

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD
Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Graham Thrussell on 01243 534653
Email: gthrussell@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House
1 East Pallant
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1TY
Tel: 01243 785166
www.chichester.gov.uk



Notice of Meeting

To All Members of Chichester District Council

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of **THE COUNCIL** in the Council Chamber East Pallant House East Pallant Chichester West Sussex PO19 1TY on **Tuesday 24 July 2018** at **14:00** for the transaction of the business set out in the agenda below

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Diane Shepherd'.

DIANE SHEPHERD
Chief Executive

Monday 16 July 2018

NOTES

(1) The Council meeting will be preceded by the following arrangements for members:

- **11:45** Careline Member Briefing
- **12:10** Non-Domestic Rates Member Briefing
- **12:30** Open Forum with the Cabinet and SLT
- **13:15** Lunch
- **13:45** Intermission

(2) Members are requested to bring with them to this meeting their copies of the agendas and agenda supplements for the Cabinet meeting on Tuesday 5 June 2018 and Tuesday 3 July 2018 (the papers may also be viewed in the committee papers section of Chichester District Council's website and Part II material via logging in to Modern.Gov)

AGENDA

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

1 **Approval of Minutes** (pages 1 to 36)

After an initial welcome by the Chairman, the Council will be asked to approve as a correct record the attached minutes of (a) the Annual Council meeting on Tuesday 22 May 2018 and (b) the special meeting of the Council on Friday 8 June 2018.

2 **Late Items**

The Chairman will announce any late items which are to be dealt with under agenda item 14 (Late Items).

3 **Declarations of Interests**

Members and officers are requested to 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 **Chairman's Announcements**

Apologies for absence will be notified at this point.

The Chairman will make any specific announcements.

5 **Public Question Time**

In accordance with Chichester District Council's public questions scheme and with reference to standing order 6 in Part 4 A and section 5.6 in Part 5 of the Chichester District Council *Constitution*, consideration will be given at this point in the meeting to questions which have been submitted by members of the public in writing by 12:00 on the previous working day. The time allocated for public question time is subject to the chairman's discretion to extend the period for each member of the public (five minutes) or the total time for public questions (15 minutes).

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE CABINET

The Council is requested to consider the following recommendations in agenda items 6 to 9, which were made by the Cabinet at its meetings on Tuesday 5 June 2018 and Tuesday 3 July 2018.

A - TUESDAY 5 JUNE 2018

6 **Section 106 Community Facilities - Westhampnett Community Hall**

The material relevant to this item are the report and also (for the information of members and relevant officers only) its confidential Part II exempt appendix, respectively pages 22 to 25 and 26 in the agenda papers considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 5 June 2018.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That the release of £98,712 section 106 community facilities monies plus interest

accrued to the date of release to Westhampnett Parish Council for the construction of Westhampnett Community Hall be approved.

B - TUESDAY 3 JULY 2018

7 Chichester District Council Annual Report 2017-2018

The materials relevant to this item are the report (pages 17 to 18) and its appendix in the agenda supplement (pages 1 to 42) in the agenda papers considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 3 July 2018.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That the Chichester District Council Annual Report 2017-2018 be received.

8 Housing Grants and Resources

The material relevant to this item is the report (pages 19 to 22) in the agenda papers considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 3 July 2018.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

- (1) That delegated authority be given to the Director of Housing and Communities, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing Services, to spend the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant set out in para 3.2 of the agenda report and the Homelessness Reduction Act New Burdens Grant set out in para 3.3 of the agenda report in line with the government guidance issued with the notification of the grants.
- (2) That the additional income received from the licencing of Houses in Multiple Occupation be used to fund the additional staffing and IT resources required to implement the new government regulations as set out in para 5.2 of the agenda report.

9 Making the Petworth Neighbourhood Development Plan

The material relevant to this item is the report (pages 13 to 25) in the agenda papers considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 3 July 2018.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That the Petworth Neighbourhood Development Plan be made part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMITTEES AND PANELS

The Council is requested to consider the following recommendation in agenda item 10, which was made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on Tuesday 19 June 2018.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - TUESDAY 19 JUNE 2018

10 **Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2017-2018 Annual Report** (pages 37 to 42)

The Council is requested to consider the report circulated with the agenda, namely the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2016-2017 Annual Report, which was published as the first appendix to a report considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) at its meeting on Tuesday 19 June 2018, and to make the following resolution:

The Council is requested to consider this report and the OSC's recommendation which is set out below.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Annual Report 2016-2017 be noted.

QUESTIONS TO THE EXECUTIVE

11 **Questions to the Executive**

[**Note** In accordance with standing order 14.11 of Chichester District Council's *Constitution*, this item is allocated a maximum duration of 40 minutes]

OTHER REPORTS

12 **Selsey and Midhurst Visions** (pages 43 to 63)

The Council is requested to consider the report circulated with the agenda with its two appendices for this item and to make the following resolution:

That (1) the release of £23,000 from general fund reserves to support the Selsey and Midhurst Vision projects be approved and (2) the Project Initiation Documents attached to the agenda report be approved.

13 **Selsey Bathing Water Enhancement Project Funding** (pages 64 to 69)

The Council is requested to consider the report circulated with the agenda for this item and to make the following resolution:

That the Selsey Bathing Water Enhancement Project be approved and authority be delegated to the Divisional Manager for Environmental Protection to approve the detailed spend of the grant awarded by Southern Water.

FINAL MATTERS

14 **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 and recorded in the minutes.

15 **Exclusion of the Press and the Public**

There are no restricted items for consideration at this meeting.

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 open proceedings of this meeting will be audio recorded and the recording will be retained in accordance with the council's information and data policies. If a member of the public enters the committee room or makes a representation to the meeting, they will be deemed to have consented to being audio recorded. If members of the public have any queries regarding the audio recording of this meeting, please liaise with the contact for this meeting at the front of this agenda.
- (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 intention 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.

MEMBERS

Mrs C Apel	Mrs J Kilby
Mr G Barrett	Mrs E Lintill
Mr R Barrow	Mr S Lloyd-Williams
Mr J Brown	Mr L Macey
Mr P Budge	Mr K Martin
Mr A Collins	Mr G McAra
Mr J Connor	Mr S Morley
Mr T Dempster	Mr A G F Moss
Mr A Dignum	Caroline Neville
Mrs P Dignum	Mr S Oakley
Mrs J Duncton	Mr C Page
Mr M Dunn	Mrs P Plant
Mr J F Elliott	Mr R Plowman
Mr J W Elliott	Mr H Potter
Mr N Galloway	Mrs C Purnell
Mrs N Graves	Mr J Ransley
Mr M Hall	Mr J Ridd
Mrs E Hamilton	Mr A Shaxson
Mrs P Hardwick	Mrs J Tassell
Mr R Hayes	Mrs S Taylor
Mr G Hicks	Mr N Thomas
Mr L Hixson	Mrs P Tull
Mr F Hobbs	Mr D Wakeham
Dr K O'Kelly	Mr P Wilding



Minutes of the meeting of the **Annual Council** held in Committee Rooms at East Pallant House Chichester West Sussex on Tuesday 22 May 2018 at 14:00

Members Present Mrs E Hamilton, Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mrs C Apel, Mr G Barrett, Mr R Barrow, Mr J Brown, Mr P Budge, Mr J Connor, Mr A Collins, Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Dignum, Mrs J Duncton, Mr M Dunn, Mr J F Elliott, Mr J W Elliott, Mr N Galloway, Mr M Hall, Mr R Hayes, Mr G Hicks, Mr F Hobbs, Mrs J Kilby, Mrs E Lintill, Mr S Lloyd-Williams, Mr K Martin, Mr G McAra, Mr S Morley, Mr A Moss, Caroline Neville, Mr S Oakley, Dr K O'Kelly, Mr C Page, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mr H Potter, Mrs C Purnell, Mr J Ridd, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs S Taylor, Mr N Thomas, Mrs P Tull and Mr P Wilding

Members Absent Mr T Dempster, Mrs P Hardwick, Mr L Hixson, Mr L Macey, Mr J Ransley, Mrs J Tassell and Mr D Wakeham

Officers Present Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

1 **Election of the Chairman of the Council**

The 2018 Annual Council meeting was opened by the Chief Executive Mrs Shepherd. She greeted everyone present and explained that it was her responsibility to preside until the election of the Chairman of the Council for 2018-2019 had been accomplished.

Mrs Shepherd announced that in common with UK government buildings a minute's silence would be observed at 14:30 to commemorate the terrorist attack in Manchester on 22 May 2017. The fire alarm would sound to mark the start and end of the period of the silence. She also summarised the emergency evacuation procedure.

Mrs Shepherd invited nominations for election of the Chairman of the Council for the 2018-2019 Chichester District Council (CDC) administrative year.

Mr Dignum proposed Mrs Hamilton.

Mr Dignum's proposal was duly seconded by Mrs Lintill.

No other nominations were received.

Mrs Shepherd requested members to vote on the aforementioned proposal.

Decision

Members voted in favour of the proposal with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

That Mrs Hamilton be elected the Chairman of the Council for the 2018-2019 Chichester District Council administrative year.

Mrs Hamilton then left her seat in the Council Chamber and took the Chairman's seat. She read, signed and dated the declaration of her acceptance of office in the prescribed form. She thanked members for electing her once again to serve as the Chairman.

2 Appointment of the Vice-Chairman of the Council

Mrs Hamilton invited nominations for appointment of the Vice-Chairman of the Council for the 2018-2019 CDC administrative year.

Mr Dignum proposed Mrs Graves.

Mr Dignum's proposal was duly seconded by Mrs Lintill.

No other nominations were received.

Mrs Hamilton requested members to vote on the aforementioned proposal.

Decision

Members voted in favour of the proposal with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

That Mrs Graves be appointed the Vice-Chairman of the Council for the 2018-2019 Chichester District Council administrative year.

Mrs Graves then left her seat in the Council Chamber and took the Vice-Chairman's seat. She read out, signed and dated the declaration of her acceptance of office in the prescribed form.

3 Approval of Minutes

The Annual Council received the minutes of the Council meeting on Tuesday 6 March 2018, which had been circulated with the agenda.

Mrs Hamilton explained that in advance of the meeting she had been notified of the need for two small amendments to be made to the draft minutes for clarification purposes only. She had agreed that in the interests of the efficient conduct of business those two changes should be incorporated into the online version (which had been republished) and the official version which she would be signing at this meeting with members' approval. There would be, therefore, no need to refer in the minutes of this meeting in that regard to any amendment of the minutes of the last meeting. The two clarifying changes were as follows:

- (1) Mr Shaxson had drawn attention to the need for a one word minor but factually relevant correction to minute 15. On the second line at the top of page 18 of the minutes in the agenda, 'a new site for a Harting facility' should in fact say 'Nyewood' instead of 'Harting'.
- (2) Mr Dignum had pointed out that in minute 11 and in the second line of the last para on page 14 of the minutes in the agenda, the words 'the SDNPA area within' should be inserted between 'for' and 'Chichester District'.

There were no further proposed amendments to the draft minutes.

Decision

The Annual Council voted unanimously on a show of hands to approve the aforementioned minutes without making any amendments.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Council's meeting on Tuesday 6 March 2018 be approved.

Mrs Hamilton then duly signed and dated the final (twenty-third) page of the official version of the aforesaid minutes as a correct record.

4 Late Items

There were no late items at agenda item 17 for consideration at this meeting.

5 Declarations of Interests

Declarations of personal interests were made by the undermentioned members in respect of the stated agenda items:

- Mrs Apel declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 (Community Governance Review – Chichester City Council) as a member of Chichester City Council.
- Mrs Apel declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 15 (Concessionary Rent Relief Delegated Decision) as a trustee of Stonepillow.
- Mr Budge declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 (Community Governance Review – Chichester City Council) as a member of Chichester City Council.
- Mr Dignum declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 (Community Governance Review – Chichester City Council) as a member of Chichester City Council.
- Mr Galloway declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 (Community Governance Review – Chichester City Council) as a member of Chichester City Council.

- Mrs Kilby declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 (Community Governance Review – Chichester City Council) as a member of Chichester City Council.
- Mr Plowman declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 (Community Governance Review – Chichester City Council) as a member of Chichester City Council.

6 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mrs Hamilton said that the following apologies for absence had been received:

Mrs Hardwick, Mr Hixson, Mr Ransley, Mrs Tassell and Mr Wakeman

Mrs Hamilton made the following specific announcements:

- (1) The Rogate by-election had taken place on Thursday 12 April 2018 and Dr K O'Kelly (Liberal Democrat) had been elected in succession to Gillian Keegan MP. Dr O'Kelly was also the West Sussex County Council member for the Midhurst Division. At the Chairman's invitation she stood in the Council Chamber and members acknowledged with applause her appointment.
- (2) In her capacity as the Chairman she had attended on Tuesday 8 May 2018 the opening by HRH the Countess of Wessex of Dementia Support's new centre at Sage House in Tangmere. Chichester District was very fortunate to have this most impressive facility within its area. The aim was to bring local dementia services together under one roof and provide the latest support, information, advice and activities to those living with dementia, their families and carers. Among the many services and activities being provided was a community café.
- (3) The well-established annual Chichester Triathlon would be taking place a month earlier than usual on Saturday 2 and Sunday 3 June 2018. Offers to help with the event or to watch and encourage the participants would be gratefully appreciated.

7 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted for this meeting.

8 **Section 106 Community Facilities - Donnington Parish Hall**

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 10 April 2018. The recommendation was in para 2.1 of the Cabinet report (pages 14 to 17 of the agenda) and also set out on the face of the Council agenda. There was a confidential Part II exempt appendix (page 18) which had been circulated to members and relevant officers only.

Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council).

In commending to the Council the proposed funding to assist Donnington Parochial Church Council (DPCC) in undertaking the first stage of improvement works to Donnington

Parish Hall, which was a well-used community facility, Mrs Lintill summarised the salient facts with reference to sections 3, 5 and 8 of the report.

Mr Ridd (Donnington) spoke in support of the recommendation. He emphasised the long-awaited and much-needed benefits which the carefully planned extension to an elderly parish hall would confer on the community.

Decision

By a vote on a show of hands members voted unanimously with no votes against or abstentions to make the following resolution.

RESOLVED

That the release of £183,938.44 section 106 Community Facilities monies plus interest accrued to the date of release to Donnington Parochial Church Council for an extension to Donnington Parish Hall be approved.

9 Risk Management

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 10 April 2018. The recommendation was in section 2 of the Cabinet report (pages 19 to 22 of the agenda) and also set out on the face of the Council agenda. There were four appendices (pages 23 to 64), the second part of appendix 2 being confidential Part II exempt material and which had been circulated to members and relevant officers only.

Mrs Hamilton pointed out that pages 23 to 35 only of the Cabinet report and appendices were germane to the issue before the Council whilst the Corporate Risk Register – Strategic Risks Quarterly Update was a matter for the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee and the Cabinet. The recommendation was on the face of the agenda and at 1) in section 2 of the Cabinet report (page 19). With respect to the amendments mentioned in the Council agenda which had been made by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee and accepted by the Cabinet, these would be summarised by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services in his introduction.

Mr Wilding (Cabinet Member for Corporate Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council).

In commending the Cabinet's recommendation to the Council, Mr Wilding said the Cabinet report sought principally to document the changes being recommended to CDC's Risk Management Policy and Strategy (RMPS) (last updated in 2004), the main ones being necessary to reflect the new CDC senior management structure. In addition to the RMPS, which was the issue for determination by the Council, the report gave details of the current Strategic Risk Register (approved by the Cabinet on 10 April 2018 and reviewed quarterly), any high scoring risks for the Programme Boards and the organisational risks including the mitigation actions to manage those risks. The Risk Management Framework (page 35) showed diagrammatically the roles, responsibilities, reporting lines, escalation routes and on-going monitoring procedures. Risk management was embedded throughout CDC to help ensure the delivery of the Corporate Plan objectives and individual services to the community. Members could therefore be satisfied that risks were identified, considered and managed appropriately in accordance with the approved strategy. As part of the scrutiny of the Risk Management Strategy, at its meeting on Thursday 29 March 2018 the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee (CGAC) recommended certain changes

(approved by the Cabinet); the key ones related to (a) all CDC members had a responsibility for managing risk; (b) the definitions of impact in the Risk Scoring matrix; and (c) appendix 2 (a) to the Strategic Risk Register: (i) Southern Gateway Regeneration – add reputational damage to risk description and (ii) Local Plan, fourth bullet point - add 'growth' after OAN (Objectively Assessed Needs).

Notwithstanding the Chairman's opening remark that the Corporate Risk Register was not before the Annual Council for determination, Mr Shaxson (Harting) wished to raise a short point with regard to CRR 147 Southern Gateway Regeneration in the Strategic Risk Register (SRR) (appendix 2 (a) on page 52 in the Cabinet agenda papers), namely an update on whether it was anticipated that the original score risk of 9 at 23 February 2018 falling to 3 by 28 September 2018 feasibly achievable.

Whilst acknowledging the validity of his question, which would be answered by Mr Over, Mrs Shepherd pointed out that the time to have asked such a question would have been when the SRR was being considered by the CGAC and the Cabinet and the decisions had already been taken on the SRR. The focus at the Annual Council should be on policy and the strategy.

Mr Over said that most of the outstanding issues related to site assembly matters, which the project team and the consultants were working hard to resolve and discussions with the relevant parties had been taking place for some time. Once concluded it was his judgment that the risk would reduce. He reminded members that they would receive a briefing in July 2018, when they would be updated on progress and would be able to ask questions on points of detail.

Decision

By a vote on a show of hands members were in favour of making the resolution set out below, with no votes against and one abstention by Mr Oakley (Tangmere).

RESOLVED

That the updated Risk Management Policy and Strategy including the amendments made by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee be approved.

10 Community Governance Review - Chichester City Council

The Annual Council considered a recommendation made to it by the Boundary Review Panel (BRevP) at its meeting on Thursday 3 May 2018. The recommendation appeared on the face of the agenda.

Mr Ridd (Chairman of the BRevP) formally moved the recommendation and this was seconded by Mr McAra (Vice-Chairman of the BRevP).

Mr Ridd said that eight responses to the second consultation had been received, seven of which were very positive in favour of the outcome now being recommended by the BRevP.

Mr Plowman referred to the immense amount of hard work which had been undertaken to achieve co-terminosity and he commended the solution achieved.

Decision

On a show of hands the members present voted unanimously in favour of the BRevP's recommendation with no votes against or abstentions.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the community governance review of Chichester City Council be approved based on the Chichester City Council's proposals to:
 - (a) Re-ward the City Council to ensure co-terminosity with the Chichester District Council wards and
 - (b) Reduce the number of Chichester City Council members from 20 to 18.
- (2) That Chichester District Council writes to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to request its approval that the above changes take place with effect from the May 2019 election.

11 Review of Political Balance 2018-2019

[**Note** During the course of this item at 14:30 a one-minute silence was observed (initiated and ended by the sounding of the emergency alarm) in common with all UK government buildings to mark the terrorist attack in Manchester on 22 May 2017]

The Annual Council received and considered the agenda report for this item.

At the Chairman's invitation, Mrs Shepherd presented the report by summarising section 4 of the report, with particular reference to paras 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7 and 4.9.

Mrs Tull expressed her pleasure at the prospect of three new members joining the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee to help promote its important work.

Mrs Hamilton (Chairman of the Council) formally moved the recommendation and this was seconded by Mrs Graves (Vice-Chairman of the Council).

Decision

On a show of hands the members present voted unanimously in favour of the resolution set out below with no votes against or abstentions.

RESOLVED

That the review of political balance arrangements set out in the agenda report be approved and that tables 1, 2 and 3 be applied in making appointments to committees.

12 Appointments to Committees 2018-2019

The Annual Council received and considered the agenda report and its appendix for this item.

Mrs Hamilton explained that the appendix showed the nominations which had been put forward by the political groups, with changes from last year shown for the Corporate

Governance and Audit Committee, the General Licensing Committee, the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee, the Investigation and Disciplinary Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. She pointed out that there were two small changes to be made to the numbers shown for the Investigation and Disciplinary Committee and the Appeals Committee (page 31): in each case the number of Conservative members should be shown as 4 and not 6.

The Chairman ascertained that no changes were being proposed by any member to the memberships of committees.

Mrs Hamilton (Chairman of the Council) formally moved the recommendation and this was seconded by Mrs Graves (Vice-Chairman of the Council).

Decision

On a show of hands the members present voted unanimously in favour of the resolution set out below with no votes against or abstentions.

RESOLVED

That members be appointed to serve on committees for 2018-2019 including their chairmen and vice-chairmen as set out in the appendix to the agenda report but subject to the number of Conservative members on the Investigation and Disciplinary Committee and the Appeals Committee being amended to 4 instead of 6.

13 Appointments to External Organisations 2018-2019

The Annual Council received and considered the agenda report for this item.

Mrs Hamilton explained that the table in para 3.2 of the report showed the nominations which had been put forward by the political groups, with two variations from the previous year in respect of the Chichester College Group Corporation (item 9) and the Chichester Harbour Conservancy (item 10).

The Chairman ascertained that no changes were being proposed by any member to the list of appointments.

Mrs Hamilton (Chairman of the Council) formally moved the recommendation and this was seconded by Mrs Graves (Vice-Chairman of the Council).

Decision

On a show of hands the members present voted unanimously in favour of the resolution set out below with no votes against or abstentions.

RESOLVED

That members be appointed to serve on external organisations for 2018-2019 and the longer term appointments/nominations be made as set out in the tables in the agenda report.

14 **Questions to the Executive**

The questions asked by members and the responses given were as follows:

Question by Mr J F Elliott: Provision of drinking fountains in Chichester District parks

Mr Elliott (Bury) referred to the motion listed later on the agenda to promote working towards making Chichester District plastic free and referred to the availability of government funding which local authorities could utilise to provide drinking fountains in parks within their area.

Response by Mr Barrow

Mr Barrow (Cabinet Member for Residents Services) undertook to provide a written reply.

Question by Mr J F Elliott: (a) Dead tree stumps in New Park Road and (b) more use of colour in Chichester District's parks

Mr Elliott (Bury) said that (a) he had previously raised his concerns about rotten and decaying tree stumps close to the carriageway in New Park Road and he wished to know what action would be taken to address this situation and (b) he felt that Chichester District's parks were very drab colour-wise and that this should be rectified as an important way of helping to improve people's sense of wellbeing.

Response by Mr Barrow

With respect to (a), **Mr Barrow** (Cabinet Member for Residents Services) said that he thought that matter had been resolved but in view of what was being said he undertook to look into the matter and provide a written reply.

Response by Mrs Lintill

Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services) gave examples of the considerable amount and variety of work CDC was doing to improve well-being for individuals and communities. She said that since it could be very difficult and expensive to lay out and maintain parks (which were very well frequented by residents and visitors) there was an emphasis on planting shrubs.

Response by Mrs Hamilton

Mrs Hamilton (Chairman of the Council) added that the previous Saturday afternoon she had been walking in the Bishop's Palace Gardens in the city and was most impressed with the high standard of presentation and maintenance; in her estimation well-being was clearly being promoted in this park.

Question by Mr J F Elliott: Addressing the A27 and the Southern Gateway as one project

Mr Elliott (Bury) asked the Leader of the Council to give serious consideration to addressing the issues of achieving improvements to the A27 and delivering the Southern Gateway scheme in one combined project.

Response by Mr Dignum

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council) said that West Sussex County Council was carrying out a transport study of the whole city including the A27, the Southern and Northern Gateways and all aspects of the Chichester Vision, and so Mr Elliott's point was in fact being addressed.

Question by Mr Moss: Underspend of government funding to assist local businesses after business rates re-evaluation

Mr Moss (Fishbourne) sought an explanation for the underspend by CDC by £179,806 of the funds allocated to it by the government for use in assisting local businesses which suffered from the effect of the re-evaluation of business rates in April 2017. He alluded to the correspondence he had had with the Cabinet Member for Community Services with regard to Dell Quay. The business in question had in fact had its rateable value reassessed and as a result a substantial discount had been secured, which outcome had been co-ordinated with the assistance of Gillian Keegan MP.

Response by Mrs Lintill

Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services) explained that the use of these funds was left by the government to local authorities to administer. The Cabinet had approved a scheme to facilitate the allocation of funding which would run until September 2018 but it was entirely a matter for individual businesses as to whether or not they chose to apply for assistance. All relevant businesses had been contacted and a number had applied for and been awarded a grant. It was not known why some chose not to apply but CDC would continue to encourage applications up to the deadline. It was for businesses to seek a review of their rateable value assessment with the Valuation Office Agency; assessments were not CDC's responsibility. Noting the outcome in the Dell Quay case, she pointed out that the terminology used by Dell Quay in the correspondence with Mr Moss had not been entirely accurate.

Question by Mrs Apel: Dissatisfaction with the 999 and 101 emergency response service

Mrs Apel (Chichester West) gave an example within her ward of an unacceptably long wait for a 999 emergency call made by a concerned constituent about drug-dealing in the area to be answered and the failure of the police to visit the complainant after two days when a visit within an hour had been promised. This in turn raised the high levels of dissatisfaction with the 101 service and she wished to know how to obtain from the police a service which was fit for purpose and improved.

Response by Mrs Lintill

Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services) said that at the last Police and Crime Panel (PCP) meeting she had attended the issue of 101 had been addressed. The police service itself was well aware of the problems with 101 and the need to address staffing and technology issues. It was said at the meeting that emergency calls should be made to 999. In non-urgent cases, the public should report matters via 101 or online. The PCP was looking to the Police and Crime Commissioner to hold the police to account over the Police and Crime Plan. She could not comment on the specific instance of the failure to respond promptly or at all to that 999 call and this should be raised directly with the police and furthermore she would pursue it at the PCP.

Question by Mr Barrett: Dissatisfaction with police response times

Mr Barrett (West Wittering) echoed concerns expressed by **Mrs Apel** (Chichester West) by describing a similar situation experienced by the Canal Society which had contacted the police about drug-dealing but there was failure to attend and one of the reasons given was the wish to pursue and catch higher-level drug-dealers.

Response by Mrs Lintill

Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services) said that she was aware that the police and CDC officers were focussing on and seeking to deal with drug-dealing in the canal area. The police were understandably focussing on higher-level dealers in order to sever or seriously reduce the flow of drugs to the smaller dealers, a strategy which was working. However there were also fewer officers available than was once the case.

Question by Mr Plowman: Review by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of resource levels in Chichester District Council's historic buildings advisory service

Mr Plowman (Chichester West) expressed his concerns about the adequacy of resource levels within CDC's historic buildings advisory (HBA) service with increased workloads caused for example by having to respond to the government consultation on the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and he requested that this issue be investigated by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. He was concerned about there being, in an area of southern England where it was difficult to recruit due to high house price levels, several vacancies within CDC Development Management currently, with an unremitting workload (including the delays with the strategic development locations and the ever-constant demand to comply with an increasing five-year housing land supply). Accordingly a review of staffing levels was necessary. Moreover it was likely that planning policy reforms would result overall in more rather than less work for officers.

Response by Mrs Taylor and Mr Frost

Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) said that CDC had just submitted its response to the draft NPPF consultation, the planning policy team was currently fully-resourced and staffing levels were kept under review. In 2017 CDC assessed the HBA service and the team was reduced from three to two officers, who were more experienced and senior, and other planning officers had been given appropriate training to deal with HBA issues. In the past an HBA officer had also worked for Arun District Council but the current officers were dedicated solely to CDC and South Downs National Park cases.

Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and the Environment) added that the outcome of the draft NPPF consultation insofar as housing numbers were concerned remained to be seen but there was an expectation that higher housing numbers were likely to be imposed. The impact of the five-yearly NPPF reviews on planning policy resources could both rise and fall in various areas, for example changes to calculating housing methodology, and he considered that the planning policy team was quite well-placed to respond accordingly and appropriately with its current (and recently increased) resources. He acknowledged that in the south-east of England it was a constant challenge to recruit and retain planning staff but over the last two years CDC had done what it could to improve the situation.

Question by Dr O'Kelly: Delivery of electrical charging points for motor vehicles

Dr O'Kelly (Rogate) expressed her concern about the serious air pollution within the county, citing as an example that Rumbolds Hill in Midhurst was an air quality area, and she pointed out how all the major car manufacturers were producing electric cars. She wished to know what CDC in conjunction with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) was doing to deliver in a significant way electric charging points in Chichester District, for example in on-street locations, on housing estates, in villages and towns and in the district's strategic development location sites.

Responses by Mr Connor, Mrs Taylor and Mr Hayes

Mr Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services) said that the installation of more electrical charging points was currently in progress and he could supply details in due course. On-street installations fell within the remit of WSCC. CDC was working with WSCC on this important issue. CDC was also addressing the Rumbolds Hill situation. He would provide further details by way of a written response.

Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) said that although electrical charging points did not feature in the current Chichester Local Plan, there was the opportunity to address this matter in the preparation of Local Plan Review.

Mr Hayes (Southbourne and Chairman of the Planning Committee) commented that the Planning Committee ensured that all new developments included a condition relating to electrical charging points.

Question by Mr Oakley: Electrical charging points for vehicles in new developments and other new technologies

Mr Oakley (Tangmere) confirmed the foregoing point by **Mr Hayes** (Southbourne and Chairman of the Planning Committee) about the Planning Committee being alert to the need for planning conditions to require provision of electrical charging points but he wondered about the risk of not taking into due account other emerging technologies.

Responses by Mr Connor and Mr Frost

Mr Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services) acknowledged the point about alternative technologies such as hydrogen fuel cells. He would supply a written response regarding these points in due course. CDC was considering with West Sussex County Council about applying for a grant for on-street electric charging points but there was no need for CDC to apply for grants to install electric vehicle charging points in its car parks.

Mr Frost (Director of Planning and the Environment) acknowledged the fast developing progress with electrical vehicle charging and that the Local Plan Review would reflect this by containing more prescriptive requirements for developers to meet. The cost of providing these charging points in CDC's car parks would not be significant.

Question by Andrew Shaxson: Velo South cyclist event on Sunday 23 September 2018

Mr Shaxson (Harting) referred to the Velo South event on Sunday 23 September 2018 when it was anticipated that 15,000 cyclists would be participating in a major closed route cycling experience which would begin and end at Goodwood Motor Circuit. This would

have the potential to cause major disruption to the lives and activities of tens of thousands of people who lived on the route or who would otherwise be affected by it. There was and would continue to be considerable concern and complaints about the handling of this event. He understood that a small number of CDC officers and members had been involved in 2017 in the proposal to arrange this occasion and the impact of it should surely have been foreseeable. He wished to know why CDC seemingly supported the event without first striving to obtain a reassurance that proper consultation had occurred with parish councils and other relevant parties before the organiser CSM Active Ltd (CSM) was given permission by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) to proceed. Although clearly WSCC had questions to answer, he hoped that CDC would make every effort to review the process to date, examine very carefully on behalf of the residents and businesses in the CDC area all future events of this kind (CSM aspired to make it an annual occurrence) including financial and practical impact, and publish the findings. Whilst he appreciated that CDC was not responsible for the event, he hoped that CDC could exercise due influence where appropriate. He pointed out that many residents had only become aware of the event through ticket sales.

Response by Mr Connor, the Chief Executive and Mr Hobbs

Mr Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services) said that he and **Mrs Lintill** (Cabinet Member for Community Services) had attended a meeting in 2017 about the proposed event but had been under the impression that it would not take place before 2019 because of the work involved in arranging it.

Mrs Shepherd (Chief Executive) referred to an e-mail which had been sent to all members stating very clearly that the event was not one for CDC to approve or disapprove. If the organiser had not responded to parish councils' concerns and questions then this should be raised with CSM. Likewise, local businesses along or in the vicinity of the route which feared a loss of trade should raise their concerns with CSM.

Mr Hobbs (Easebourne) remarked that notwithstanding the initial disruption the event would cause, the prospect of 15,000 cyclists coming to the area could be welcomed by many on account of the tourism potential this would afford on this inaugural occasion and in subsequent years.

Question by Mr Oakley: The need to preserve the gap between Chichester and Arun districts from encroaching development

Mr Oakley (Tangmere) referred to the housing targets set by the five-year housing supply and which had to be kept under review and expressed his concern at the ever-present threat which they posed to the gap between the Chichester and Arun district areas and also the impact on the Pagham and Chichester Harbours as well as the South Downs National Park (SDNP). He asked if it were now time to produce a joint policy to safeguard the gap.

Responses by Mrs Taylor, Mr Frost, Mr Connor and Mr Dunn

Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) said that CDC worked in co-operation with its neighbouring authorities on strategy and she would ensure this issue was discussed.

Mr Frost (Director of Planning and Environment) emphasised the ongoing fulfilment by CDC of the duty to co-operate through meetings between its officers with those from Arun District Council (ADC). CDC needed to meet its objectively assessed need requirement in the most sustainable way possible. The concept of strategic gaps no longer existed and officers would raise this issue with ADC.

Mr Connor speaking in his capacity as a ward member (Selsey North) rather than Cabinet Member for Environment Services emphasised what he called the huge threat from development to Medmerry, Pagham Harbour, the SDNP (and for that matter also the Chichester Harbour AONB) and the wildlife in each of those areas.

Mr Dunn (Westbourne and CDC's representative on the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)) said that the SDNPA was very concerned to protect rural corridors, the landscape and the rural environment, it took its statutory remit very seriously and it wished to resist significant development in the SDNP.

Question by Mr Dunn: Value for money in consultancy fees being paid to Systra for advice on the A27 Chichester bypass improvement works options

Mr Dunn (Westbourne) asked the Leader of the Council if he was satisfied that CDC was obtaining value for money from the fee being paid to Systra, the consultants engaged to advise on the A27 options.

Response by Mr Dignum

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council) explained that so far CDC had not paid anything to Systra

Question by Mr Lloyd-Williams: Business plan option to sell The Novium for commercial or residential redevelopment

Mr Lloyd-Williams (Chichester North) asked if the business plan being developed, as he understood it, for The Novium would include the option to sell the building for commercial or residential redevelopment. As this was a Conservative administration, he wished to know how much money the Leader thought should be poured year-on-year into what he termed a bottomless pit.

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council) said that was not an option. Since he had become the leader, CDC had been examining options for The Novium and to date there had been no interest shown in taking over running the museum as a trust. The option of converting the museum into residential use was not being entertained because Chichester was a cultural, historical centre and the wish was for The Novium to be one of the city's four cultural pillars alongside the Cathedral, the Pallant House Gallery and the Chichester Festival Theatre. The new manager was charged with producing a business plan to realise that objective and this would be considered in due course by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet. In his opinion an annual net cost of approximately £600,000 (compared with £300,000 to £400,000 for the former museum) was reasonable value for money as part of CDC's cultural strategy and should be seen in the context of the grants made to the Pallant House Gallery and the Chichester Festival Theatre.

Question by Mr Barrett: Control of Goodwood airplane disturbance over the Manhood

Mr Barrett (West Wittering) asked the Leader of the Council about complaints he had received about the noise made by a particular airplane flying out of Goodwood Airfield and conducting low-level aerobatics over Chichester Harbour, West Wittering village and the western Manhood which was causing a disturbance, including the apparent over-revving of its engine.

Responses by Mr Dignum and Mr Connor

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council) said that he and **Mr Barrett** (West Wittering) had been in correspondence about this issue and he was due to be CDC's new representative on the Goodwood Airfield Consultative Committee following the next Cabinet meeting and he would be directly involved in pursuing this matter and to seek and secure a resolution.

Mr Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services) commented that in the past when he had raised complaints he had been referred to the Civil Aviation Authority and in his experience that was a fruitless exercise with little or no response received. **Mr Dignum** (Leader of the Council) concurred with **Mr Connor's** remarks.

[**Note** End of Questions to the Executive]

15 Concessionary Rent Relief Delegated Decision

The Annual Council received and considered the agenda report and its confidential Part II exempt appendix (which had been circulated to members and relevant officers only).

The Chairman stated that the purpose of the report was to inform the Annual Council of a delegated decision that had been taken by Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services) and the Annual Council was requested to note the taking of that decision.

Members did not wish to ask any questions about this matter.

On behalf of the Annual Council the Chairman confirmed that the delegated decision made by the Cabinet Member for Community Services to award a rent concession to Stonepillow for the duration of its lease term renting office space within East Pallant House was formally noted.

16 Working Towards Making Chichester District Plastic-Free

The Chairman introduced the final substantive item on the agenda, which was a motion on a new matter submitted by Mr Moss (Fishbourne).

Mr Moss read out his motion in full as set out on the face of the agenda, namely:

'This Council commits to working towards making this District plastic free, supporting plastic free initiatives within Chichester District by:

- (1) Phasing out within the next two years the use of single use plastic from Council premises.
- (2) Supporting Surfers against Sewage in its goal to have a plastic free coastline.

- (3) To explore how the Council can involve local environmental groups and businesses to create a robust strategy to encourage local businesses, other organisations and residents to go single use plastic free.
- (4) An Overview and Scrutiny-led Task and Finish group be set up to oversee how these objectives can be achieved and to make appropriate recommendations to the Cabinet including assessing what resources will be required.'

Mr Moss formally proposed his motion.

Mr Morley (Midhurst) seconded Mr Moss' motion.

Mr Moss presented his motion. He expressed concern about the future of the environment locally and nationally. He cited facts about the amount of plastic in the world's oceans and the alarming projected estimate in a 2015 study of the likely quantity of plastic pollutant in the seas by 2050. He said this state of affairs must not be allowed to continue and CDC had a responsibility to take a lead by phasing out single-use plastic (SUP). In doing so it should work collaboratively with groups such as Surfers against Sewage to deal with the damaging impact of plastic waste on the district's and country's beaches. CDC needed to engage with and exhort residents and other organisations to be highly proactive in addressing this very serious scourge. An organisation such as LitterAction did important work but much more was required to address the gravity of the situation. The manner of support to be given to Surfers Against Sewage (a group which was already doing a great deal) would be in whatever way deemed appropriate and this would be considered by the envisaged task and finish group. Having outlined the four aspects of his motion, he commended the same to the Annual Council for its support.

The Chairman called on Mr Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services), who wished to present a counter motion.

Having thanked Mr Moss for his motion and the case he had submitted in support of it, Mr Connor said he wished to amend Mr Moss's motion so that it read as follows (the text below carries a slight amendment which was made later in the debate and was duly seconded by specifying 'the October 2018' meeting of the Cabinet rather than merely 'a subsequent' meeting):

'That this Council commits to:

- (1) Continue its work to remove SUPs from Council premises and encourage 'plastics free' initiatives supported by appropriate campaigns across Chichester District.
- (2) Continue its on-going support for locally led community anti-pollution groups working towards making Chichester District and its coastline a 'single-use plastics' free area; and where appropriate to appoint a member to represent the Council at meetings of such groups.
- (3) Task Officers with preparing a report on the issues in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment for the October 2018 meeting of the Cabinet, following scrutiny of the report by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.'

Mr Connor formally proposed his counter-motion

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council) seconded the counter-motion.

Mr Connor shared entirely Mr Moss' concern about the terrible effects of plastic pollution in the oceans and said that he was sure everyone endorsed the broad objectives behind the motion. This was an issue which greatly concerned CDC and was being taken very seriously but those objectives and how to address them had to be considered in the context of CDC's role, remit and resources. CDC had for some time been seeking to reduce and as far as possible eliminate the use of SUP at its premises (now almost entirely free of them); deploying bio-degradable bags in the dry recycle waste bins and recyclable paper cups at committee room water fountains; and providing fresh milk only rather than long-life milk in small plastic containers. Other SUP alternatives were being explored on premises and across the district eg the postal packets used for members' agenda papers; how to improve internal recycling and waste disposal; what SUP items were being used by members and staff and how they disposed of them; ways to encourage suppliers not to use SUP; and how to promote the use where possible of recyclable materials. Overall CDC's initiatives on household waste and recycling, when taken with the new anti-litter policy, were designed and expected to reduce the amount of plastic waste in the environment. He hoped (this was confirmed by Mrs Shepherd and Mr Frost during the debate) that a progress report could be brought to the Cabinet in autumn 2018 after consideration first by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Whichever motion was approved, he would welcome ideas and initiatives from members.

During the debate members welcomed the opportunity to discuss this subject and they expressed a range of views for and against the competing motions, both of which were acknowledged generally to have merit.

One of the principal points made against the counter-motion was that it did not contain timescales or targets, which given the urgency of the situation were very important and served to give a focus, sharpen resolve and set a high-profile lead. In addition it was felt that it did not specifically mention working with business and organisations. It was felt that the counter-motion would have a watering-down effect.

Those in favour of the counter-motion considered that it reflected the reality that CDC was already taking and being seen to be taking and that a timescale was not a critical criterion because this was an ongoing objective being delivered over the short-, medium- and long-term and it was better not to set targets or timescales which it might not be possible to achieve. It was also felt to be unhelpful for the motion to name one specific group (with which CDC was already engaging) when there were others also doing valuable work in this regard.

The following points among others were made: (a) persuade local supermarkets and the horticulture and agriculture industries to stop their extensive use of plastic; (b) the admirable example already being set by some local suppliers of cafés; (c) the damage done to marine life by plastic waste shed by cruise and commercial shipping; (d) support research into better types of recyclable plastic; and (e) the opportunity should be taken by CDC to encourage other local authorities and groups to take similar action and to put pressure on the government to take action to tackle this issue.

At the close of the debate Mr Moss made closing remarks in support of his motion. He said that he had worked hard on the wording, which was based on a similar one passed by Harrogate Borough Council. He had shared the text of his motion with Mr Connor in advance and invited him to suggest changes if he thought fit. He felt that his motion most

suitably reflected what CDC ought to be doing, was forward-thinking and would engage communities. The counter-motion, however, was in his opinion not adequately framed to signal that CDC would be seen as a leader on this issue.

The Chairman called for a vote first of all on Mr Connor's counter-motion, which was passed by a majority and so Mr Moss' motion was not put to a vote.

Decision

The Annual Council voted by a show of hands on the counter-motion by a majority of 26 votes in favour to 13 against with no abstentions and so made the resolution set out below.

RESOLVED

That this Council commits to:

- (1) Continue its work to remove SUPs from Council premises and encourage 'plastics free' initiatives supported by appropriate campaigns across Chichester District.
- (2) Continue its on-going support for locally led community anti-pollution groups working towards making Chichester District and its coastline a 'single-use plastics' free area; and where appropriate to appoint a member to represent the Council at meetings of such groups.
- (3) Task Officers with preparing a report on the issues in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment for the October 2018 meeting of the Cabinet, following scrutiny of the report by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

17 Late Items

There were no late items for consideration at this meeting of the Annual Council.

18 Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no restricted items for consideration at this meeting of the Annual Council.

[**Note** The meeting ended at 16:14]

CHAIRMAN

DATE



Minutes of the special meeting of the **Council** held in the Committee Rooms at East Pallant House East Pallant Chichester West Sussex on Friday 8 June 2018 at 10:45

Members Present

Mrs E Hamilton, Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mrs C Apel, Mr G Barrett, Mr R Barrow, Mr J Brown, Mr P Budge, Mr J Connor, Mr A Collins, Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Dignum, Mr M Dunn, Mr J W Elliott, Mr N Galloway, Mr M Hall, Mrs P Hardwick, Mr R Hayes, Mr G Hicks, Mr L Hixson, Mr F Hobbs, Mrs J Kilby, Mrs E Lintill, Mr L Macey, Mr K Martin, Mr G McAra, Mr S Morley, Mr A Moss, Caroline Neville, Mr S Oakley, Dr K O'Kelly, Mr C Page, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mr H Potter, Mrs C Purnell, Mr J Ransley, Mr A Shaxson, Mr N Thomas, Mrs P Tull, Mr D Wakeham and Mr P Wilding

Members Absent

Mr T Dempster, Mrs J Duncton, Mr J F Elliott, Mr S Lloyd-Williams, Mr J Ridd, Mrs J Tassell and Mrs S Taylor

Officers Present

Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

1 Approval of Minutes

The Chairman welcomed everyone present including a large number of members of the public to this special meeting of the Council which had been convened to consider Chichester District Council's (CDC) submission to Highways England on the schemes to be put forward for inclusion in the government's Roads Investment Strategy (RIS2).

Mrs Hamilton explained the emergency evacuation procedure.

As stated on the agenda there were no minutes for approval at this special meeting. The minutes of the Annual Council meeting on Tuesday 22 May 2018 and those of this meeting would be presented for approval at the Council's next ordinary meeting on Tuesday 24 July 2018.

[**Note** Hereafter in these minutes Chichester District Council is denoted by CDC]

[**Note** This para and paras 2 to 6 below summarise the consideration of and conclusion to agenda items 1 to 6 inclusive but for full details of the matters summarised hereunder reference should be made to the audio recording facility via the link below.

<http://chichester.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=132&MId=923&Ver=4>]

2 **Declarations of Interests**

The Chairman reminded members of an e-mail which they had received on Wednesday 6 June 2018 from the Monitoring Officer Mr Bennett giving his detailed reasons for granting an all-member dispensation to enable them to participate fully in the debate and decisions at the special meetings of both the Cabinet and the Council on Friday 8 June 2018. The issue of the dispensation was confined to that day only.

The following members declared a personal interest in agenda item 5:

- (1) Mr Dunn (Westbourne) as a CDC appointed member of the South Downs National Park Authority
- (2) Dr O'Kelly (Rogate) as a member of West Sussex County Council
- (3) Mr Oakley (Tangmere) as a member of West Sussex County Council
- (4) Mr Plowman (Chichester West) as the vice-chairman of the Goodwood Motor Circuit Consultative Committee
- (5) Mrs Purnell (Selsey North) as a member of West Sussex County Council

3 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mrs Hamilton said that the following apologies for absence had been received:

Mr Lloyd Williams (Chichester North), Mr Ridd (Donnington), Mrs Tassell (Funtington) and Mrs Taylor (East Wittering).

The Chairman acknowledged the presence of Mrs Lintill (Petworth and Cabinet Member for Community Services) notwithstanding the death of her husband very recently and thanked her for attending despite her bereavement.

Mrs Hamilton gave the following tribute to Steve Hansford, CDC's former Head of Community Services who had also very recently died:

'It saddens me to announce the death of Steve Hansford who died last week after a long illness. Steve joined the Council in December 2005 and was appointed Head of Community Services in 2014; he retired from the Council in March this year. Steve was highly thought of by his colleagues, members and partners for his kind and considered approach to work and was recognised as a person of high personal integrity. He always had a very positive outlook on life, even during his illness, and always tried to help resolve issues. Steve will be deeply missed by all, leaving behind fond memories. On behalf of all the members, I wish to send our condolences to his wife Jane and all his family.'

Mrs Apel (Chichester West and chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee) remarked that Mr Hansford was an incredibly special person, who was very supportive of scrutiny-related matters and he would be missed tremendously.

Members responded to the foregoing tributes with an audible assent and approval.

4 Public Question Time

Twelve public questions had been submitted for this special meeting, details of which appear below.

The text of the public questions had been circulated to CDC members, the public and the press immediately prior to the start of this meeting. Mrs Hamilton invited each person in turn to come to the designated microphone in order to read out his or her question.

The questions (with the date of submission shown within [] at the end of the text) and the oral responses given by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council) or Mr Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services) were as follows:

(1) Question by Dr Linda Boize

In view of the final para of her question below, Dr Boize prefaced it by noting that at its special meeting which had immediately preceded this meeting the Cabinet had amended its anticipated recommendation to the Council (set out on the face of the agenda) by the deletion of the words 'as being desirable' from para (1).

'My question concerns flyovers.

Does the Full Southern concept meet the BABA27 key feedback theme to avoid flyovers and would the proposed flyovers and extensive sliproads needed to allow all turning movements result in home demolition and land grab greater than last year's Option 2?

And if the Stockbridge proposed underpass cannot be dug deep enough for high sided vehicles would the A286 need to be elevated resulting in 3 proposed flyovers becoming 4, and the concept insufficiently different from Option 2 as Highways England requires?

Is the Full Southern concept desirable, regardless, or is it rather that the technical appraisal is recommended to find out if the engineering challenges can be overcome?'

[Monday 4 June 2018]

Response by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council)

'Thank you for your question.

The Full Southern Concept is identified by Systra as meeting most of the requirements of the BABA27 group noting that unanimous community consensus is unlikely to be achieved and that this concept comprises a combination of underpasses and flyovers at the junctions with the potential therefore to better mitigate the environmental and visual impacts in sensitive locations. Systra advise that in the time available they have not been able to develop detailed designs for the junctions and that significant further technical feasibility and engineering design work will be required by Highways England which will include reassessing road realignments and land take. Systra have also indicated that the concept for the Stockbridge junction is predicated on an A27 underpass to minimise community severance but again make it clear that further detailed design feasibility work will be required to assess whether the concept for this junction is achievable. As a concept, this option is considered to have strong merit but with a range of engineering and mitigation challenges that would need to be tested by Highways England.'

(2) Question by Mr Bob Marson

After making additional preliminary remarks not included in his submitted question below (details in the audio recording), Mr Marson put the following question:

‘On the assumption that the Full Council vote towards consensus with WSCC, my question is, therefore, one which is aimed at providing facts for our MP to help her position the case with the government to secure sufficient funding for Chichester in the RIS2 budget for a long term solution to the A27.

Events at national level have moved on since the RIS planning timeframe so it would be astute for councillors to take cognizance of (a) HE Road Design Principles published Jan 2018 and (b) the government plan for tackling roadside nitrogen dioxide concentrations jointly published by DfT and DEFRA in July 2017.

Now with the availability of the tool developed for Public Health England by Imperial College (announced by Philip Hammond in May 2018), local authorities are enabled to estimate the economic impact of air pollution in their area. The government’s clean air strategy will be published in the summer, however Mr Gove’s comments in April 2018 gave a clear indication how seriously he viewed quote “the huge public health issue”.

The Air Quality/Public Health impact from traffic congestion during the probable 4+ year major engineering construction work required by the Full Southern Route was raised by many stakeholders at the BaBA27 meetings as a serious public concern.

While there is total compliance by CDC to meet their statutory duties on AQ monitoring, the government Air Quality Management Policy Guidance (April 2016) provided an option for district councils to declare Fast-Track AQMAs (Air Quality Management Areas). Public domain information from Sussex Air clearly shows the pollution level exceeds limits along the A27, feeder roads to the A27 and in the “rat runs” through the city.

QUESTION: In anticipation of the inevitable and increasing traffic congestion on the A27 in the RIS2 period to accommodate the full Southern Route Option”, is there value in CDC declaring fast track AQMAs based on the Sussex Air modelling work?

Under the two-tier authority system which we have in this constituency, WSCC, now armed with aforementioned tool, could work closely with CDC with both local authorities gathering data to help our MP articulate the need for a level of funding that could potentially enable the preferred WSCC option, ie the Mitigated Northern Route, to become reality. What is CDC’s view of this approach?

[Monday 4 June 2018]

Response by Mr Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services)

‘Thank you for your question. Firstly, I am pleased to note your acknowledgment that there is total compliance by CDC to meeting its statutory duties on Air Quality monitoring. We are of course aware of the option to declare fast track Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) but having reviewed our current extensive programme of air quality work which includes air quality modelling, the possible declaration of a further AQMA and the refresh of our current Air Quality Action Plan, we are satisfied that our intended approach accords well with government guidance and our statutory duties.

Consultants Systra have advised that both of their shortlisted conceptual options will require significant environmental mitigation, including to address matters such as the impact on air quality. Such considerations will need to be addressed within subsequent technical and feasibility work undertaken by Highways England, including, for example, preparation of a construction environmental management plan, in the event that either of these options are included in RIS2. We will continue to work closely with WSCC in respect of air quality matters but consider that it would be premature to take the course of action suggested at this relatively early stage in terms of scheme development.'

(3) Question by Mr Ian Milton – Chairman of the Chichester Ship Canal Trust

'If the full southern route concept and Southern Gateway go ahead, there could be 4 or 5 years of construction that will discourage residents and visitors from coming to the canal. The Trust services would be disrupted. There would be a major decline in our income, reducing resources available to maintain the canal. What can Chichester District Council do to maintain visitor numbers to the canal and its environs if this building takes place?'

[Monday 4 June 2018]

Response by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council)

'Thank you for your question. Systra were appointed by WSCC to provide high level technical advice and support to the BABA27 group. They have identified that an on-line solution to the A27 will result in significant transport and wider environmental disruption during construction and that the potential impacts on nearby residents, users of the A27 and the wider network including on business (which includes the Chichester canal) are likely to be substantial. Systra's high level assessment regarding construction impacts, which draws on the earlier RIS1 economic assessment is set out in Section 8 of their report (pages 44-45). It explains that detailed construction management plans would need to be prepared to set out the approach to managing disruption during construction and that a future economic appraisal would also address this important issue in the event that this concept is developed further by Highways England.'

(4) Question by Mr James Pickford – Chairman of Lavant Parish Council

'My question concerns the budget.

The average cost of a project in RIS1 was £100m and our budget was doubled to £250m. To accommodate this a project somewhere else was dropped as the total budget of RIS1 remained fixed. If you go forward with a mitigated northern route another 2-3 projects will be sacrificed elsewhere in the country. What is so special about the Chichester economy that Highways England (HE) will sacrifice two to three other projects elsewhere most of which are already far further ahead than Chichester's? To back an online development with a sunken road at Fishbourne would be a significant gain which would justify all the work of the Council over the past year. Anything else is a gift to HE to throw out and revert to the original Option 2a.'

[Tuesday 5 June 2018]

Response by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council)

'Systra's high level analysis has focused on the development of conceptual options only at this stage. They recognise that in order to overcome community concerns raised regarding previous options published by Highways England, likely costs will be higher for both the shortlisted options although they also note that benefits would potentially be similar or greater. Systra consider both shortlisted options to be potentially deliverable and Highways England have undertaken to examine them in greater detail and report their findings to the Councils later this year. It is recognised that the level of government funding for RIS2 is not yet known and matters relating to the size of the available budget for any Chichester scheme included in RIS2 will ultimately be for Highways England and government to determine.'

(5) Question by Mrs Carolyn Cobbold

The submitted text of Mrs Cobbold's question appears below but additional remarks made and the order of some of her comments and the two questions asked were reversed (details in the audio recording).

'Can CDC confirm whether they or any consultants or highway professionals have made an assessment of the likely impact and disruption cost of construction works associated with a full online southern scheme?

So far 135 businesses have called for a Northern Bypass to be selected as the preferred option, warning that any online scheme would result in years of disruptive road works that would cripple the local economy. Among the businesses that have signed a petition so far are 14 holiday parks operating a total of 4444 family holiday units, providing more than six million visitor nights of accommodation in the area. A wide range of businesses from tourism operators, engineering firms, retailers to restaurants to firms in the service sector have signed the petition in the past two weeks. The West Sussex Growers Association also believes the Northern Option is the only sustainable solution. Has CDC factored in this cost to our tourism, agricultural and retail businesses in its decision not to favour the route preferred by Systra and WSCC?

What routes will form the diversionary routes for traffic during construction of an online route or in the event of an accident, roadworks or severe congestion after completion of the scheme?

An online scheme would leave Chichester as the only section of the entire A27 without a diversionary route, meaning any future incident on a southern A27 would result in a return to gridlock and rat running through Chichester city, Lavant and surrounding villages.'

[Tuesday 5 June 2018]

Response by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council)

'Systra were appointed by WSCC to provide high level technical advice and support to the BABA27 group. Consequently, whilst the two shortlisted conceptual options are considered to be potentially feasible and deliverable, Systra recognise that they both present a range of challenges with significant further detailed technical feasibility required. Systra identify that an on-line solution to the A27 will result in significant transport and wider environmental disruption during construction and that the potential impacts on

nearby residents, users of the A27 and the wider network including on business are likely to be substantial. Systra's high level assessment regarding construction impacts, which draws on the earlier RIS1 economic assessment is set out in Section 8 of their report (pages 44-45). It explains that detailed construction management plans would need to be prepared to set out the approach to managing disruption during construction and that a future economic appraisal would also address this important issue in the event that this concept is developed further by Highways England. The question of diversionary routes would again be a matter for Highways England to address as part of the construction management process and further feasibility analysis should this concept be taken forward.'

(6) Question by Mr Mike Dicker

Mr Dicker slightly varied the comments made in asking his question (details in the audio recording).

'Background: It is now time for our elected officials to take a real leadership role and deliver the best solution to our traffic problems for the future. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to get this right for now and the long term and not sit on the fence. I for one will find it very difficult to vote for our local politicians in 2019 if you do not show leadership today. In 2023 or 2024 I will find it equally difficult to vote where we are plagued by greater traffic issues as the canal is moved, the concrete carbuncles are being built and the Southern option costs go through the roof during construction of a series of upgrades that will fail to deliver our much needed infrastructure. The mitigated Northern option is the only option that will deliver the long term solution that we need whilst not causing pollution, delay and the death of our tourist and other fragile commerce on the Manhood peninsula and elsewhere in Chichester.

Q1. Will the leaders of our community drop Cabinet and party direction and vote on what really matters for all Chichester District Residents both North and South following the lead of the Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee of West Sussex Council and vote to push for a Mitigated Northern route as part of RIS 2?

Q2. Can we please have a fully recorded vote on any motion on the A27 agenda item?'

[Wednesday 6 June 2018]

Response by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council)

'Thank you for your question. You will have noted from the officers report that both of the conceptual options shortlisted by Systra are considered on the basis of their high level analysis to be deliverable but with different cost, benefit and risk profiles and a reliance on strong mitigation measures. Systra have not therefore recommended one concept over the other and on balance, recognising that more detailed feasibility work is required and that Highways England have confirmed they will undertake a technical assessment of both concepts, officers have reached the same recommendation. Your first question will of course be answered by the debate and decision to be taken by Council on the matter this morning. The second question is a matter for members to move, should they wish to, in accordance with the constitution prior to the vote taking place.'

(7) Question by Mr Richard Bramall - Summersdale Residents Association Committee

Mr Bramall made additional remarks in asking his question (details in the audio recording).

'My name is Richard Bramall and I represent the 450 members of the Summersdale's Residents Association, the committee of which has seconded me to ask this Council Chamber a question concerning the ecological vandalism that will result from the building of a second A27 Bypass, west - east across the Lavant Valley, one of southern England's most famous landmarks and a vitally important recreational, environmental, ecological, cultural and historical, link through the Downs and National Park, directly to Chichester. This is a matter that has reverberations far wider than this chamber or for West Sussex but nationally.

My question is now of greater importance, since Louise Goldsmith informed The Parkland Residents Association on 2 June that a northern route is her preferred option, a calamitous decision, in the light that, despite SYSTRA identifying in their report two A27 options, of "a mitigated Northern route" and a "full southern route" option, WSCC has voted for its preferred option to submit to Highways England the 'mitigated Northern Route', subject to the inclusion of important mitigation measures that are needed to make the scheme acceptable in environmental terms".

Chairman there is no consensus, this whole process has confirmed that every resident's representative body in the county to the west, east and the north, is for the full southern option and against any northern route.

I therefore ask that since every page of the SYSTRA report emphasises the importance of the "retention of place and settings", illustrated examples of mitigation by green bridges, sunken roads, living walls and noise barriers, that they declare as essential to make a northern route even conceivably acceptable to the ecologists, environmentalists, walkers, cyclist, athletes and tourists not to mention the thousands of residents, when the West Sussex Record office shows there are 23 highways, bridle paths, footpaths, cycle paths and a famous river, all running north/south, crossing the two and a half mile stretch of route from Goodwood across to Lavant, that all have to be maintained across any carriageway by eco-corridors to create even the lowest level of mitigation. How then, is this council, going to ensure the necessary budget and how can this council, guarantee the stakeholders of Chichester that after the "value engineering" has been accomplished there will be any mitigation on the northern route available at all?

Thank you for listening.'

[Wednesday 6 June 2018]

Response by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council)

'Systra were appointed by WSCC to provide high level technical advice and support to the BABA27 group. Consequently, whilst the two shortlisted conceptual options are considered to be potentially feasible and deliverable, Systra recognise that they both present a range of challenges with significant further detailed technical feasibility required. Highways England have nevertheless made it clear that they are prepared to undertake a technical assessment of the Systra shortlisted concepts including the 'mitigated northern route'. Whilst this concept is predicated on extensive environmental mitigation, the level of government funding for RIS2 is not yet known and matters relating to the size of the available budget for any Chichester scheme will ultimately be for Highways England and government to determine.'

(8) Question by Mrs Catherine Ward-Penny

Mrs Ward-Penny made additional comments in asking her question (details in the audio recording).

'I truly believe that if the 'Northern Route' is made, Chichester people, and visitors, will regret it forever.

However, I have been able to have no influence in the decision, apart from the "wonky" questionnaire.

I have seen many recent building projects in Chichester completed without the originally promised 'extras', (cycle paths, pedestrian pathways, cafe, etc) due to the money running out.

Can you guarantee that, once a 'Northern Route' choice has covered that beautiful area with concrete and Tarmac, the 'mitigations' - (very expensive ideas - with some possibilities shown on pages 30 to 34 of the SYSTRA document) - will actually be built, and that the money won't have run out?

Thank you.'

[Wednesday 6 June 2018]

Response by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council)

'Thank you for your question. Systra were appointed by WSCC to provide high level technical advice and support to the BABA27 group. Consequently, whilst the two shortlisted conceptual options are considered to be potentially feasible and deliverable, Systra recognise that they both present a range of challenges with significant further detailed technical feasibility required. Highways England have nevertheless made it clear that they are prepared to undertake a technical assessment of the Systra shortlisted concepts including the 'mitigated northern route'. This concept is predicated on extensive environmental mitigation as your question notes and we expect Highways England to review the concept on this basis. Nevertheless, the level of government funding for RIS2 is not yet known and matters relating to the size of the available budget for any Chichester scheme will ultimately be for Highways England and government to determine.'

(9) Question by Mrs Heather McDougall

'Stockbridge roundabout was declared an Air Quality Management Area on 24 August 2006, this is over ten years ago. The effects of air pollution are known; it has an adverse impact on health and it costs lives. Public Health England suggests that 4.9% of deaths in the Chichester District are related to particulate pollution. The A27 at Chichester borders three schools, and many residences and businesses. It is time to do more.

The CDC 2008 Air Quality Action Plan states "at present there are no practicable options to bring forward air quality ahead of the proposed A27 improvements." This is our chance to make a difference to this ongoing issue.

Whilst a north concept may be undesirable due to the impact on the countryside, there are well documented mitigations that can be put in place to reduce this impact. However, the opportunities to mitigate the air pollution for an online solution are limited.

Therefore, my question is: how can the two concepts for the A27 be recommended equally, when one presents a clearer benefit for the health and lives of the residents represented by CDC?’

[Wednesday 6 June 2018]

Response by Mr Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services)

‘Thank you for your question. Air quality and its effect on public health is a matter that is taken very seriously by the Council and we do already have plans to progress a refresh of our current air quality action plan over the next 12 months, recognising that it is, as you note, now several years old.

The work undertaken by consultants, Systra is a high level analysis of the options that appear to be available to resolve current problems of congestion, capacity and journey reliability on the A27. Consequently, Systra have made it very clear that should either of the two shortlisted options be put forward to Highways England for its consideration, they will need to be the subject of much more detailed feasibility work to assess the range of engineering and environmental mitigation challenges, including the effect on air quality, that they present. Officers have therefore concluded that at this stage and on balance, both concepts are worthy of more detailed assessment by Highways England and this of course is what will be considered carefully by Cabinet and Council this morning.’

(10) Question by Mr Ian Webster

‘For any significant infrastructure project such as the A27 improvements it is critical to conduct a Risk Assessment Study so that the decisions taken are made based on facts and well conducted research. This study would need to include: the funding risk – to establish if too much is asked for in the next round of government road investment which is already oversubscribed; a risk of impact on the South Downs National Park; a risk of land availability; a risk of legal challenges; a risk of non-compliance with any local or national policies and so on and so forth.

If no risk assessment work has been conducted by the CDC then it is imperative that the members of the Council submit both concepts with no preference so that Highways England can use their expertise to create an independent Risk Assessment Study and thoroughly evaluate the options to provide a solution that is best for our community as a whole.

So my question is: Is there a CDC Risk Assessment Study for either concept? If there is then will the Council guarantee that they will disclose it to the public immediately in the interests of transparency?’

[Thursday 7 June 2018]

Response by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council)

'Thank you for your question. Systra were appointed by WSCC to provide high level technical advice and support to the BABA27 group in order to inform the assessment as to whether a scheme concept could be identified that might achieve greater community consensus and thereby increase the possibility of inclusion of a scheme for the A27 at Chichester in RIS2. Systra's full report identifies key risks with both of the shortlisted conceptual options throughout the document. Highways England have confirmed that the level of detail in the current work is reasonable and that they will undertake a detailed technical assessment of the two concepts and report their findings to the Councils. The Council has not commissioned a separate study and it is our view that the Systra document contains sufficient information for the Council to come to a decision on the recommendation before it.'

(11) Question by Mrs Zoe Neal

As a preface to her submitted question below, Mrs Neal referred to the fact that there had been a slight change in the recommendation made by the Cabinet at its immediately preceding special meeting and also said that a CDC Conservative member who was present for this meeting had earlier in the week said in an e-mail to a local resident that 'The opponents to the northern route have hardly begun to fight. And they include powerful and national interests - with very widespread public support on a national, rather than local level'. She said that if that were so, then the purpose of local democracy and what it was hoped to achieve in this meeting had to be questioned and showed the need for strong, local political leadership.

'The agenda for the 8th June meeting of the Full District Council item 5 in relation to the A27 at Chichester, shows the recommendation as follows:

1. That in promoting a scheme to the government for inclusion in RIS2 Approach A should be supported as being desirable, without indicating a preference for either option, i.e. promoting both the 'mitigated northern route' and the 'full southern route'.

2. That the 'fall-back position' if no approach is selected be noted".

In the event that this recommendation is agreed by Chichester District Council, can it give an assurance that, once this has been communicated to Highways England, CDC will continue to promote both options equally?'

[Thursday 7 June 2018]

Response by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council)

'Thank you for your question. Systra have identified two concepts for improvements to the A27 which they consider have strong merit but given the high level nature of their assessment, they have not been able at this stage to recommend to the Councils one option over the other. Highways England have confirmed that that they are prepared to undertake a technical assessment of both shortlisted concepts and report back their findings to the Councils. We do not of course know whether either of these concepts will be included in RIS2 but if one or both are, then Highways England have advised that public consultation on their scheme options would then take place, possibly in 2020. At that stage, I think it is likely that the Council would be expected to indicate a preference

and that Highways England would also wish to assess whether or not there was greater consensus between the Councils to enable a scheme to go forward in RIS2.'

(12) Question by Mr Gavin Barrett

Mr Barrett made additional comments in asking his question below (details in the audio recording).

'Highways England (HE) reports that demand for funding for schemes across the UK under the RIS2 call for proposals is expected to be unprecedented and that many schemes, however deemed worthy by their sponsors will not, in fact, make it to the short-list. What is the fall-back position of CDC in the event that HE does not adopt any scheme in respect of the A27 at Chichester? Do we wait until RIS3 or, more wisely, make a renewed effort to adopt practical, innovative and proven "modal" improvements to local transport management including public transport timetable integration, appropriate prioritisation at peak times, park-and-ride schemes and strong incentives to reduce car-usage in the urban area?'

[Thursday 7 June 2018]

Response by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council)

'Should we be unsuccessful in securing a scheme of improvements for the A27 at Chichester within RIS2, then we expect that the 'fall back' position as set out in paragraph 6.4 of the Council's covering report will need to be adopted. That is, that improvements to the junctions on the A27 Chichester Bypass will still need to be delivered to mitigate the impact of development in the adopted Local Plan. These comprise small-scale, at-grade improvements to ensure the junctions will continue to operate effectively. These improvements are intended to be partly developer-funded and so are likely to be delivered incrementally as development comes forward over the Local Plan period to 2029. Systra's view is that modal measures alone will not be sufficient to address the existing problems on the A27 although, subject to identifying funding sources, it may be possible to develop a wider transport package including modal suggestions, to build on any future investment in the A27.'

[**Note** End of Public Question Time]

5 A27 Chichester Bypass Improvements: Submission to the Government's Roads Investment Strategy

The Chairman introduced the single substantive item of business at this special meeting, namely to determine CDC's position with regard to a scheme to be promoted to the government for inclusion within RIS2 for the improvement of the A27 Chichester Bypass.

She drew attention to the agenda report and its appendix for the Cabinet's special meeting which had preceded this meeting, copies of which were available in the Council Chamber.

She also referred to an agenda supplement which had been published the previous day on CDC's web-site for online viewing only, consisting of two documents: (a) the second background paper listed in the Cabinet agenda report (paras 9.4 and 13.2 on page 8) namely a note of the BABA27 meeting held on 18 May 2018 and (b) a letter dated 5 June

2018 written by Jim O'Sullivan, Chief Executive of Highways England, to Louise Goldsmith, Leader of West Sussex County Council.

She stated that at its special meeting earlier in the day the Cabinet had considered this matter and made a slightly amended version of para (1) of the recommendation set out on the face of both the Council agenda and on the Cabinet agenda. The revised version appeared on a sheet circulated within the Council Chamber prior to the start of this special meeting namely:

- (1) That in promoting a scheme to the government for inclusion in RIS2, Approach A be supported without indicating a preference for either option ie namely both the 'mitigated northern route' and the 'full southern route'.
- (2) That the 'fall-back' position if no approach is selected be noted.

In response to the Chairman, Mr Dignum moved the Cabinet's aforementioned amended recommendation and Mr Connor duly seconded it.

The report in the Cabinet agenda was presented by Mr Dignum.

He said that there was almost a complete consensus in favour of one thing: achieving improvements to the A27 to ease congestion etc issues for local and through traffic. Highways England (HE) had afforded the community the opportunity to put forward, on balance, the best route by choosing between the northern and southern concepts. The consultants, Systra Limited, had advocated an off-line mitigated northern route and an on-line full southern route, which sought to address the disadvantages of those two options. HE had so far neither restricted the nature and extent of improvements to on-line nor ruled out off-line routes and was prepared to consider two alternatives. The report by officers recommended Approach A ie both northern and southern concepts to be advanced with no preference. West Sussex County Council's (WSCC) Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure had stated that the 'mitigated northern route' was WSCC's preferred option but the 'full southern route' should also be developed as a reasonable alternative. Mr Dignum had asked HE's Regional Sponsor for South East England, Paul Benham, if a different submission by CDC from WSCC would present any problem in terms of consensus and was advised: 'In response to your question, I do not see it as an issue at this stage. It will be more important to achieve a level of consensus once we have carried out our assessment of both options and arrived at our conclusions.' HE had recently been asked by WSCC and CDC leaders to evaluate both concepts as soon as possible and it had agreed to do so and report on the engineering feasibility and likely cost of both options by 'late autumn' 2018. Systra had identified advantages and disadvantages to both routes. The issue of affordability within the likely RIS2 budget was relevant to both routes and HE had twice emphasised to the leaders that many other schemes across the country were competing for inclusion in RIS2 and their combined cost was far greater than the likely total RIS2 budget. Of the various local surveys of opinion, the Build A Better A27 (BABA27) showed the highest support (but not a majority) for one concept only – however, respondents had not been asked to specify a preferred concept and so the balance between north and south could not be ascertained. Thus the community had not been able to agree a single choice. As Leader of the Council he was proposing that CDC should not make a single choice at this stage since it did not have all the relevant facts (which only HE could provide) and there was a risk that in choosing a single option now, which was not later accepted by HE, the A27 Chichester bypass would be excluded from RIS2. HE should fully evaluate both concepts equally and provide its analysis as soon as possible. If

included within RIS2, HE would undertake detailed design work prior to a full public consultation. The eventual route announced by HE would be the subject of a development consent order for approval by a government inspector (the public would be entitled to comment), assuming of course that the route was included in RIS2. Construction would probably begin in 2023 or 2024. He acknowledged that there was a difference of opinion both within the Cabinet and obviously within the Council, as the democratic debate during this special meeting would demonstrate.

At the Chairman's invitation Mr Barrow (Selsey South and Cabinet Member for Residents Services) proposed an amendment to para (1) of the Cabinet's recommendation, against which he had voted during the preceding Cabinet meeting.

Mr Barrow first introduced his amendment proposal. As a Selsey South ward member he represented many residents who did not support the southern route option. As a Cabinet member he had a duty to make decisions with the best interests of Chichester District as a whole in mind. Accordingly he had faced something of a dilemma but hitherto he had kept an open mind. There was a considerably larger population in the south of the District than the north. However, it was clear that most of the many e-mails he had received about the issue of the alternative A27 routes were in favour of the northern route option; very few had favoured the southern route or even supported pursuing both options. He had some very grave concerns about the southern route eg serious disruption to businesses and residents during construction; air quality impact especially given the prevailing south/south-west winds; and the effect of traffic diversions on the city itself. These and other factors had led him to conclude that the mitigated northern route option should be CDC's preference. He accepted that it was nonetheless right to get an expert engineering and feasibility assessment of both options so that a subsequent final decision could be made on a fully informed basis. Ideally, despite HE's advice about consensus at this stage, it would be better for CDC at this point to be in line with WSCC's position and so he advocated expressing a preference for the offline mitigated northern route with the online full southern route as an alternative.

Mr Barrow read out his amendment to para (1) of the Cabinet's recommendation, namely:

'(1) That in promoting a scheme to the government for inclusion in RIS2, that CDC write to Highways England requesting that the A27 Chichester scheme is included in the second Roads Investment Strategy (RIS2) stating that the 'mitigated northern route' is CDC's preferred option, subject to the inclusion of important mitigation measures that are needed to make the scheme acceptable in environmental terms, but that the 'full southern route' should also be explored as a "reasonable alternative" in order to mitigate the community consensus and policy fit risks associated with the "mitigated northern route".'

Para (2) of the Cabinet's recommendation was unaltered by Mr Barrow's proposal.

Mr Hayes (Southbourne) duly seconded Mr Barrow's proposal.

During the debate members expressed various views on the Cabinet's recommendation, Mr Barrow's proposed amendment and the competing merits of the two route options.

Among the points made were the following:

- It was important for members to listen to and take into account the views of the residents in their wards, both individuals and community groups/forums.

- In view of the conflicting views in the community, it was incumbent on members in this meeting to show leadership on behalf of the citizens and grasp a once in a lifetime opportunity which could be expressed as indicating at this stage a preference or adopting an independent position from WSCC. It was not necessarily a lack of leadership to decline to identify a preferred route and indeed the government was not expecting or requesting for that to happen now.
- The contrasting views of the public in northern and southern wards was natural and understandable, thus the relevant issue was which route was in the interests of Chichester District as a whole.
- It was essential that this time the northern route was not withdrawn by HE but fully assessed before a final decision could be expressed by the local councils and communities concerned, the achieving of which could be facilitated by expressing at this stage a preference for that option.
- The southern route option during the protracted five-year period of engineering works would inevitably cause considerable serious disruption to residents and businesses (which needed to be encouraged to start up and thrive), with particular threats to the city centre from diverted traffic (as closures of the A27 Chichester bypass because of accidents vividly demonstrated) or an increase in rat-running, the construction of flyovers, the closure for two years of the Chichester Ship Canal, and implications for the Southern Gateway project, hindering tourism on the Manhood Peninsula and disturbing rural life. The southern route would not be a long-term one and this begged the question of what should be done then.
- The protection of the environment was very important and the mitigation measures for the northern route must be acceptable and would have to be very carefully scrutinised. These measures could include the introduction of wildlife corridors. The northern route would also help to secure significant improvements in air quality along the extant southern route.
- From an engineering point of view there was an obvious advantage to constructing a new northern route rather than upgrading the existing online southern route, which would present significant engineering challenges and uncertainties. The strength of the case for the northern route would be best exemplified and then be able to command majority support if both options were assessed.
- It was very difficult if not impossible to express a preference at this stage without knowing the full details and facts of each route, including the route for the northern option and how the southern route would be upgraded. Systra had identified two alternative routes and CDC did not need currently to go beyond submitting both of those routes to HE for a full assessment to be undertaken. On this basis the Cabinet's recommendation should be supported.
- The issue to be resolved in this meeting was a preliminary one and CDC should retain an unfettered discretion as to its final position and the preferred route it would choose once it had all the relevant evidence available to it. Both options should be left open and members should in the meantime engage meaningfully with their communities while the routes underwent a full design and feasibility assessment. It was premature to express a preference at this stage.

- In its report Systra had advised that a mitigated northern route could offer the best long-term solution for the A27 as it best fitted the criteria and wider considerations and would add capacity and resilience to the strategic road network. A true strategic route for the A27 could only be realised by constructing a new route.
- It should be noted that HE had given a clear indication that a lack of consensus at this stage between WSCC and CDC would not be prejudicial to the prospects of the A27 Chichester bypass improvement scheme being fully assessed with a view to the route eventually chosen being recommended for inclusion in RIS2. On the other hand a broad agreement between the two councils could only enhance the case for the A27 being included in RIS2 and presenting a united front was essential to avoid the appearance of divisiveness and risking the jeopardy of losing a second time the opportunity for being included in the government's RIS. The sending of an unambiguous message to HE and the government by expressing a preference at this stage could do no harm.

During the debate there were a few points of clarification raised and these were answered by Mr Frost and Mr Dignum.

Towards the end of the debate Mrs Tull requested that there should be a recorded vote and this was supported by a number of other members, a total of more than four, which satisfied the requirements of standing order 9.4 in CDC's *Constitution* for a recorded vote to be conducted.

At the end of the debate the Chairman announced that members would by way of a recorded vote consider first of all Mr Barrow's amendment proposal. If that was supported by a majority it would be carried and there would be no need to proceed to vote on the Cabinet's recommendation.

Mr Barrow read out his amending proposal and it was again seconded by Mr Hayes.

The Chief Executive conducted the recorded vote. As shown in the table below, the 39 members present voted as follows:

- For: 22
- Against: 17
- Abstain: 0

Nine members were absent.

MEMBER	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Mrs Apel		X		
Mr Barrett	X			
Mr Barrow	X			
Mr Brown	X			
Mr Budge		X		
Mr Collins	X			
Mr Connor		X		
Mr Dempster				X
Mr Dignum		X		
Mrs Dignum		X		
Mrs Duncton				X
Mr Dunn		X		
Mr J F Elliott				X
Mr J W Elliott	X			
Mr Galloway	X			
Mrs Graves		X		
Mr Hall		X		
Mrs Hamilton	X			
Mrs Hardwick		X		
Mr Hayes	X			
Mr Hicks	X			
Mr Hixson	X			
Mr Hobbs		X		
Mrs Kilby	X			
Mrs Lintill		X		
Mr Lloyd- Williams				X
Mr Macey	X			
Mr Martin	X			
Mr McAra		X		
Mr Morley	X			
Mr Moss				X
Caroline Neville		X		
Mr Oakley	X			
Dr O'Kelly	X			
Mr Page	X			
Mrs Plant				X
Mr Plowman		X		
Mr Potter		X		
Mrs Purnell	X			
Mr Ransley	X			
Mr Ridd				X
Mr Shaxson	X			
Mrs Tassell				X
Mrs Taylor				X
Mr Thomas		X		
Mrs Tull	X			
Mr Wakeham	X			
Mr Wilding		X		
TOTAL (48)	22	17	0	9

Decision

In accordance with the aforesaid recorded vote, the Council supported by a majority Mr Barrow's amending proposal and so the Cabinet's recommendation was not subjected to a vote. The resolution is set out below.

RESOLVED

- (1) That in promoting a scheme to the government for inclusion in RIS2, that CDC write to Highways England requesting that the A27 Chichester scheme is included in the second Roads Investment Strategy (RIS2) stating that the 'mitigated northern route' is CDC's preferred option, subject to the inclusion of important mitigation measures that are needed to make the scheme acceptable in environmental terms, but that the 'full southern route' should also be explored as a "reasonable alternative" in order to mitigate the community consensus and policy fit risks associated with the "mitigated northern route".
- (2) That the 'fall-back' position if no approach is selected be noted.

Mr Barrow thanked members for supporting his proposal and expressed the hope that everyone would work together on this issue. Mr Dignum assented to that sentiment.

6 Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no restricted items for consideration at this special meeting and accordingly it was not necessary to pass a Part II resolution.

[**Note** The meeting ended at 13:12]

CHAIRMAN

DATE

Chichester District Council

Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Annual Report 2017-18

Introduction by the Chairman

Time rushes by and here we are again with the annual report of Overview and Scrutiny.

The list that the committee covers seems to get longer each year. Yet again I hope all the members feel enough time was given to all the subjects we covered. Time is always the enemy as I have to move things on which means I may seem to cut people short at times. I hope this is not an event the committee feels I have to do too often.

Yet again this year we have had members of the Cabinet presenting their portfolios which have been varied and useful to see how their areas work in the Council. I thank the Cabinet members for their informative and helpful presentations. I hope this will continue in the future.

Again I would like to thank the members for attending the pre meetings. I know with traffic problems this is not always easy. I sincerely believe these pre meetings help to make the committees run more smoothly.

I went to a Scrutiny seminar at Birmingham University in November. They presented a paper which had been drawn up as a result of the Parliamentary Select Committee looking at Overview and Scrutiny. The conclusion was that Scrutiny is vitally important to a Council and where it is supported and well run it makes a great difference to the efficiency of Councils.

I want to thank Bambi for all her 10 years of service to O and S. She has been an enormous help to the committee and we shall miss her tremendously. The other person who was such a force to this committee was Steve Hansford. It was really sad to see him retire. We all wished him well in his retirement. The shock of his death has been such a tragedy. I will remember his wisdom and help with great pleasure.

Thanks to all the other officers for their help. A big thank you must go to all the members of the committee.

Clare Apel
Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Scrutiny at Chichester District Council

Scrutiny is the way in which non-executive members of the council hold the Cabinet to account. They do this by reviewing existing council policy or decisions and by inputting into the development of new policies before the Cabinet approves these. In some cases they may ask for a decision (made by the Cabinet) to be re-considered before it is implemented to make sure all possible outcomes are thought through. These are called call-ins.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) or its task and finish groups may require any member of the Cabinet, any chief officer, and-or any head of service to attend before it to

explain in relation to matters within their remit. Other public sector or public service officials, external partners and-or residents and stakeholders may also be invited to address the committee, discuss issues of local concern and-or answer questions. Recommendations may be made to the Cabinet or directly to Council. In scrutinising an external partner or partnership, the recommendations may be made directly to that body. The views of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee may be reported to the Cabinet or the Council, and the chairman of the committee shall be entitled to address the meeting on the committee's views.

Setting the Overview and Scrutiny work programme for 2017-18

The 2017-18 OSC work programme was developed taking into account:

- the Corporate Plan projects agreed by Cabinet
- the Forward Plan of Cabinet key decisions over the next few months
- projects identified from individual Service Plans
- items proposed or raised by Members
- topics included in last year's work programme which had been delayed
- topics requiring members' involvement suggested by the Business Routeing Panel

A number of Task and Finish Groups were set up to carry out reviews in more depth and to report back to the main committee. These task and finish group reviews are detailed later in the report. Space was left in the work programme for topical issues that often arise during the year.

All Members were consulted on the development of this work programme at a member workshop held on 23 March 2017.

The impact and influence of scrutiny

OSC held five ordinary meetings in 2017-18. The Chairman meets with the committee before each meeting to enable discussion about the agenda items and to agree the key issues to be explored on each topic.

Task and Finish Groups are used to take issues offline in order to maximise the volume and depth of a review.

A total of 11 recommendations were made by the committee to the Cabinet or Leader during the year. 9 recommendations were agreed. 1 recommendation has yet to be progressed due to a resourcing issue and 1 recommendation was not progressed by Cabinet.

Mrs P Plant was nominated by the committee to be its representative on the corporate Leisure Contract Management Task and Finish Group. Mr N Galloway was nominated by the committee to be its representative on the corporate Novium Options Task and Finish Group as well as an observer on the Growth Board.

Members' training and development

- Mrs C Apel, C Neville and Mrs P Plant attended a Regional Scrutiny Networking Seminar (led by Mr S Quigley) at CDC on 12 October 2017.
- Mrs C Apel attended an INLOGOV seminar 'Scrutiny in Challenging Times' at the University of Birmingham on 12 October 2017.
- C Neville attended a Centre for Public Scrutiny course 'Scrutinising Complex

Main areas of work for OSC this year and outcomes-achievements

Areas of focus	Outcomes-achievements
Preparing a Vision for Chichester City Centre	The committee was consulted on and contributed to the development of the Chichester City Centre Vision which was agreed by Cabinet on 11 July 2017.
Supporting Chichester BID	<p>The committee considered the support provided to the Chichester BID to deliver joint projects and requested that regular briefings and updates on issues which the BID wished to promote were provided to members in the monthly Members' Bulletin and that early consultation was carried out with the BID in relation to proposals which affected the city such as transport issues, Local Plan development and Southern Gateway.</p> <p>Outcomes: Mr Dignum gave a full briefing to the BID Board at its meeting on 18 July 2017 about the Vision, the Chichester Local Plan Review insofar as they affected the city centre however transport issues was a matter which fell within the remit of West Sussex County Council.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council and the Divisional Manager for Place attend the BID Board meetings and regular meeting are held with the Chairman of the BID and the Chief Executive, the Director for Growth and Place and the Divisional Manager for Place.</p> <p>The BID are leading on a number of projects relating to the Chichester Vision and the Chairman of the BID is part of the Chichester Vision Delivery Steering Group.</p>
SDNPA Development Management Agency Agreement	<p>This issue was requested to be scrutinised by Mr A Shaxson.</p> <p>The committee considered the S101 Agreement and Service Level Agreement and noted the position with potential new delegated arrangements from 1 September 2017. It was concerned at the lack of consultation with district and parish councillors and recommended to the SDNPA that that Authority considered the preparation of a Communications Protocol (with district and parish councillors) with the local authorities to whom it contracts development management matters, for inclusion within the agency arrangements. The committee also recommended to the Cabinet that if the response on this recommendation to the SDNPA was not favourable, that a Communications Protocol (with district and parish councillors) be developed by CDC with the SDNPA and that it be brought back to the OSC for consideration in 6 months' time.</p> <p>Following a meeting arranged by the SDNP with district council members (whose wards fall within the park area) in early October 2017 to discuss communication issues the committee considered</p>

	<p>the issue further and requested that a report come back to the committee in 12 months' time with an update on progress.</p>
Chichester In Partnership (CIP)	<p>The committee reviews the achievements and business plan of this partnership annually to ensure that it is achieving the outcomes it sets. In June 2017 and in May 2018 the committee noted the progress achieved by the partnership in delivering its outcomes and noted the following year's Business Plan.</p> <p>The return on investment achieved by the Choose Work project was particularly commended.</p>
Cultural Grants TFG - final report	<p>The review of Cultural Grants was noted, along with the 2016-17 annual reports from both organisations and the following year's Service Level Agreements.</p> <p>At a further meeting the proposed Funding Agreements for Chichester Festival Theatre and Pallant House Gallery were considered. The monitoring arrangements for both organisations were endorsed by the committee and Cabinet.</p>
Review of Housing Allocations Scheme	<p>The committee recommended to the Cabinet Member for Housing Services that a corporate task and finish group be established to review the Quality Standards of existing affordable housing stock in the district and the overall demand for the type and volume of new affordable housing in rural and urban areas.</p> <p>The task and finish group has met on six occasions and has been taken on a tour of Hyde properties (both new and relets). A report is currently being drafted. This will feed into a more comprehensive review of the allocations scheme and the development of a new housing strategy.</p>
Leisure Services Performance Review	<p>The committee was satisfied that the contractor was achieving satisfactory levels of performance against the outcomes set out to be delivered in the period May 2016 to March 2017.</p>
Southern Gateway, Chichester - Implementation	<p>The committee considered amendments to the draft Southern Gateway Implementation Plan and agreed that Mr N Galloway be appointed to the Chichester Growth Board as an observer.</p> <p>The first Growth Board meeting is scheduled for 4 August. The committee will receive a copy of the draft development brief for consideration before it is recommended to Cabinet in the autumn of 2018.</p>
Consultation Review	<p>The committee resolved that a task and finish group be established to develop a council protocol on public consultation and to consider the resources and budget and the monitoring process.</p> <p>Draft Terms of Reference have been developed for consideration by the O&SC on 19 June 2018. The Task & Finish Group will work in conjunction with officers to review the council's wider Communications Strategy including options around how the council consults with its residents, businesses and visitors.</p>

Housing Strategy Update	The committee was updated on progress made in delivering the council's Housing Strategy for the period 2013-2018 and made a number of comments and suggestions which it was agreed by the lead officer would be taken into account in developing a new Housing Strategy.
East Pallant House Options (EPH) Appraisal	<p>The committee considered the options for the Council's future office accommodation and recommended to Cabinet that East Pallant House should continue to be used as its primary office accommodation and that capital costs associated with the refurbishment of office space for commercial let be funded from the identified spend in the asset replacement programme.</p> <p>Cabinet agreed with this recommendation and requested that officers continue to identify opportunities to provide office accommodation for partners, voluntary sector or commercial organisations as those opportunities arise to ensure office space is fully utilised and operating costs are kept to a minimum, while being mindful of staff welfare in any re-planning.</p> <p>The council has let part of East Pallant House to a local charity, providing them with 10 desks to house their administrative function. This allows them to transform their existing premises to become a 24 hour service provision for their clients, whilst providing an income to the Council.</p>

Task & Finish Groups

The work of the Task and Finish Groups is described below along with the outcomes achieved.

Budget Task and Finish Group

Overview and Scrutiny Members: Mr J Ransley, Mr S Lloyd-Williams (Chair) and Mrs P Plant

Corporate Governance and Audit Committee Members: Mrs P Tull, Mr G Barrett and Mr G Hicks

Areas of focus – This group has representatives from both OSC (performance and policy remit) and Corporate Governance and Audit Committee (governance and risk remit). The group considered the projected revenue budget variations for 2017-18 and 2018-19.

Outcomes – Members involvement with budget scrutiny prior to presentation of the Budget to Cabinet in February 2018. The group was satisfied with the explanation of the projected variances on the 2018-19 budget.

Community Safety Review Task and Finish Group

C Neville (Chair), Mrs C Apel and Mr J Brown

Areas of focus – OSC has a statutory duty in accordance with Sections 19 and 20 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 to review the district's Community Safety Partnership (CSP) by holding the CSP to account for its decision making, scrutinising the performance of the CSP and undertaking policy reviews of specific community safety issues. The group held two meetings in February 2018. Ms P Bushby, Community Intervention Manager, outlined

the CSP annual report 2017/18, CSP performance plan 2017/18 and CSP spending plan 2017/18.

The following witnesses gave evidence:

- Mrs Eileen Lintill, Cabinet Member for Community Services and the Council's representative on the Police and Crime Panel (PCP), described the role of that panel in holding the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to account.
- Acting Chief Inspector Kris Ottery of Sussex Police described the structure of the local Police force, working in a combined Chichester and Arun area and the new role of Police Community Support Officers (PCSO).
- Questions were sent to Ms Emily King, the Principal Manager Community Safety and Wellbeing at WSCC to be answered.

Outcomes – The TFG felt able to reassure the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that the required level of scrutiny of the CSP had been achieved, that the performance of the CSP was good and that evidence of effective partnership working in the district had been demonstrated. The TFG felt the reasons for the increase rise in crime rates had been suitably explained due to a number of factors including increased reporting of historic offences and changes to the reporting method of certain categories of offence.

Corporate Plan Task and Finish Group

Mrs P Dignum (Chair), Mr N Galloway, Mr S Morley and Mr L Hixson

Areas of focus – To consider mid-year progress on actions and targets in the Corporate Plan and to identify any further action that needs to be taken to challenge poor performance and to reduce any risk to an acceptable level.

Outcomes – The group considered that there were good explanations for areas of the Corporate Plan where targets had not been met. Some were outside our control, others showed great council input making a difference and some needed a little more time. While requests were made for further scrutiny or information, there was a feeling that the limited number of concerns raised from a huge range of projects showed the Council's high standards and care in carrying out its Corporate Plan priorities.

WSCC Select Committee liaison

C Neville is the council's representative on the West Sussex County Council Health and Adults Social Care Select Committee (HASC). She has reported back to the committee on health issues affecting the district and local residents. The council can submit concerns regarding any health issue to the HASC for consideration via its Business Planning Group (BPG) which meets quarterly.

West Sussex Joint Scrutiny

Mrs C Apel is the Vice-Chairman on the West Sussex Joint Scrutiny Steering Group, a group of scrutiny members from the seven districts and boroughs of West Sussex who get together to suggest issues which are of common interest to two or more authorities for joint scrutiny review. No joint issues have been considered this year.

Chichester District Council

THE COUNCIL

24 July 2018

Selsey and Midhurst Visions

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Tania Murphy – Divisional Manager Place

Telephone: 01243 534701 E-mail: tmurphy@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Tony Dignum – Leader of the Council

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

2. Recommendation

That the Council approves the release of £23,000 from general fund reserves to support the Selsey and Midhurst Vision projects and approves the Project Initiation Documents attached to this agenda report.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Cabinet agreed in January 2018, as part of the revised Corporate Plan for the authority, to approve a number of projects for development. Two of these projects were the Midhurst and Selsey Visions.
- 3.2 Initial Project Proposal Documents for both Visions were considered at the Cabinet meeting in January. Since this time further work has been undertaken to progress the visions, including the production of the Project Initiation Document (PID) (see Appendices 1 and 2) for each of the Visions. The PIDs set out in more detail how the anticipated budget of £10,500 and £12,500 for Selsey and Midhurst respectively will be allocated.
- 3.3 In order to authorise the budgets for these projects and to ensure that works can progress over the summer months for both Visions, it is requested that the Council approves the funds of £10,500 for Selsey and £12,500 for Midhurst. Ordinarily PIDs and funding of up to £100,000 would be approved by Cabinet. However, as the Cabinet does not meet again until September, the Council is asked to approve these PIDs and the necessary funding under the urgency provision in the constitution, so as to enable work to progress over the summer.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 The outcomes of the Selsey and Vision projects are as listed in the appendices.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 To obtain authority to allocate the budget to the Selsey and Midhurst Visions.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 Not to allocate the funds to the schemes – this would not have the desired effect of ensuring that the Vision work can progress in accordance with the approved Corporate Plan or would have an unnecessary delaying impact on the projects.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 The funds requested will come from Council Reserves.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 Consultation on the projects and priorities for Selsey and Midhurst has been undertaken through the Selsey and Midhurst Vision Steering Groups and project teams, comprising of local Members, Town Council representatives, Local Authority staff and other relevant stakeholders.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1 Visions for the two towns will help to meet the priority of supporting the vitality of the town(s) and sense of place and to deliver an action plan for improvements.

10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		✓
Climate Change		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact		✓
Safeguarding and Early Help		✓
Other		✓
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR):		✓

11. Appendices

- 11.1 Selsey Vision Project Initiation Document
11.2 Midhurst Vision Project Initiation Document

12. Background Papers

- 12.1 None

Project Documentation

PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT (PID)

Selsey Vision

Release:	Draft
Date:	31/05/2018
Author:	Jane Cunningham and Steve Hill
Approved by:	Tania Murphy, Place Divisional Manager

Document History

Revision Date	Version	Summary of Changes	Reviewer(s)
01/05/2018	1	Refinement of the Selsey Vision IPPD	SH/TM/PO

Consideration by the Corporate Improvement Team

Date	Reviewing Officer	Comments for Consideration
13/07/2018	Andy Buckley	Minor amendments suggested to the outcome measures to ensure the success of the project can be assessed post-completion.

Approvals

This document requires the following approvals:

Name of person, group or committee
CDC Cabinet
Selsey Vision Group

Distribution

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

Name	Job Title
Tania Murphy	Divisional Manager Place
Steve Hill	Rural Town Co-ordinator
Jane Cunningham	MPP Project Officer

1. PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

This Project Initiation Document (PID) defines the Selsey Vision project. It builds upon the Initial Project Proposal document and sets out the aims of the project, why the project should go ahead, who is involved and their responsibilities. This PID will provide the baseline for the project's management and for an assessment of its overall success.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

To work with partners to consult on, review and refresh the Selsey Vision. The intention is not to re-tread old ground, but to focus on what Selsey could be. The project will adopt the approach taken by the Chichester Vision project. There will be short-term actions along with longer term aspirations, which will come from this project.

Selsey Town Council and Selsey Business Partnership will be key partners. The Vision will be underpinned by the extensive community planning that has taken place in Selsey in recent years including the Neighbourhood Plan

3. BACKGROUND

The original Selsey Vision was published in 2007. The process enabled groups to work together, establishing a common vision and creating the ability to attract

external funding. This helped them to make physical improvements to the town and provided advice for the traders. The project was able to raise funds via SEEDA and more recently the Mary Portas work. Projects have included shop front improvements, retail consultancy advice, developing markets, improved signage and more street furniture.

However, whilst much of the work has been completed, the change to people's shopping patterns and the ability to shop online has set further challenges. The new edge-of-town ASDA store also poses a challenge.

There is a desire to make a clear case for Selsey as a town for the future, a town with a future. In line with the recently published 'Chichester Vision', the Vision will aim to re-imagine what the town could be, and what role it will take in the future.

Selsey Town Council do not have the means to create a fresh Vision alone, but are keen to work in partnership with CDC to create a positive, inspirational statement about what Selsey could and should be. They have recently established an Economy and Tourism Working Group, made up of Town Councillors, business people and other local authority officers. This demonstrates their commitment to moving the town forward and the new Visioning process will provide further momentum and an overarching direction in which the Working Group could operate and develop.

Without a refreshed plan the town may suffer from a lack of partnership approach by the local government involved in supporting the town.

4. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND SUCCESS CRITERIA

4.1. Outputs

The outputs are intended to reflect the recommendations from the Marshall Regen 2017 Socio Economic report on Selsey Haven as approved by CDC Cabinet in March 2018.

- Improve the public realm at East Beach.
- Develop trails and improve signage.
 - Wayfinding projects creating links and routes between Selsey High St and East Beach will address both of the points above. This will enable visitors to explore Selsey more easily and distribute trade round Selsey. Visitors and locals will be reminded that the Selsey Fishery is close by and easily accessible. The visitor economy, local traders and the fishing industry will benefit.
- New temporary commercial units or concession opportunities:
 - Preliminary ideas produced during an Architecture student competition for the re-design of East Beach kiosk into a café/restaurant will be the first step in re-imagining the existing Selsey kiosk. This will help re-invigorate the area and improve the visitor offer in Selsey.
- Employ a Seafood Sales and Marketing Champion
 - The work will be defined by the Selsey Fisherman's Association, and funding sought to either expand/extend an existing post, or employ a new person. CDC to host the post.
 - Supply chain review. This has been requested by the Selsey Fisherman's Association. Funding to be sought for delivery by a consultant. The project to be overseen by the Sales and Marketing Champion.

- Develop and host Crab and Lobster events
 - To be developed by Selsey Town Council and the Sales and Marketing Champion as part of other events in Selsey and elsewhere on the Manhood Peninsula.

Outputs will also reflect current projects and those arising from community engagement. These projects will be pursued by Selsey Town Council during and beyond the duration of the Vision engagement project:

During the Vision:

- Selsey Vision engagement materials
- Architecture student competition for new East Beach Kiosk design
- Develop a monthly local market selling local produce.
- Disabled infrastructure improvements at East beach, including access path between the car park and kiosk, play equipment and toilet improvements.

Taking the Vision forwards:

- Increased NHS dentist provision
- High Street / shop front trading promotions
- Patrick Moore memorial 'Stardisc'.

4.2. Outcomes

Selsey Vision will complement other community and forward planning work, creating an aspirational environment to develop Selsey into the town it needs to be for economic and community sustainability.

Selsey will have renewed objectives to achieve on which all parties will be agreed with commitment to deliver. The town will continue to be a vibrant place to do business and will be more attractive to visitors.

As a result of this improved confidence Selsey businesses will increase their investment; improve trade; encourage new investment and maintain vacancy rates and increase visitor numbers and tourism spend.

Improved prospects for the Selsey fishing industry.

Increased awareness of the history of Selsey and how to get round the interesting places. This improves the attractiveness of the area and benefits the visitor economy

4.3. Outcome Measures

In partnership with Selsey Town Council, we are aiming to build maximum awareness of 'Selsey Vision' as a brand.

The main outcome will be providing sufficient opportunities and engaging all local people, in particular unheard voices in the community.

Outcome measures are:

- Increased visitor footfall at East Beach green (to be measured through car park statistics, visitor and business surveys)
- Improved sustainability of businesses (to be measured through vacancy rates)
- Refreshed Vision process to include an online presence for Selsey Vision

- Improved wayfinding and transport (signage and customer feedback)

4.4. Dis-benefits

None

4.5. Out of Scope

The project will not include:

The project will not deliver project ideas gleaned through the consultation process. The objective is to ask the question 'what do you want Selsey to be?' and collate the answers into an action plan for delivery by Selsey Town Council or community groups. The projects for delivery in parallel with delivery of the Vision were outlined in the Marshall Regen Socio Economic Report in respect of Selsey Haven.

5. PROJECT CONSTRAINTS

The project will be constrained by a failure to start the engagement process quickly, which in turn will be constrained by lack of funds to 'kick start' the engagement tools discussed with Selsey Town Council and described above. Funding for the projects which are identified as part of the consultation and engagement process may not be sufficient or available. There is also a risk that there is no consensus agreement on the priorities for the area.

6. PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS

The project commenced in April 2018. It is proposed to conduct surveys with residents and businesses within the first 3 months of the project and to conduct participation workshops in the town to refresh the vision and encompass what has been learnt for the surveys. It is anticipated that the elements of the project against which costings have been shown in the table below will be delivered by the end of March 2019 unless otherwise stated.

7. PROJECT COSTS

7.1. Project Delivery Costs

	Costs (£)	Source
9 month duration	Partnership funded. Selsey Vision HQ in Selsey Library	WSCC.
One-Off	£200. Venue hire for workshops and other events and refreshments	STC to supply venue
One-Off	Marketing and Website , £5,500. To include Selsey Vision website, 'Selsey Stew' recipe competition, Selsey Vision 'washing line', paper and pegs, 2000 A3 fold out Vision leaflets/posters, Selsey Vision bunting, 6 panel display board with aluminium frame, printing of final Vision leaflet / poster.	CDC Selsey Vision Fund
One-Off	£5,000. Investigate potential of	CDC Selsey Vision Fund

	East Beach kiosk	Funding also sought from Coastal Communities Fund – see below.
	£10,500	Total
	Selsey Vision projects for which funding will be requested from CDC:	
Ongoing	Investigate feasibility of developing a monthly local market selling local produce to help support local fishing industry.	Funding source to be determined - anticipated to be a partnership project
Ongoing	Disabled infrastructure improvements at East beach, including access path between the car park and kiosk, play equipment and toilet improvements.	Funding source to be determined - anticipated to be a partnership project
One-Off	Wayfinding projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wayfinding Website • A3 fold out leaflets. • QR codes • 10 bronze pavement bezels by Fitzpatrick Woolmer (City Walls Project) 	Funding sought from Coastal Communities Fund. Expression of interest submitted. Invitation to develop full funding bid July 2018. Bid due on Oct. Results due in Dec 2018.
	<p>Selsey Haven related projects</p> <p>Create better pedestrian wayfinding between town centre and East/West Beaches.</p> <p>Develop trails and improve signage.</p> <p>New temporary commercial units or concession opportunities.</p> <p>Employ a seafood sales and marketing champion.</p> <p>Develop and host crab and lobster events.</p> <p>Improve the public realm at East Beach.</p>	Funding source to be determined - anticipated to be a partnership project
	Selsey Sports Dream Contribution towards construction of a multisport pavilion/clubhouse by Selsey	CDC S106 contribution of £89,916

	Sports Dream. The facility will be located in Paddock Lane Selsey. The project was identified as an infrastructure project in the previous Selsey Community Vision document.	
Revenue	None	
Savings	None	
Services to be involved in the project delivery	Growth and Place. Community Engagement Team for door to door consultation. Planning, Estates, PR	

7.2. On-going Costs Following Project Completion

Ongoing costs – maintenance of the Selsey Vision website to be produced by CDC – officer time.

Revenue costs - CDC officer time to monitor website and ensure the dynamism of the ongoing Vision process is maintained.

On-going internal support from other service areas – specified in 7.1 above

Efficiency savings - NA

8. OPTIONS SUMMARY

Alternative ways of delivering the Vision project employ static methods such as online consultation via CDC's website, single workshops or consultation forms to be completed and submitted online or in paper formats.

After many years of formal consultation Selsey is not receptive to the usual formal means of consultation described above. Previous consultations have not posed the question – 'what do you want Selsey to be' and have not offered an ongoing opportunity for people to make their views known. It is hoped a more dynamic approach, that also appeals to under 25 year olds, will elicit a greater response and create a more representative picture of Selsey community's aspirations.

9. PROJECT APPROACH

The project will be delivered by Selsey Town Council assisted by the CDC Rural Towns Co-ordinator and the MPP Project Officer using the following tools:

- 1) **Mobile unit** (push along trolley with a range of low-tech consultation tools, washing line, display boards, pens, pencils, etc, built locally in the community:
 - i. To build identity and awareness of the vision
 - ii. To visit as many local events and groups as possible
 - iii. Linked to a CDC PR campaign, the mobile unit will be instantly recognisable and understandable to local people.
 - iv. The unit will be available for 6 months after public consultation begins
- 2) **Website:** stand alone, mobile friendly, currently under discussion with CDC web team. Ability to create a visual and dynamic process, capturing views, ideas, progress, actions and conversations, using social media elements. The legacy of these websites will be the creation of an ongoing project delivery

and development Vision website that will provide a focus for the project going forward and alleviate the need for paper documents.

- 3) **Central Hub:** hopefully utilising the space allocated to Selsey Works in Selsey Library. This will help to reinforce the message of the Vision and provide a complimentary access point to getting involved in the process. Will also be a place to run unique and creative Visioning activities and web logs/vox pops.

10. PROJECT PLAN

Task No.	Task / milestone	Completion Date	Responsible Owner	Dependency
Stage 1				
1	Selsey Vision (SV) logo	May 2018	Steve Hill	STC funding
2	SV barrow	June 2018	Mike Beal - STC	STC funding
Stage 2				
3	SV website	Summer 2018	Steve Hill	CDC Web&GIS CDC funding
4	SV consultation materials purchase	Summer 2018	Steve Hill	STC and CDC funding
5	SV HQ launch	Summer 2018	Steve Hill	WSCC and STC agreement
6	Funding to be sought for Fisheries Co-ordinator	June - Dec 2018	Jane Cunningham	Funding agreement from either Coastal Communities Fund or Seafarers UK
Stage 3				
7	Advanced website landing page	Summer 2018	Steve Hill	CDC funding
8	Commencement of Seas the Day	July 2018	Jane Cunningham	HLF funding received
9	Wayfinding priorities established	July 2018	SH and JC	'Head' and 'Heart' working groups to agree priorities
10	Scoping of CDC Project Brief for East Beach Kiosk Project	July 2018	Jane Cunningham	'Head' group to agree priorities
11	SV HQ ongoing	Summer / Autumn 2018	Steve Hill	WSCC and STC agreement
12	SV website monitoring	Summer / Autumn 2018	Steve Hill	CDC Web&GIS
13	SV promotion via CDC and STC websites	Summer / Autumn 2018	Steve Hill	CDC Web&GIS and STC
Stage 4				

14	Consultation barrow Selsey Festival	Aug 2018	Mike Beal / Steve Hill	STC/CDC collaboration
15	Agree priorities for developing trails and improving signage	Aug 2018	Steve Hill	'Heart' group to agree priorities
16	Seek funding for agreed priorities on trails and signage	Oct 2018	SH and JC	'Heart' group to agree priorities
17	Consultation barrow at Selsey Fireworks	Nov 2018	Mike Beal / Steve Hill	STC/CDC collaboration
18	Selsey Sports Dream pavilion/clubhouse on Paddock Lane. Funding decisions by contributing funding parties	Nov 2018	Mike Nicholls,	Funding decisions by England Cricket Board; Football Stadium Improvement Fund; Co-Op.
19	Consultation barrow Christmas light switch on	Dec 2018	Mike Beal / Steve Hill	STC/CDC collaboration
20	Completion of Seas the Day materials	Jan 2019	Jane Cunningham	
21	SV HQ ongoing	Jan 2019	Steve Hill	WSCC and STC agreement
22	SV website monitoring	Jan 2019	Steve Hill	CDC Web&GIS
23	Collation of material	Jan 2019	Steve Hill	Material gathering via above means
24	Seas the Day exhibition in the Novium commences	March 2019	Jane Cunningham	Completion of Seas the Day exhibition material
25	Draft SV leaflet	April 2019	Steve Hill	Collation of material
26	Final SV leaflet	May 2019	Steve Hill	Collation of material
27	Selsey Sports Dream pavilion/clubhouse on Paddock Lane. Construction	June 2019	Mike Nicholls	Funding
28	Report to Cabinet	July 2019	Steve Hill / Tania Murphy	Project completion
29	Seas the Day exhibition in the Novium ends	Dec 2019	JC or Selsey Town Council	Agreed date

11. PROJECT TEAM

Tania Murphy: Divisional Manager Place	Project overview
Steve Hill: Rural Towns Co-ordinator	To co-ordinate the Selsey Vision process; budget monitoring; co-ordinate SV HQ; ensure barrow is onsite

	at events; purchasing and procurement; collation of material
Jane Cunningham: MPP Project Officer	Budget monitoring; project monitoring; co-ordinate SV HQ; purchasing and procurement; collation of material

12. COMMUNICATION

Everyone with an interest in the project to be kept informed as follows:

- Project progress to be monitored via emails and meetings between CDC and STC held at 1-2 monthly intervals as agreed
- Monthly or bi-monthly meetings of the different project groups as agreed
- Monthly review of project budget against spend and other issues as they arise
– Steve Hill, Jane Cunningham, Tania Murphy

13. RISK LOG

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

Risk No	Risk Description	Likelihood Unlikely Possible Probable Certain	Impact Minor Significant Serious Major	Planned Actions to Reduce Risk	Responsible Officer
1	Lack of funding	Possible	Serious	Draw down funds to enable purchase of project components in good time	SH/JC
2	Lack of cooperation	Possible	Serious	Frequent contact via meetings and emails	SH
3	Missed deadlines	Possible	Serious	Project monitoring at frequent intervals	SH/JC
4	Lack of staff resources	Possible	Serious	Inclusion within service plans for partners	All partners

Project Documentation

**PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT
(PID)**

Midhurst Vision

Release:	Final
Date:	16 July 2018
Author:	Steve Hill – Rural Towns Co-ordinator
Approved by:	Tania Murphy – Divisional Manager - Place

Document History

Revision Date	Version	Summary of Changes	Reviewer(s)
13/07/18	1	Changes following feedback from Corporate Improvement Team	TM/JW & PO

Consideration by the Corporate Improvement Team

Date	Reviewing Officer	Comments for Consideration
13/7/18	Andy Buckley	Minor amendments suggested to how the financial information is shown and to the impact ratings within the risk log. Nothing further to consider.

Approvals

This document requires the following approvals:

Name of person, group or committee
Midhurst Town Council
Midhurst Vision Steering Group
Chichester District Council (Cabinet)

Distribution

Name	Job Title
SLT	
Tania Murphy	Divisional Manager (Place)
Steve Hill	Rural Towns Coordinator
Tony Dignum	Leader and Portfolio Holder
Midhurst Town Council	
Midhurst Vision Steering Group	
Midhurst Town Team Community Interest Company (CIC)	

1. PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

This Project Initiation Document (PID) defines the **Midhurst Vision** project. It builds upon the Initial Project Proposal document and sets out the aims of the project, why the project should go ahead, who is involved and their responsibilities. This PID will provide the baseline for the project's management and for an assessment of its overall success.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A refresh of the 2009 Midhurst Vision, creating a process for delivering actions to improve the town and wellbeing of local communities and business, and developing aspirations for the future of Midhurst. The project will be led by a partnership between Midhurst Town Council and Midhurst Town Team CIC and overseen by a multi-partner steering group.

3. BACKGROUND

The first Midhurst Vision was published in 2009. The process enabled often disparate groups to work together, establishing a common vision and creating the ability to attract external funding. This helped them to make physical improvements to the town and provided advice for the traders. The project was able to raise funds via SEEDA and more recently as part of the Mary Portas work. Projects which emerged from the Vision have included shop front improvement scheme, retail consultancy advice, developing markets, improved signage, more benches and street furniture, and the development of the first version of Midhurst Town Team.

Since the Midhurst Town Team was constituted in 2013, the town has had an effective forum for local businesses, community groups and local people, to help to bring the town together and develop projects that improve Midhurst's prosperity for all the community.

Outcomes achieved include:

1) To keep the shop vacancy rate down on the High Street - Midhurst vacancies have reduced from 14% in 2009 to less than 1% now.

2) Making town promotions easier to achieve, for example Christmas street banner and promotional leaflet with traders contributing and helping with distribution.

3) Encouraging new businesses to choose Midhurst, by demonstrating that the town works well together. One business owner, also trading in Chichester, compared the Town Team in Midhurst to having the BID in the city. It gives potential businesses the confidence to set up in Midhurst

4) Developing a baseline of high street data by investing in Noggin foot flow sensors for Midhurst, in partnership with CDC.

5) Influencing trading enhancements in the town. For example, the Town Team invested in Christmas lights in 2016 to include West Street.

Midhurst Town Team constituted itself as a Community Interest Company in 2017, a social enterprise, with a board of directors and a local stakeholder consultation group from all over the town. The aim is to fund raise to become a sustainable organisation. Other existing groups and organisations will be working under the broader umbrella of the Midhurst Town Team CIC, for example Visit Midhurst.

Whilst much work has been completed, the changes to people's shopping patterns, the ability to shop online, and the development of newer facilities and amenities in neighbouring towns, have set further challenges. Therefore, many traders in Midhurst continue to find generating footfall and maintaining dwell time in the town a significant issue.

4. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND SUCCESS CRITERIA

4.1. Outputs

Midhurst Vision will help create a new future role for the small market town as a driving force for innovation and self-sufficiency. The town will continue to be a vibrant place to do business and will be more attractive to visitors and will understand clearly how dynamic its future might be.

Midhurst Vision will become a structure that enables continued involvement in the development of improvements to the town and help to retain and create businesses, encouraging local employment – by identifying gaps in the market, barriers to progression and barriers to local employment.

The Vision will create the vehicle for an ongoing dialogue between the Town Team and Town Council to be receptive to the needs and challenges of the changing role of the market town.

Employment and business development will be a central part of the work of the CIC, will create a regular forum and action plan. Regular monitoring of footfall via the 'Noggins' and feedback of results to focus priority on and evaluate business enhancing events.

Larger scale complimentary attraction for the town centre will be created, for example a regular market space defined in the Town Centre for larger scale markets, with the infrastructure in place, therefore encouraging bigger and more attractive markets 3 or 4 times a year.

Responsibilities for infrastructure and development of events in the town will be established.

Taking full advantage of existing events calendar will be improved, for example MADhurst; Christmas Street party; Cowdray Ruins; Polo.

Development of new cultural venue/practice space and creation space in the town centre. This initiative is well supported in Midhurst, particularly amongst local retailers and young people, as it's often said that there is no real unique focus in the town centre (outside of the Ruins for example), so limited reasons to visit or stay in town. The centre would provide space for established and start-up artists and makers to remain in the town; and initiate the development of a 'cultural quarter', with a small performance space included and space for creative tuition, for example music and drama.

4.2. Outcomes

As a result of the collaborative nature of Vision activities, the Midhurst Town Team CIC Stakeholder group attendance will increase and the variety of backgrounds and interests of stakeholder group will broaden.

Local people, particularly young people, will feel more confident that good jobs can be found in town.

A developing narrative and clear identity of the town will encourage confidence in the future of the town, and improvements to cultural resources will provide more reasons to stay in and visit the town.

Better communication and collaboration between statutory authorities will ensure the Vision has a lasting legacy.

4.3. Outcome Measures

The main outcome will be creating the ability to refresh the vision for Midhurst.

Outcome measures are:

- Increased visitor numbers and duration of stay (to be measured through Visit Midhurst/Car Parks/Noggin footflow data)
- Refreshed Vision process to include an online presence for Midhurst Vision
- Better retention of young people (data to be captured through MRC)
- Improved sustainability of businesses (to be measured through vacancy rates)
- More creative businesses/artists and makers starting-up in the town (to be measured through statistics collected through the Economic Development team)
- Improved wayfinding and transport (improvements to signage and customer feedback)

4.4. Dis-benefits

None

4.5. Out of Scope

Midhurst Vision isn't a full-blown rewrite involving wide scale public consultation. It will constitute a refresh and update of the previous Vision, with additional consultation achieved through networking and the increasing role of the Midhurst Town Team CIC.

5. PROJECT CONSTRAINTS

Limited budget available for big-ticket projects and initiative, for example better bus services or establishing a creation space/performance venue. It will include an emphasis on collaboration. Much work being carried out by volunteers, limited officer time available on the project and limited administrative support. Time taken to arrange meetings (due to availability of local people) may limit the effectiveness of the 12 month project.

6. PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS

The project commenced in April 2018. The project is being led by Midhurst Town Council, supported by CDC, working closely with Midhurst Town Team CIC (MTTCIC). The outputs of the Vision development will in part inform the strategic plan and actions for MTTCIC.

7. PROJECT COSTS

7.1. Project Delivery Costs

	Costs (£)	Source
	Midhurst Vision projects for which funding will be requested/sought	
One-off	Enhancement of Visit Midhurst website to include B2B services	CDC Enabling Grant/Midhurst Town

	section; creation of Midhurst Town Team CIC page on the site.	Team CIC
One-off/ongoing	£1,500 - CDC ICT Web Team to design and host Midhurst Vision website (online portal, providing legacy for the project and creating a lasting collaborative platform to ensure longer-term project delivery according to local needs).	CDC Midhurst Vision fund (joint-funded with Selsey Vision website)
One-off	£1,500 - Creation of 'welcome pack' for new businesses in town	CDC Midhurst Vision fund
One-off	£2,500 – Printing of final Vision leaflet / poster and Marketing of the Vision	CDC Midhurst Vision fund
One-Off	Interactive shopping guide – hosted by Visit Midhurst website Designed by local design company.	Rural Towns Co-ordinator budget
Ongoing	Welcome / Meet and Greet Patrolling officer for North Street (information provider not parking by-law enforcer)	Midhurst Town Team CIC
One-off/ongoing	Feasibility study to consider potential to develop an Arts Centre/Creation space with emphasis on creating spaces for creative businesses in central Midhurst	Midhurst Vision Fund/sustainable business/Arts Council/SDNPA/Crowd-funding
One-off	£4,000 - Improvements to street furniture and paving.	CDC Midhurst Vision fund/MTC
One-off	£3,000 Wayfinding sign enhancement – including gateway signage to Old Town areas	CDC Midhurst Vision fund/MTC/SDNPA
Revenue	None	
Savings	None	
Services to be involved in the project delivery	City & Town Co-ordination, Planning, Estates, PR, Economic Development, ICT Web	

7.2. On-going Costs Following Project Completion

Ongoing costs – hosting and updates of the Midhurst Vision website, captured within existing budget and resources.

Revenue costs - CDC officer time to monitor website and ensure the dynamism of the ongoing Vision process is maintained.

On-going internal support from other service areas – specified in 7.1 above

Efficiency savings - NA

8. OPTIONS SUMMARY

The project will be a refresh of the existing Vision. Midhurst Town Council is keen to build on what is already there, with little appetite or capacity to undertake a full public consultation process.

This has already been done in part by the establishment of Midhurst Town Team CIC, an independent community and business organisation that will use local networks to involve and engage the wider community and generate Vision aspirations.

9. PROJECT APPROACH

The project will be lead in the town by Midhurst Town Council assisted by the CDC Rural Towns Co-ordinator and Midhurst Town Team CIC.

There will be four independent project groups led by local councillors and business-people:

Branding – led by Philippa McCullough from Visit Midhurst

Transport – led by Cllr Steve Morley (will incorporate the work of the Highway Review Group)

Place – led by Cllr Gordon McAra

Business Development/Town Centre Promotion – led by local businessman, Andrew Chiverton from Midhurst Town Team CIC.

Website: stand alone, mobile friendly, currently under discussion with CDC web team. Ability to create a visual and dynamic process, capturing views, ideas, progress, actions and conversations, using social media. The legacy of these websites will be the creation of an ongoing project delivery and development Vision website that will provide a focus for the project going forward and alleviate the need for paper documents.

10. PROJECT PLAN

Task No.	Task / milestone	Completion Date	Responsible Owner	Dependency
Stage 1				
1	Set up project groups	Completed	Steve Hill/MTC/ group leads	Availability of group members
2	Project Groups Create Action/Delivery Plans	Ongoing/ April 2019	Group leads	Availability of group members
3	Steering Group – quarterly oversight	Ongoing/ April 2019	Steve Hill/MTC	Time management
4	Communicate progress	ongoing	Steve Hill	Time management
Stage 2				
5	Create project portal/website	September 2018	Steve Hill/CDC ICT	Midhurst Vision fund

			team	
6	Project prioritisation – from Action sheets for delivery	Ongoing	Steve Hill/MTC/ Midhurst Town Team CIC	Midhurst Vision fund, searches for partnership funding.
Stage 3				
	Monitoring and Review against approved outcomes	April 2019	Steve Hill / MTC	Time management

11. PROJECT TEAM

Tania Murphy: Divisional Manager Place	Project overview
Steve Hill: Rural Towns Co-ordinator	To co-ordinate and facilitate the Midhurst Vision process; relationships and confidence building; budget monitoring; fundraising and collaboration advice.
Mark Purves/Gordon McAra: Midhurst Town Councillors	Chair Midhurst Vision Steering Group, meets quarterly and overview of project progress on the ground.

12. COMMUNICATION

The Vision process has a simple hierarchy, using local networks to provide input and assess need via four themed project groups: Brand; Place; Transport and Business Development/Town Centre Promotion.

The project groups are populated by members of the local community, representatives from statutory agencies, local business people. Overseeing the process is a steering group, primarily reps from the local authorities and local town team.

Progress is communicated up to the steering group from the project groups on a quarterly basis.

Communication of progress of projects and activities from project groups is communicated to the wider community via public meetings; one-to one consultation; an independent website and the creation of a project portal aimed at facilitating collaborative approaches to delivery and fundraising for projects and activities.

13. RISK LOG

Risk No	Risk Description	Likelihood Unlikely Possible Probable Certain	Impact Minor Significant Serious Major	Planned Actions to Reduce Risk	Responsible Officer
1	Lack of funding	Possible	Serious	Multiple sources of funding sought, including pump-prime funding from CDC's Midhurst Vision fund. Can	Steve Hill

Risk No	Risk Description	Likelihood Unlikely Possible Probable Certain	Impact Minor Significant Serious Major	Planned Actions to Reduce Risk	Responsible Officer
				extend project deadlines or re-prioritise projects, or find other creative solutions.	
2	Lack of cooperation	Possible	Serious	Frequent contact via meetings and emails; developing relationships of trust; creating project ownership; regular progress updates to all partners and stakeholders.	Steve Hill
3	Missed deadlines	Possible	Minor	See above (point 1)	SH
4	Lack of staff resources	Possible	Significant	Inclusion within service plans for partners	All partners

THE COUNCIL

24 July 2018

Selsey Bathing Water Enhancement Project Funding

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Dominic Henly – Senior Engineer

Telephone: 01243 534550 E-mail: dhenly@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

John Connor - Cabinet Member for Environment Services

Telephone: 01243 538585 E-mail: jconnor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

That the Council approves the Selsey Bathing Water Enhancement Project and delegates authority to the Divisional Manager for Environmental Protection to approve the detailed spend of the grant awarded by Southern Water.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Council signed a Statement of Intent for joint working with Southern Water on the Selsey Bathing Water Enhancement Project in December 2016.
- 3.2 Southern Water have subsequently awarded the Council grant funding of £38,895 for the delivery of specific interventions for dog fouling, bird fouling and litter, as detailed in Schedules 2 and 7 of the signed legal agreement with Southern Water (see appendix).
- 3.3 The timescale for the delivery of the interventions requires urgent approval from the Council to enable implementation to commence immediately for the current bathing water season (May to end of September) and for the 2019 bathing water season. The usual approval route of the Cabinet is not practicable as the Cabinet does not meet again until September which will be too late for the 2018 bathing season.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 The attainment and maintenance of excellent bathing water standards at Selsey, through implementation of identified interventions involving ongoing collaboration between the Council and Southern Water during the period of the project to maximise both short and long term benefits.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 The project proposes a range of specific interventions to reduce sources of pollution in the vicinity of the bathing water at Selsey. For the Council these

comprise installation of appropriate signage and bin provision, publicity campaigns, warden patrols of the area and enforcement of dog bans.

5.2 The provision of delegated authority will enable the grant to be spent in accordance with the conditions included in the legal agreement.

6. Alternatives Considered

6.1 Not to enter into a grant arrangement with Southern Water and deliver a reduced scale of intervention around the existing Public Space Protection Order – Dog Control, within existing staffing arrangements.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

7.1 Management of the project can be met within the existing staff budget. The grant will cover all additional staffing for publicity and behaviour change interventions and purchasing of materials such as new multi-function bins and services such as enforcement patrols. The Council’s Legal Services team has been consulted on the legal agreement. It is considered that there is minimal risk to the Council as all interventions are grant supported. If however no grant is made available to the Council, then there is no obligation on the Council to undertake the interventions.

8. Consultation

8.1 Consultation has been undertaken with Selsey Town Council which is supportive of the project and appropriate Council staff (Public Relations and Council Contract Services).

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

9.1 Given the objectives of the project, it is expected to have a positive community impact. There is not considered to be any significant corporate risk for the Council.

10. Other Implications

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

11. Appendices

11.1 Bathing Water Enhancement Programme – Selsey: Grant to Chichester District Council., Schedule 2 – Interventions: Part 1 – Pollution on seafront and Schedule 7 - Dog and Litter Intervention.

12. Background Papers

12.1 None

Bathing Water Enhancement Programme - Selsey

Schedule 2 – Interventions: Part 1 – Pollution on seafront Schedule 7 – Dog and Litter Intervention

Schedule 2:

Interventions

Part 1 – Pollution on seafront

Introduction

Appropriate interventions are required to significantly reduce the instances of the following pollution sources at or near the bathing water location (see Management Zone Schedule 5):

- dog fouling;
- bird fouling;
- vermin and litter

Through collaboration with other local authorities we will determine the optimum numbers, positioning of signs and bins as well as the emptying regime for dog and litter bins for peak and off-peak periods. Further explanation and detail of the scope of interventions are attached in the spread sheet in Schedule 2b – schedule of costs.

Scope of Interventions

To achieve the above a combination of the following are proposed:

- installation and maintenance of signs (to an agreed format) at all significant entry points to the Management Zone – see map at Schedule 2b
- enhanced signage and banners, encouraging effective disposal of dog faeces (including stencils at drainage gullies within an agreed surface water catchment (subject to agreement by WSCC Highways and CDC LPA)
- utilisation of suitably qualified and experienced resources to enforce existing dog fouling, dog exclusion and litter regulations;
 - a minimum of 9 days of weekend patrols per location between 9 June 2018 and 30 September 2018 (to be renegotiated for 2019).
- utilisation of an intervention officer to undertake programme of interventions and publicity campaigns for dog exclusion, dog fouling and litter (see Schedule 2b) between mid June 2018 and 30 Sept 2018 including 4 day interventions on Saturdays or Sundays outside of the WSCC school summer holidays (to be renegotiated for 2019).

Bird Deterrents

- appropriate deterrents to reduce birds such as:
 - hawk bird deterrent kites at agreed locations (from each building / structures) where birds roost;
 - installation and regular emptying of 4 bird-proof bins (Glasdon bins) at agreed spacing and frequency in Management Zone – see Map at Schedule 2;
 - signage and stencils discouraging feeding of birds;
 - publicity campaigns discouraging feeding of birds;
- extension and subsequent enforcement of the dog bans where appropriate to include the whole of the management zone, but subject to the powers under the PSPO and any update to it.

Timing

These measures are required at least 2 weeks before and during the bathing water seasons in 2018 and 2019, specifically:

- 2018 – from date of signing legal agreement to 30/09/2018 inclusive 2019 - 13/04/2019 to 30/09/2019 inclusive
- Bins , signage and bird deterrent measures installed will be considered as permanent and maintained until the end of the 2019 Bathing Season thereafter subject to Council funding at the Council's discretion.

Measure of Success

Monthly reports on the number of enforcement notices for the Selsey site.

Signage and banners - pre and post condition survey

Bins - pre and post condition survey

Disposal of waste - quantities of binned waste before and after new bins

Monitoring and review of the Green Dog Walking Scheme

Schedule 7 Dog and litter intervention programme

Programme of interventions during 18/19 bathing water season.

- 9 days of weekend patrols with 2 officers working each other weekend. Enforcement patrols during week days will occur at a rate set by CDC and will be cost neutral
- Every Tuesday throughout the summer holidays, Intervention Officer to support local groups litter picking the area around East Beach Car Park and engaging with local dog owners
- One morning a week, Interventions Officer to walk the prom engaging with local dog walkers
- One afternoon a week, Interventions Officer to accompany Community Warden engaging with fishermen (private/commercial) focusing on impact of waste in general and on bird population.
- Attendance at the following community events-
 - Selsey Lifeboat Week – Fun Dog Show – Friday 3rd August
 - Selsey Lifeboat Day – Sunday 5th August
 - Screen on the Green – Friday 10th August
 - Screen on the Green – Saturday 11th August
 - Selsey Classic Car Show- Saturday 18th August
 - MCS Great British Beach Clean – Saturday 15th September
- Selsey Academy Assembly Attendance – Friday 6th July
- School showcase (all Selsey schools) – Tuesday 17th July

Programme of intervention for 19/20 bathing water season are to be confirmed in advance of the start of the season