - Increased use of larger aircraft by airlines, thereby increasing number of passengers per flight
 - £1.1bn of capital investments into airfield, terminal and surface access improvements
- 3.19. Looking further ahead to the period 2022-2023-2032-2033, the master plan considers three broader growth strategies to meet anticipated demand:
- **Scenario 1 – a single runway operation using the existing main runway.** Under this scenario, passenger traffic is projected to rise to between 57 and 61 million passengers per annum by 2032-2033. Cargo tonnage is projected to increase to 220,000 tonnes per annum;
 - **Scenario 2 – existing standby runway is brought into more active use alongside the existing main runway.** Under this scenario, passenger traffic is projected to rise to between 68 and 70 million passengers per annum by 2032-2033. Cargo tonnage is projected to increase to 325,000 tonnes per annum;
 - **Scenario 3 – land is safeguarded for an additional runway to the south.** Under this scenario, the total capacity of the airport could be around 95 million passengers per annum. The timescales for achieving this scenario is not specified, as there is currently no policy support from government.
- 3.20. Broadly, the first two scenarios may be considered to be consistent with the government agenda to make best use of existing runways. This is certainly the case with the first scenario which would see very little physical changes to the airfield, relying instead on ever increasing efficiencies being made, including

growth outside of current peak travel times. As such, there is expected to be little need for additional infrastructure and potentially limited opportunities for local planning authorities to influence this growth.

- 3.21. The second scenario would be reliant on bringing the existing standby runway into more active use as a second runway operating alongside the existing main runway. Relatively moderate changes would be required to the layout of the airfield and its boundary. The anticipated development required, combined with the projected increase in passenger traffic movements, indicates that the project would be a 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project' and thus consent for development would need to be secured through the Development Consent Order process. As such, the decision-taker for any planning application would be the Secretary of State, with the process managed by the Planning Inspectorate.
- 3.22. The third scenario, namely the potential longer-term provision of an additional runway, would clearly be in conflict with current government policy. This is acknowledged in the draft master plan, which only seeks to safeguard the land required for this longer-term aspiration.
- 3.23. Whilst presented as three different scenarios, these are not necessarily mutually exclusive in terms of their physical ability to be delivered. Conceivably, and subject to a change in government policy, all three scenarios could, over time be delivered. The master plan, once finalised, will replace the 2012 plan. It has no significant status within the parameters of planning legislation, and carries little weight as a material planning consideration. However, as an expression of intent by the owners of a key part of the country's national infrastructure, it is considered to be an important document to consider.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1. CDC has been invited to make representations on the draft master plan prior to the closing date for consultation on 10 January 2019.
- 4.2. The impacts on Chichester District are generally considered to be relatively limited, particularly in the southern parishes. However, those parishes in the northern part of the district are within close proximity to Gatwick Airport and currently experience environmental impacts (including noise disturbance) from the operation of the airport, as well as economic benefits. The potential intensification and extension of the airport could have implications for these areas, as well as having a more indirect impact on other parts of the district.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. An analysis of the potential economic, social and environmental impacts on the district arising from the proposals set out in the draft master plan is set out in Appendix 1. The proposed response to the consultation is set out in appendix 2.
- 5.2. In responding to this consultation, it is important to recognise the limited status of the draft master plan as discussed in paragraph 3.23 above. Nevertheless, the plan does represent the expression of intent of the airport's owners as to its future development. The limited scope is acknowledged in the plan, including recognition that many of the aspirations and objectives discussed require the preparation of significant evidence to justify and further inform them.

5.3. The potential impacts on Chichester District are generally considered by officers to be relatively limited, particularly in the southern parishes. However, those parishes in the northern part of the district are within close proximity to Gatwick Airport and currently experience environmental impacts (including noise disturbance) from the operation of the airport, as well as a share of economic benefits. The potential intensification and extension of the airport could have implications for these areas, as well as having a more indirect impact on other parts of the district.

6. Alternatives Considered

6.1. Although CDC could resolve not to formally respond to this consultation, the role and influence of Gatwick Airport in the wider economy is considered to justify a response.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

7.1. There are not considered to be any significant resource and legal implications arising from this report.

8. Consultation

8.1. This report considers CDC's response to a consultation being undertaken by the owners of Gatwick Airport. Other groups are free to comment as they see fit. There is therefore no need for the recommended response set out in this report to be the subject of consultation. Comments from the Economic Development and Environmental Protection teams have been included in the report.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

9.1. The potential impacts are set out in the report and specifically within the Appendices and related documents for this consultation.

10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		✓
Climate Change There could be implications and these are discussed at para 5.13 of the report.	✓	
Human Rights and Equality Impact		✓
Safeguarding and Early Help		✓
General Data Protection Regulations		✓
Health and Wellbeing Draft Masterplan scenarios 2 and 3 are likely to give rise to environmental implications mainly for residents in the north of the district (eg in relation to noise and air quality) which will need to be	✓	

addressed when more detailed information is available.		
Other		✓

11. Appendices

- 11.1. Appendix 1 - Analysis of potential impacts on Chichester District arising from Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan
- 11.2. Appendix 2 - Proposed Chichester District Council response to Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018 consultation

12. Background Papers

12.1. Background papers of particular relevance to this report are:

- Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018 Consultation
(<https://www.gatwickairport.com/globalassets/business--community/growing-gatwick/gatwick-draft-master-plan-final.pdf>)
- Agenda item from 6 January 2015 setting out the Council's previous response to the Airports Commission Consultation Document
(<http://chichester.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s825/09.0%20Gatwick%20preferred%20route%20consultation%20v4.pdf>)

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

8 January 2019

Commissioning of West Sussex Community Advice Service

1. Contacts

Report Author:

David Hyland - Community Engagement Manager
Telephone: 01243 534864 E-mail: dhyland@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Eileen Lintill - Cabinet Member for Community Services,
Telephone: 01798 342948 E-mail: elintill@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Cabinet agrees, subject to continued partner funding, to the continuation of the Funding Partnership to commission a Community Advice Service across West Sussex for up to three years from April 2019 with West Sussex County Council as the lead authority.**
- 2.2 **That the Cabinet delegates authority to the Director of Housing and Communities, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, to agree the specification and signing of the contract, and delegates the annual monitoring of performance to the Grants and Concessions Panel.**

3. Background

- 3.1 At the meeting of January 2018, the Cabinet recommended to the Council the allocation of £74,000 per annum for up to two years to enable a bridging contract to be negotiated for the provision of a Community Advice Service across West Sussex. The existing contract was due to end in March 2018. The purpose of this arrangement was to sustain funding (through a partnership with West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) and the district and borough councils in the county) for the existing providers as an interim measure to enable a formally recommissioned service for a longer period.
- 3.2 The one year bridging contract was negotiated and agreed under delegation by the Head of Community Services, and is due to conclude in March 2019. Discussions have identified that the Funding Partnership are keen to continue the service with the lead contractor, Central and Southern Sussex Citizens Advice, delivered in this District by the local charity Arun and Chichester Citizens Advice.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 To identify the most effective economic and efficient means of continuing a community advice service which meets the needs of residents in the District. In the context of increasing demand, ensure the continued availability of access to:

- Impartial advice
- Support for avoiding and reducing debt
- Advice that ensures individuals are receiving correct benefits
- A quality volunteering experience for those involved in delivery

5. Proposal

- 5.1 The current contract is between the Funding Partnership (WSCC and the constituent District and Borough Councils) and Central and Southern Sussex Citizens Advice as lead provider. The relationship has been successful in supporting the local service for the period of the current contract (since April 2015), but the new contract specification will reflect the changing nature of welfare advice, particularly in respect of Universal Credit and changes in the way the service is provided across the county.
- 5.2 It is proposed that a contract is procured by way of single tender with the current supplier, rather than by competitive tender (subject to approval by WSCC internal procurement committee). It is considered that the Citizens Advice organisations offer a distinctive service to local residents and its methodology of operation, utilising a large number of volunteers in locations across the county, is unique and could not be replicated.
- 5.3 It is proposed that the process will be led by WSCC on behalf of the funding partners, all of whom would be party to the final agreement.
- 5.4 It is anticipated that the term of the contract will be negotiated as a two year contract from 1 April 2019 with an option to extend for the third year. It will also be subject to the availability of funds from the various partners, which will in effect be reconfirmed annually. Providers are happy that the longer term commitment still indicates support for the service and allows them to plan more effectively.
- 5.5 WSCC is expected to formally approve the commissioning of the new service this month, and the procurement process will then follow. A new contract should be in place by April 2019, but the Citizens Advice organisations are fully engaged in the process to ensure continuity.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 The Council could choose to discontinue funding of this service but the current level of use is clear evidence of the need for the service, and there is concern that the need for advice will rise further.
- 6.2 The original countywide contract arrangements were products of the Legal Services Commission led commissioning of a countywide service that was discontinued prior to 2014. Discussions over the last 12 months amongst the funding partnership have identified different views about the way forward, and it could be possible to return to local grant giving directly between Chichester District Council and Arun and Chichester Citizens Advice as the local provider. However there is now mutual aid between the two Citizens Advice Services, and the countywide arrangement continues to draw in significant funding from WSCC

(£350,000 committed for 2019/20), which might be jeopardised.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 Funding for the service to cover this proposal of £ 82,100 per annum is within base budget with an inflationary increase for 2019-20 (subject to the Council's approval of the budget in March 2019).
- 7.2 WSCC will be leading on the procurement so staff resourcing implications are low.
- 7.3 The contract and specification will be reviewed by Legal Services to ensure that the interests of Chichester District Council are protected.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 The annual performance of Arun and Chichester Citizens Advice has been reported to the Grants and Concessions Panel to its satisfaction. In advance of their meeting of 30th January 2019, this report has been circulated to the Panel in draft form. Members of the Panel have indicated their support for the Arun and Chichester Citizens Advice and this funding proposal.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1 There is justification for the approach proposed as summarised at para 6.2, and the arrangement when more openly commissioned in previous years received no interest from the wider market. It is also felt that uncertainty over future funding levels means there is no justification to re test the market.
- 9.2 Impact on the community will be positive as an advice service will be available.

10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		X
Climate Change and Biodiversity		X
Human Rights and Equality Impact An EIA on the previous tendering exercise demonstrated a positive impact	X	
Safeguarding and Early Help Vulnerable people receive help and advice through this commissioned service. The contract ensures that service providers have robust Safeguarding arrangements in place, and can prioritise support to those least able to help themselves.	X	
Health and Wellbeing Access to advice from a trusted organisation will have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of residents	X	
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) As lead organisation, WSCC have already ensured compliance with GDPR as part of the contract extension April 2018 – March 2019.	X	

11. Appendices

11.1 None

12. Background Papers

12.1 None

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

8 January 2019

Land at Mill Road and Covington Road Westbourne –

Community Land Trust Proposal

1. Contacts

Report Author

Peter Legood - Valuation and Estates Manager

Telephone: 01243 534668 E-mail: plegood@chichester.gov.uk

Holly Nicol - Housing Delivery Manager

Telephone 01243 534699 E-mail: hnicol@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member

Tony Dignum - Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place

Telephone: 01243 538585 E-mail: tdignum@chichester.gov

Jane Kilby - Cabinet Member for Housing Services

Telephone 01243 773494 E-mail: jkilby@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

2.1 The land to the rear of 50-56 Mill Road and the land at Covington Road Westbourne be declared surplus to requirements.

2.2 To note that following this, the actions set out in section 5.0 of the agenda report are to be pursued by the officers under delegated authority.

3. Background

3.1 This report primarily relates to Chichester District Council's (CDC) land to the rear of 30-56 Mill Road Westbourne which Westbourne Community Trust (WCT) is seeking to acquire. WCT has also asked for consideration to be given to the transfer of an area of open space at Covington Road Westbourne which is recommended and the Scout premises in Mill Road, Westbourne which is not recommended at this time and is not considered in this report.

3.2 CDC's Housing Delivery Team is currently supporting WCT through its community led housing (CLH) early stage support programme. An affordable housing working group was set up by the Parish Council to investigate their housing needs and the delivery mechanisms. Subsequently, a CLH steering group was formed with both members from the Parish Council and the community to set up a Community Land Trust. In this regard Westbourne Community Trust was incorporated as a Community Benefit Society on 13

November 2018. They have based their objectives on the Charity Commissions example Rural Regeneration Objectives.

- 3.3 The Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) has identified two market housing development sites. However, as they are expected to deliver less than 11 units, no onsite affordable units can be sought. There are 19 households on CDC's housing register who have a local connection to Westbourne, of which 47% are in priority housing need. The Housing Delivery Team has been working with WCT to identify potential affordable housing sites to meet the local housing need and have identified the land to the rear of 30-56 Mill Road as a potential site. WCT has been advised by Planning Policy that although the Mill Road land has not been included as a housing development site in the WNP it could be the subject of a planning application for housing development as an exception site for affordable housing.
- 3.4 The land to the rear of 30-56 Mill Road comprises part of a larger site acquired in 1947 for housing purposes. The land was not included in the initial housing development and was excluded from the 2001 transfer of land with the housing stock as it was considered to have long term potential for housing development. In this connection CDC also retained part of the long gardens of the houses that transferred (or had sold under the right to buy) and these areas are the subject of garden licences at nominal rentals. Excluding the garden land and the access road the land comprises a site of 0.78 ha.
- 3.5 In 2002-2003 the Parish Council approached CDC through the Communities Team seeking a long term (99 year lease) agreement to use the land for open space purposes, the land being more centrally located than the main recreation ground to the north of the village. This conflicted with the long term ambition of promoting the land for housing development but CDC agreed to grant a lease to the Parish Council for a limited period of 30 years. This lease will expire in 2033 and the Parish Council currently pay a concessionary rental of £100 per annum.
- 3.6 As part of the development of the WNP preparation, the site was submitted as a potential housing development site for inclusion in the Plan. This was favoured by the Parish Council on the basis that the site would be jointly promoted by the CDC and the Parish Council, and development would be restricted to part of the site. As leaseholder, the Parish Council would have shared the potential of the development and achieved an enhanced interest in the residue of the land. Unfortunately before the WNP housing sites were finally determined an alternative site (not supported by the Parish) was granted planning permission on appeal and this replaced the Mill Road land in the plan.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 The WCT wish to acquire the Mill Road land from CDC and use part of this as an exception site for about 10 affordable houses with provision of enhanced community facilities on the remainder of the site including play facilities, toilets and other facilities to support the adjoining allotments.

- 4.2 To help achieve community support the WCT would not seek to include the sections of retained gardens in the development. Small capital receipts might be achieved by CDC through offering this land to the householders in the cases where the house has been acquired.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 The land to the rear of 50-56 Mill Road to be sold to WCT at a market value which reflects the limited value of an exception site, for affordable housing with a retained community use on the remainder of the land. The sale to include appropriate covenants and restrictions to ensure that the houses built on the land are retained as affordable housing in perpetuity.
- 5.2 The land at Covington Road to be transferred to the WCT for a nominal payment, subject to appropriate covenants and restrictions being included in the transfer, to ensure that it is retained as open space.
- 5.3 If the sale to the WCT proceeds, CDC's retained land let on garden licences will be offered for sale to relevant householders. Pending this right of access to be retained over the land to the rear of 50-56 Mill Road.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 As far as the Mill Road and Covington Road sites are concerned, CDC has the options of retaining the present arrangements or selling to the WCT as proposed.
- 6.2 The Covington Road land had been identified as a potential building plot but an Inquiry determined that residents had established a right of way over the land which limits use to open space purposes.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 CDC has CLH grant for land purchase (up to £10,000 per plot) and grant for technical and feasibility costs to bring a CLH scheme to planning (up to £30k per scheme). CDC also has commuted sum money which can be used as grant towards development costs of new affordable units. In addition to this, the WCT can also access grants from the national CLH funds for capital, revenue and infrastructure costs. For the community element of the proposal, WCT could potentially access the New Homes Bonus via the Parish bid process.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 Internal consultations have been undertaken with CDC officers. The Parish Council has been representing local interest in wider discussion about the proposals.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1 The Mill Road site is not an easy one to bring forward for development. Although, the issues will be reduced as the WCT, Parish Council and CDC will be working together.

9.2 The access to the site is owned by the Parish Council with a covenant limiting use to recreational purposes. There are also two ransom strips – one imposed when the adjoining land was originally sold for residential development and the other when the land changed hands between housing developers that also restrict the use of the access road. In all cases the restrictions are believed to have been imposed for financial reasons to enable the beneficiaries to charge for permitting access for development on the subject land or the land to the east. The parties may be prepared to release the restriction for a low value exception site but options for overcoming the restrictions need to be investigated.

10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
Crime and Disorder		No
Climate Change There are some concerns about flooding in Westbourne but account will be taken of any potential flood risk in proposals for the land.	Yes	
Human Rights and Equality Impact. The proposal includes the provision of affordable housing for local people in need of assistance in housing provision.	Yes	
Safeguarding and Early Help The proposals include the provision of improved play provision for young children	Yes	
General Data Protection Regulations		No
Health and Wellbeing The proposal will lead to improved housing and community facilities.	Yes	
Other (please specify)		

11. Appendices

- 11.1 Site Plan Land at Mill Road Westbourne
- 11.2 Site Plan Land at Covington Road Westbourne

12. Background Papers

- 12.1 None



CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

**Paul E.Over BSc (Hons), MBA, FRICS
Executive Director**



Land rear of 30-56 Mill Road, Westbourne

© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018803

Date: 02.03.15 Scale: 1:1250 Drawing No. 5036 Produced on GIS by DJ LILLEY



Based on Ordnance survey Mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

UNAUTHORISED REPRODUCTION INFRINGES CROWN COPYRIGHT AND MAY LEAD TO PROSECUTION OR CIVIL PROCEEDINGS.

Chichester District Council
East Pallant House
Chichester, West Sussex: PO19 1TY.
License No. LA100018803

**This copy has been produced specifically to supply an individual with information only.
NO FURTHER COPIES MAY BE MADE**

This page is intentionally left blank



CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

**Paul E.Over BSc (Hons), MBA, FRICS
Deputy Chief Executive**



Land at Covington Road, Westbourne

© Crown copyright and database rights 2018 Ordnance Survey 100018803

Date: 06.09.18 Scale: 1:1250 Drawing No. 5576 Produced on GIS by DJ LILLEY



Based on Ordnance survey Mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright.

UNAUTHORISED REPRODUCTION INFRINGES CROWN COPYRIGHT AND MAY LEAD TO PROSECUTION OR CIVIL PROCEEDINGS.

Chichester District Council
East Pallant House
Chichester, West Sussex. PO19 1TY.
License No. LA100018803

**This copy has been produced specifically to supply an individual with Information only.
NO FURTHER COPIES MAY BE MADE**

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

8 January 2019

Recording of Committee Meetings

1. Contacts

Report Author

Nicholas Bennett - Monitoring Officer and Divisional Manager Democratic Services
Telephone: 01243 534668 E-mail: nbennett@Chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member

Peter Wilding - Cabinet Member for Corporate Services
Telephone: 01428 707324 E-Mail: pwilding@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Cabinet approves the ongoing audio recording and publishing of the Council, the Cabinet, the Planning Committee, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee meetings online.**

3. Background

- 3.1 At the Council meeting on 22 September 2015, when considering a recommendation from the Cabinet regarding government regulations on openness of local government, it was resolved (minute 43) that: 'That the Cabinet be recommended to undertake a one year trial of publication of audio recordings of proceedings at the Council, the Cabinet, the Planning Committee, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee meetings.'
- 3.2 The trial completed in January 2017 and all the above meetings were recorded. However there remained some issues with the system provided by the contractor and recordings of two meetings were not capable of being properly heard or accessed after the meetings. Several further meetings required significant officer time to correct problems with recordings so that they could be accessed and an extension of the pilot was agreed by the Cabinet in May 2017.
- 3.3 During the further pilot period technical problems have been overcome and the system is now one that the Divisional Manager has confidence in. Some updated hardware has been put in place and software conflicts have been overcome. Further, work to publicise the availability of recorded meetings has been undertaken with the support of the Public Relations team.
- 3.4 The benefits of the system remain as set out in previous reports – simple access by the public including persons who would otherwise find it difficult to attend meetings. It enables live broadcast which is of particular benefit for high-significance matters such as certain large planning applications. Some savings in officer time in hand-recording minutes are also being realised and also in investigating complaints about alleged conduct and statements made in meetings.

3.5 Against these benefits, the annual cost of the system is £3,900 per annum. An increase in set-up time and monitoring time has been required, though it is hoped that as the technology is improved and the problems have been addressed this impact will reduce.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

4.1 The system will enable members, the public and officers to access recordings of meetings improving transparency and maintain efficient delivery of Democratic Services and Code of Conduct complaint decisions.

5. Alternatives Considered

5.1 The alternatives considered are whether or not to proceed with recording of meetings using the current system, cease to record or alternatively whether to test the market again through a further procurement exercise.

5.2 The views of IT and Facilities have been sought and the clear opinion is that having put significant effort into installing and improving the systems, the system is now sufficiently fit for purpose and delivering the intended outcomes sought by members for the original trial period.

5.3 The market for systems of this kind is relatively young and changing to another system at this time is likely to lead to similar issues of integration with any other product.

5.4 If Chichester District Council (CDC) was to cease to record meetings then further resource to minute meetings in a more verbatim manner would be required, and there would be less certainty as to the investigation of any possible complaints about members at meetings.

6. Resource and Legal Implications

6.1 Funding of the contract will be £3,900 per annum funded from existing budget. The costs of the microphone system are not relevant to this contract as the sound system would remain in place whatever committee recording software is used.

7. Consultation

7.1 Members were all invited to attend microphone system demonstrations to allow them involvement in deciding the initial specification of the future system

7.2 Colleagues in Democratic Services, Facilities and IT have been part of the group testing the system through the pilot period.

8. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

8.1 An audio record of the Council's main meetings published online will allow local people to have access to, and an understanding of, CDC's decision making processes. Those who find it difficult to attend meetings, due to disability, caring responsibilities, work commitments or access to transport, will be able to benefit. An equality impact assessment was carried out as to the

change adopting recording in 2015 and the recommended decision would mean that no change occurred requiring a further assessment.

8.2 There is no other direct community or corporate impact from the recommendations of this report other than as set out above.

9. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		X
Climate Change and Biodiversity		X
Human Rights and Equality Impact		X
Safeguarding and Early Help		X
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)		X
Health and Wellbeing		X
Other (please specify)		X

10. Appendices

10.1 None

11. Background Papers

11.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

8 January 2019

Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure Support

1. Contacts

Report Author

David Hyland - Community Engagement Manager

Telephone: 01243 534864 E-mail: dhyland@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member

Eileen Lintill - Cabinet Member for Community Services

Telephone: 01798 342948 E-mail: elintill@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Cabinet agrees, subject to continued partner funding, to Chichester District Council's participation in a funding partnership with West Sussex County Council, Clinical Commissioning Groups and other West Sussex district and borough councils to agree joint funding principles of West Sussex Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure Support services.**
- 2.2 That the Cabinet delegates authority to the Director of Housing and Communities, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, to agree a service specification and signing of a three-year funding agreement and delegates to the Grants and Concessions Panel the annual monitoring of performance.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Chichester District Council (CDC) recognises the importance of a successful and resilient voluntary and community sector made up of charities, social enterprises and community groups that support residents, particularly those who are more vulnerable. CDC has historically funded support to ensure that the organisational and development needs of the sector are met. This is achieved by funding the local 'infrastructure support' organisation.
- 3.2 In the Chichester District, the service is delivered by Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (VAAC). VAAC is a registered charity and a company limited by guarantee. VAAC was formed in 2012 following a merger of the voluntary and community sector support organisations that served Arun and Chichester. VAAC is a membership organisation led by and answerable to local groups. They currently have 248 member organisations from Chichester.
- 3.3 The service is currently under a funding agreement that ends in March 2019, this was a one-year agreement to allow for countywide discussions about how the service might be commissioned and delivered in the future. Over the previous three years West Sussex County Council (WSCC) has chosen to fund this service

by 'passporting' their grant funding to Districts to procure a suitable local service. VAAC's performance supporting groups and volunteers in Chichester District is monitored quarterly, with annual reports to the Grants and Concessions Panel (GCP). The GCP has been satisfied with performance.

- 3.4 Since December 2017, district and borough council officers have met with WSCC officers to review the Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure (VCSI) support services across West Sussex. These meetings have also included two Clinical Commissioning Groups.
- 3.5 WSCC has identified, following internal consultation and consultation with the wider voluntary and community sector across the county, a need for it to have a closer relationship with the sector. As a result it wishes to have a greater ability for strategic engagement and representative VCS 'voice' through their funding of this service. It has therefore encouraged discussion of how this could be achieved through a collective approach.
- 3.6 The voluntary sector infrastructure delivery providers have been engaged with and independently have proposed working together through an alliance. They report that this will enable them to maintain their independent local service, meeting the needs of district and borough funders, respond to the challenge to offer a 'countywide' representation role and also benefit from shared expertise or opportunities for collaborative work.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 Continued support for the infrastructure needs of the voluntary and community sector in the Chichester District. In the context of increasing demand ensure the continued availability of:
 - Governance advice
 - Volunteer recruitment assistance
 - Training
 - Fundraising guidance
- 4.2 To endorse the direction of travel of the proposed formal alliance between the service providers by committing funds to see through their three year strategy for alignment.
- 4.3 Funding for the constituent service providers comes from a range of sources and the commitment of CDC is seen as valuable in securing the commitment of funding from other partners. WSCC is minded to support the alliance on the basis that the local service providers are well supported by their respective District or Borough.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 Under the current contract, CDC contributes £44,000 'core funding' to VAAC, with a further £28,382 received from WSCC paid to VAAC. Arun District Council (ADC) pays VAAC a further £48,760 (with an equivalent contribution received from WSCC). ADC has confirmed their intention to fund the service with £50,000 from 1 April 2019 for three years. WSCC has said that they will look to maintain the

current funding levels awarded for a period of two years (with the possibility of extension for two years) and are proposing to fund the service through the alliance.

- 5.2 It is proposed that funding of £47,600 (maintaining the current value of the funding plus an inflation allowance) is confirmed to VAAC for a period of up to three years subject to continued partner funding. Direct funding to VAAC would allow for local accountability regarding the continuance of the current service levels.
- 5.3 The alliance model proposed will maintain the existing local infrastructure delivery organisations so services are delivered locally, but ensure a shared vision and greater collaboration between the service providers across the county.
- 5.4 A number of formal or informal arrangements continue to be discussed, but all funders have committed to a shared monitoring framework for the service with key performance indicators. However, the local agreement with VAAC will continue to be reviewed locally to ensure local priorities are being met.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 Funding for this support could be discontinued, however the voluntary and community sector face increasing demand to sustain or increase the services they provide to the local community. Fundamentally the infrastructure support provided is essential to the “health” of the sector, and is support that might otherwise be expected from CDC.
- 6.2 Consideration of the best way to jointly procure a VCSI service for West Sussex has generated a number of more formalised options. The aligned approach that has been proposed does require CDC to echo the approach being taken by other districts and boroughs, and the Council could choose not to follow suit (for example only funding year by year based on budget availability). However, it is the longer term commitment that is most likely to secure corresponding commitments from others, which is the best chance to sustain this local service.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 Funding for the service of £47,600 per annum is within base budget with an inflationary increase for 2019-20 (subject to the Council’s approval of the budget in March 2019).
- 7.2 WSCC will be leading on the Funding Partnership co-ordinating terms and monitoring. There is a staffing resource benefit to all other funding partners in this arrangement and the provider organisations will benefit from a standardised reporting approach.
- 7.3 The ultimate arrangements for aligned funding are yet to be agreed, but any Memorandum of Understanding or similar will be reviewed by Legal Services to ensure that the interests of CDC are protected.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 The GCP has received annual reports regarding the performance of VAAC and have historically been supportive of their work and activities. In advance of its meeting of 30 January 2019, this report has been circulated in draft form. Members of the GCP have indicated their support for VAAC and this funding proposal.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1 WSCC is yet to make a formal decision about the allocation of their funds to VCSI, and an award to the alliance is predicated on the existence of the local delivery organisations (including VAAC) and their self determination to come together as an alliance.
- 9.2 The impact on the community is deemed to be positive as support will be provided to voluntary organisations to continue their work.

10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following? If you tick "Yes", list your impact assessment as a background paper in paragraph 13 and explain any major risks in paragraph 9		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		X
Climate Change and Biodiversity		X
Human Rights and Equality Impact		X
Safeguarding and Early Help Part of the role of the service to support training in Safeguarding for local community groups and charities	X	
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) Any new Agreement and the Alliance agreement will cover responsibilities under GDPR	X	
Health and Wellbeing Access to support and guidance from a trusted organisation will have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of many groups' beneficiaries	X	
Other		

11. Appendices

- 11.1 None

12. Background Papers

- 12.1 None

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank