

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Bambi Jones on 01243 534685

Email: bjones@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of **Overview & Scrutiny Committee** will be held in Committee Room 2, East Pallant House on **Tuesday 14 March 2017 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mrs C Apel (Chairman), Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mr P Budge, Mr M Cullen, Mr J Connor, Mrs P Dignum, Mr N Galloway, Mr G Hicks, Mr S Lloyd-Williams, Caroline Neville, Mr H Potter, Mr J Ransley, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs J Tassell and Mr N Thomas

AGENDA

- 1 **Chairman's announcements**
Any apologies for absence that have been received will be noted at this point.
- 2 **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 12)
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 17 January 2017 and 24 January 2017.

To receive an update on progress against the committee's recommendations to Cabinet and Council.
- 3 **Urgent Items**
The Chairman will announce any urgent items that due to special circumstances are to be dealt with under the agenda item below relating to Late Items.
- 4 **Declarations of Interests**
Members and officers are reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests they may have in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.
- 5 **Public Question Time**
The procedure for submitting public questions in writing no later than 12:00 on 13 March 2017 is available upon request to Member Services (the contact details for which appear on the front page of this agenda).
- 6 **Deputy Leader and Community Services Portfolio Holder address**
The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Community Services is invited to present her priorities and areas of focus over the coming months and to answer questions from the committee on progress towards achieving the priorities within her portfolio which appear in the Council's Corporate Plan.
- 7 **Recycling Action Plan** (Pages 13 - 28)
The committee is requested to consider and note progress against the 2016/17 Recycling Action Plan. The committee is also asked to consider the updated 2017/18 Recycling Action Plan and to recommend this to Cabinet for approval. Messrs Connor and Shaxson, members of this committee on the Waste & Recycling Panel, will contribute to this discussion.

- 8 **Education Review 2017 - final report from the Task and Finish Group** (Pages 29 - 33)
The committee is requested to consider the final report from the task and finish group established by this committee to carry out a review of education in the district.
- 9 **Community Safety Review 2017 - final report from the Task and Finish Group** (Pages 34 - 37)
The committee is requested to consider the final report of the task and finish group established by this committee to carry out the statutory annual review of the performance and strategic direction of the council's Community Safety Partnership.
- 10 **Cultural Grants Review 2017 - Terms of Reference and scoping of review** (Page 38)
The committee is requested to consider and approve the Terms of Reference for this review and to appoint the members and the Chairman of this group.
- 11 **Forward Plan** (Pages 39 - 51)
Members are asked to consider the latest Forward Plan (attached) and to consider whether it wishes to enquire into any of the forthcoming decisions.
- 12 **Late Items**
Consideration of any late items as follows:
 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 reported at the meeting.
- 13 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**
There are no restricted items for consideration.

NOTES

1. The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any item of business where 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. Restrictions have been introduced on the distribution of paper copies of supplementary information circulated separately from the agenda as follows:
 - a) Members of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, the Cabinet and Senior Officers receive paper copies of the supplements (including appendices). Other members may request a copy of the supplementary information or a copy is available in the Members' Room, East Pallant House.
 - b) The press and public may view this information on the council's website here [here](#) unless they contain exempt information.
3. 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.
4. 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.



Minutes of the meeting of the **Overview & Scrutiny Committee** held in Committee Room 2, East Pallant House on Tuesday 17 January 2017 at 9.30 am

Members Present: Mrs C Apel (Chairman), Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mr P Budge, Mr M Cullen, Mr J Connor, Mrs P Dignum, Mr N Galloway, Mr G Hicks, Caroline Neville, Mr H Potter, Mr J Ransley, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs J Tassell and Mr N Thomas

Members not present: Mr S Lloyd-Williams

In attendance by invitation:

Officers present: Mr S Hansford (Head of Community Services), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Head of Commercial Services), Mrs B Jones (Principal Scrutiny Officer), Mrs T Murphy (Parking Services Manager), Mr S Oates (Economic Development Manager), Mrs S Peyman (Sport and Leisure Development Manager) and Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services)

124 **Chairman's announcements**

The Chairman wished all members of the committee a belated New Year. She welcomed new councillor, Mr J Brown, to the committee meeting and the member of the public attending.

Apologies had been received from Mr Lloyd-Williams.

125 **Minutes**

The committee considered and agreed the minutes of the last meeting held on 15 November 2016.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2016 be approved as a correct record.

The following comments were made under Matters Arising.

- Minute 118: Following the last meeting Mr Shaxson had posed some questions regarding the breakdown of sickness levels by department. Mrs Dignum advised that this question had been asked at the task and finish group and the response had been that Chichester Contract Services had the highest level of sickness

due to physical problems and the nature of the work. The Human Resources Manager had been requested to respond.

- Minute 119: Mr Potter requested information on behalf of a swimming group at Westgate Leisure Centre. Mrs Peyman undertook to come back with a written response.

126 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

127 **Declarations of Interests**

Mrs Dignum declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as she was a friend of The Novium Museum. Mr Connor declared a personal interest in agenda item 11 as one of the items on the Forward Plan was the Selsey Haven project.

128 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been received.

129 **Budget 2017-18 Review - feedback**

Mr Ransley presented an oral report on the deliberations of the task and finish group, stating that members had concluded they were satisfied with the explanations on the projected variances on the 2017-18 budget.

Mr J Ward, Head of Finance & Governance Services, advised that the draft settlement had been received from the Government on the day of the review and confirmed that the figures in the draft financial model had been similar to those predicted. The projected funding in the draft settlement had been confirmed for 2016-17 plus three years. A variance of £300,000 deficit in the car parks budget had been identified which had been due to a budgeting error when the 2016-17 budget had been set based on the 2015-16 budget monitoring position at the end of the second quarter, which had forecast an increase in car park usage. This budget correction would be fed into the 2017-18 budget.

Mr Ransley thanked officers for being candid about budgeting mistakes and for the detailed presentations made to the group and for managing the council's accounts in an exemplary manner. The Chairman gave her thanks to the Task and Finish Group for its review.

130 **Education Review 2017**

The committee considered the report in the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

RESOLVED

- 1) That Mr N Galloway, Mrs P Dignum, Mrs J Tassell and Mrs N Graves be appointed as representatives on this group, with Mrs Dignum chairing the

review.

- 2) That the Terms of Reference be agreed.

131 **Community Safety Review 2017**

The committee considered the report in the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

RESOLVED

- 1) That Mr H Potter, Mr J Connor and Mr M Cullen be appointed as the representatives on this group with Mr Connor chairing the review.
- 2) That the Terms of Reference be agreed.

Following the meeting Mr J Brown agreed to take part on this review.

132 **Commercial Services Portfolio Holder address**

The Chairman welcomed Mrs G Keegan, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services, to the meeting along with Mrs J Hotchkiss, Head of Commercial Services, attending to support the portfolio holder.

Mrs Keegan gave an oral report on her priorities and areas of focus over the remainder of the year and on progress being achieving against the projects which appear in the council's Corporate Plan. She focused on the leisure centres, the City Vision, economic and business development and car parks.

Members made comments, including the following:

- In June 2016 the committee had nominated a member to serve on The Novium task and finish group. The group would be set up imminently.
- Queried the increase of 100% in visitor numbers at The Novium. Good exhibitions at the museum had increased visitor numbers however the Tim Peake exhibition had been a step change. The museum had achieved a status of accreditation which increased its reputation and recognition allowing better travelling and special exhibitions to be hosted.
- The Novium is viewed as a cultural service as it is subsidised by the council, however the driver is commercial i.e. how many visitors and how much they spend. A full review by the task and finish group will assess the further options for the museum.
- Queried current progress with marketing the Grange commercial site. The potential developer had pulled out and the council had gone back to the market, receiving one mixed use offer (residential and retail space). A deadline was set for a serious offer to be received however this deadline has passed. We will continue to market the site and will ensure that we get the right offer.
- Queried service and facility issues at the Grange. The task and finish group is monitoring these aspects. Members were advised to ensure that residents and parish councils raise complaints through the centre as the low number of

complaints received does not match what has been reported to members. It was suggested that the task and finish group meet with parish councils at the Grange to hear their views. The conveniences at the centre were built as unisex so that they could be multi-functional, however Mrs Hotchkiss undertook to discuss the operational requirements when there is a large event on at the centre and the allocation of toilet facilities

- Queried realigning of car parks to facilitate wider vehicles. The industry standard for car parking spaces is used.
- Queried the further provision of pay on exit facilities at the districts' other car parks. This project was reviewed by the parking forum. Mixed feedback had been received. Only a couple of car parks were physically able to have barriers installed. Since then new technologies had become available such as pay by phone which may override the need for pay on exit facilities.
- Enterprise Centre – Basepoint is taking operational liability of the facility and Neilcott are responsible for design and building. The two contracts would be signed co-terminous so that there is no risk to the council. We own the building and land and we have input into managing their performance. We will then look at the feasibility of investing in other enterprise satellites in Midhurst, Petworth and possibly Selsey.
- Queried the usage of the Grange car park in Midhurst. We take account of usage figures by reducing season tickets at less used car parks to try to manage usage equally in the districts' car parks.

RESOLVED

That the report from the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services be noted.

133 Developing a New Strategy for the Visitor Economy

The Chairman welcomed Mr S Oates, Economic Development Manager, to the meeting. The committee considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

The committee made comments, including the following:

- Statistics demonstrate that in spite of attractions in the district day visitors numbers are low .cannot be encouraged to become staying visitors. Queried whether the figures were skewed by Goodwood events. Research was carried out May to August through the core summer season and we have quarterly figures from Visit England going back a number of years. A joined up approach would help to attract more inward investment for bed spaces.
- A shortage in overnight tourist accommodation is identified in the studies. We need to get the visitor economy working, to extend the season, continue web and social media activity, linking to other demographics and activities. The first task is to open negotiations with Visit Chichester.
- Developers will consider accommodation more favourably once the tourism season is extended and there are better offers all year round; then major investment will come in.

- Partnership working with other tourist organisations to attract people to the district.
- The standard research sample size used by Visit England was 400-500 people. A number of questions were asked leading to the summary level information set out in the supporting papers.
- Queried building an exhibition hall in Chichester. That sort of facility could come into the district through existing projects and may be outside of the city.
- Queried the change required for Visit Chichester - There would be negotiations with Visit Chichester to establish whether they would be willing to change the shape of the organisation, taking into account the cost involved and investment required from the public sector to facilitate it with the two funding partners, Chichester BID and the council. Then it would need to go out to the market to encourage others to invest in the new destination management organisation (DMO).
- Tourist based industry represents 7.2% of all business in the district with a revenue of £411m in 2015. Queried the overall value of business revenue in the district. Mr Oates undertook to provide a written response on this.
- Car parking charges were not deterring visitors to the city. Research showed that visitors considered our car parking charges reasonable. Occupancy was also not an issue.
- Queried figures for serviced accommodation. Mr Oates undertook to provide this information if available. Mr Potter suggested ward members could establish how many providers there were in each area.

Mr Ransley stated that this council needed to encourage development of overnight accommodation for visitors in the district and to ensure that land for hotel accommodation was included in the Local Plan going forward. He suggested a further recommendation be added to Cabinet as follows: "That Cabinet sponsors a strategic review as to how this council can facilitate or encourage additional overnight accommodation in the district." This was seconded by Mr Potter.

On the recommendations being put to the vote they were declared carried.

RESOLVED

That the committee notes the outcome of the visitor economy review.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

- 1) That £50,000 annual partnership funding is allocated for five years from April 2017 to assist development of the district's visitor economy.
- 2) That a strategic review is sponsored as to how this council can facilitate or encourage additional overnight accommodation in the district.

134 **Forward Plan**

The committee considered the report in the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Galloway advised that he welcomed the report to be considered by Cabinet regarding litter clearance on the A27.

135 **Late Items**

There were no late items.

136 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The committee

RESOLVED

That the public, including the press, be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that it is likely that there would be a disclosure to the public of 'exempt information' of the description specified in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

137 **The Novium Museum Options Appraisal**

The committee considered the report (copy attached to the official minutes) and discussed the current operation and option appraisal

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

That the baseline and Trust options considered in the report were worthy of further consideration.

The meeting ended at 1.20 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:



Minutes of the meeting of the **Overview & Scrutiny Committee** held in Committee Room 2, East Pallant House on Tuesday 24 January 2017 at 11.00 am

Members Present: Mrs C Apel (Chairman), Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mr P Budge, Mr J Connor, Mr M Cullen, Mrs P Dignum, Caroline Neville, Mr N Galloway, Mr H Potter, Mr G Hicks, Mr J Ransley, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs J Tassell and Mr N Thomas

Members not present: Mr S Lloyd-Williams

In attendance by invitation:

Officers present: Mr N Bennett (Legal and Democratic Services Manager), Mr S Hansford (Head of Community Services), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Head of Commercial Services), Mrs B Jones (Principal Scrutiny Officer), Mrs T Murphy (Parking Services Manager), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services)

138 **Chairman's announcements**

Apologies had been received from Mr S Lloyd-Williams.

139 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

140 **Declarations of Interests**

Mrs Apel, Mrs Tassell and Mrs Dignum declared a personal interest in agenda item 5 in respect of their membership as friends of Chichester Festival Theatre.

141 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been received.

142 **Call-In of the Cabinet decision relating to evening car parking charges in New Park Road and Northgate Car Parks**

The committee considered the report in the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr S Hansford, Head of Community Services, advised the committee the call in related to a decision taken by Cabinet at its meeting on 10 January 2017 relating to agenda item 8 Off Street Parking Charges. Cabinet resolved:

(1) That having considered the representations made in respect of the proposal to amend the *Chichester District Council (Off Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2012*, the *Chichester District Council (Off Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) (Variation No 1) Order 2017*, to include reference to the charges detailed in paragraph 5 of the agenda report (as amended in sub-para (a) thereof), shall come into effect from 1 April 2017.

(Paragraph 5.1(a) of the report states - To extend the hours of charging in New Park Road and Northgate Car Parks from 6.00pm Monday to Saturday to 8.00pm Monday to Saturday.)

Councillor Mr Richard Plowman had initiated the call in, supported by Mr Leslie Hixson, Mrs Tricia Tull, Mr Mike Hall, Mrs Jane Kilby and Mrs Julie Tassell.

The criteria identified by Mr Plowman for calling in the decision was that a) the decision is likely to cause distress, harm or significant concern to a local community or to prejudice individuals within it, b) the matter has not been subject to consultation or debate with relevant interested parties and h) the views of the members requesting the call in were not taken into account in arriving at the original decision.

Mr Hansford explained the procedure for hearing the call in. He also reminded the committee that they had three options – 1) to accept the Cabinet decision in which case it would come into effect immediately; 2) to refer the decision back to the decision maker for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of the committee's concerns, or 3) to refer the matter to Council, setting out in writing the nature of the committee's concerns. If the matter was referred to Council, Council would not be able to make a decision, but would, in turn, need to refer the decision back to the decision maker, Cabinet.

Mr Plowman was invited to present his evidence to demonstrate the alleged breaches. These were:

- 1) There had been an inadequate consultation process and flawed interpretation of the responses.
- 2) There was inequality of charges in New Park Road Car Park due to different car parking hourly rates.
- 3) The effect on Chichester Festival Theatre and New Park activities and the night time economy.

Mr Plowman wished to call witnesses from the following organisations – Chichester Festival Theatre, New Park Centre and Chichester City Council. These witnesses each presented their case for supporting the call in.

Mr T French, representing Chichester City Council, spoke against the decision stating that the City Council had voted against the decision as a consultee. He was also the City Council representative on the Chichester District Parking Forum. He

supported car parking charges when these charges were fair and didn't result in Chichester being out of kilter with neighbouring cities. In 2015, when evening car parking charges were suggested, West Sussex County Council was against charging beyond 6pm due to traffic management reasons. He agreed with the reasons stated by Mr Plowman that this would be bad for the city and affect the night time economy.

Ms A McDonald-Hughes spoke on behalf of the New Park Centre, saying that total footfall was about 130,000 per annum, half being cinema goers and the other half attending activities at the centre. There were over 30 groups which would be affected by evening car parking charges - support groups and counselling services for the disadvantaged, many of whom have very low disposable incomes.

Ms R Tackley, the new Executive Director at the Chichester Festival Theatre, stated that as evening car parking charges were not planned at all car parks, it would disproportionately affect evening theatre goers, a large number of whom came to the theatre by car. The proposed charges would equate to 15% on the fee for a theatre ticket. Many people would arrive at 7pm to avoid a charge between 6pm and 7pm and this would have a knock on effect on queues and late entry to performances, making patrons stressed before their evening out. Some of the theatre's staff on the living wage would suffer.

Mrs Keegan Cabinet Member for Commercial Services was invited to respond to the call in and put the case for the decision as set out in the report to the committee.

An opportunity was then given for witnesses to be questioned by the members of the committee.

The committee made the following comments, which were responded to by Mrs G Keegan, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Mrs T Murphy, Parking Services Manager.

- There were concerns over the consultation process.
- A trial period was a ruse as once in place there was no going back.
- To be fair a policy must apply to all car parks.
- In 2011 the theatre had supported the introduction of an evening car parking charge which it had requested was donated to the theatre to assist fundraising for new building works.
- Other accessible car parks were within 10-15 minutes' walk from the theatre.
- Questioned the fairness of policy by singling out these two car parks for raising revenue.
- Cabinet made a decision in October 2015 to freeze car parking charges in all car parks from April 2016 to March 2018.
- Suggested that capacity of the two car parks was being targeted to encourage usage of other car parks in the city.
- There was a need to review the car parking charging policy to look at the freeze on increasing charges which had been implemented for two years from 2016-2018 and not to target these two car parks for evening charges.

- Day time users were subsidising night time users by charging during the day time only.

Mr Plowman made a concluding statement that if this was a revenue generating exercise he considered there were fairer ways of doing it. Chichester Vision was in progress and car parking would be part of that discussion in improving the night time economy. He suggested waiting to see what the outcome of the Vision was before implementing this decision.

Mrs Keegan made a concluding statement stating that as a responsible council we needed to ensure we balanced our budgets in a fair way. The introduction of evening car parking charges was for a trial period of one year. There was a drop off zone in New Park Centre and at least 30 spaces on the street adjacent to the centre. The Cattle Market car park was not far away at which there was free car parking was available in the evenings. There were designated Blue Badge spaces in all CDC-owned car parks, and there were also designated Blue Badge spaces in the New Park Centre's car park. The results of the trial would be considered by the parking forum and its members, which included businesses, community groups as well as representatives from the City and District Councils.

Members of the committee then discussed the call-in and points raised. Mr Connor was concerned that the charging regime would affect less affluent members of community. There was no incentive for people attending the Chichester Festival Theatre to arrive early. He also stated that members of the car parking forum were not aware that this item would be decided by Cabinet, having understood it was a Council decision. He suggested the introduction of a single payment of £1 for the entire evening period at all CDC car parks which would be easier on the public and still allow revenue to be made by the council.

Mr Shaxson agreed with the points made about introducing car parking charges across all car parks and not cherry picking the two car parks for evening charges by a largely captive clientele. He suggested a motion that reconsideration be given to the entire car parking charges regime. He was seconded by Mr Connor. Mr Hansford explained that the decision had yet to be made by the committee on where the decision should be directed in accordance with agenda item 5 a) and b) and that the call in related only to the specific part of the decision made by cabinet relating to evening charges.

Mr Ransley questioned the exaggerated claim that Chichester Festival Theatre represented 30,000 people who were against the decision. He put forward a motion "That this committee compliments Cabinet on making their decision and recognises their consideration for commissioning a one year trial before making a final decision on whether or not to introduce evening car parking charges". This was seconded by Mr Thomas. On this motion being put to the vote, it was declared not carried.

Mrs Dignum doubted claims that people would arrive at the theatre in distress at being asked to pay 70p for one hour. There was room for improvement in putting up notices regarding charge increases in car parks and requested that this be reviewed. The local paper had run an article which made people aware of the charges. She doubted whether the increase in these charges would make much

difference to the night time economy, particularly as the Cattle Market car park was so large and empty in the evenings. If charges are increased in more than these two car parks it would affect a lot more people. When Sunday charges were introduced there was concern that this would affect Sunday shopping, however this had not come to pass.

Mrs Apel was concerned that the City Council was against this charging regime and that the consultation had been difficult to access online.

Mr Hansford reminded members that this decision had been made by Cabinet and it was an Executive decision; regardless of where the committee referred the decision, it would ultimately still need to be made by Cabinet.

Mr Cullen suggested a motion, a variance on the motion made by Mr Shaxson earlier, which read "To refer the decision back to the decision maker for reconsideration taking into account the comments made by the committee which are that:

- To identify only two car parks for the introduction of evening car parking charges is unfair and targeted to the City.
- An increase in all current car parking charges in the district's car parks during current charging hours would be a more fair and equitable means to increase car parking charges.

This was seconded by Mr Shaxson.

On the motion being put to the vote, it was declared carried.

RESOLVED

To refer the decision back to the decision maker for reconsideration taking into account the comments made by the committee.

RECOMMEND TO CABINET

That this decision is reconsidered taking into account the following comments made by the committee:

- By identifying only the two car parks for the introduction of evening car parking charges is unfair and targeted to the City.
- An increase in all current car parking charges in all the district's car parks during current charging hours would be a more fair and equitable means to increase car parking charges.

143 Late Items

There were no late items.

The meeting ended at 12.25 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

Chichester District Council

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 March 2017

Recycling Action Plan 2017/18

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Amie Huggett, Business Development Manager

Tel: 01243 534731 E-mail: ahuggett@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

The committee is requested to:

2.1 Note progress against the Recycling Action Plan for 2016/17

2.2 Recommend to Cabinet that the updated 2017/18 Recycling Action Plan is approved.

3. Background

3.1 In April 2016 Cabinet endorsed the Recycling Action Plan based on the Council's commitment to achieving a 50% recycling rate by 2020 and to reducing the amount of waste going to landfill.

3.2 A number of key projects have since been delivered and the recycling rate has increased from 39.9% (full year performance 2015/16) to 43.3% (provisional result for Quarter 2, July-September 2016). Sample contamination levels (material in the recycling bins that cannot be recycled) have been maintained at an average 4.7% during April to October 2016 exceeding the target of no greater than 6%.

4. Outcomes

4.1 Appendix 1 provides a detailed progress update against the original Action Plan approved. The key headlines are summarised below:

Project Officers; Cabinet approved the recruitment of two Recycling Project Officers to deliver the various projects within the Recycling Action Plan. One officer was appointed in September 2016 rather than the original two as the second post was absorbed as part of existing resources.

Garden Recycling Service; introductory offer for new customers launched alongside re-branded advertising material and online self-service access. During the promotional period 1,370 new customers joined the service and garden waste tonnage has increased by 11% compared to the previous year.

Communications Strategy; 'back-to-basics' communications campaign launched raising general awareness of our key recycling messages. Communication tools developed and include pull-up banners, detailed recycling information leaflet,

regular articles in Initiatives magazine, increased social media activity, new vehicle signage and a mailshot of the leaflets to over 30,000 residents.

A new residents' recycling forum has also been created in order to gather ideas and feedback on how recycling could be made easier. This has had a very positive response, with residents already contributing to the campaign and providing useful feedback on projects as they develop.

The communications campaign gained momentum during Recycle Week which took place during 12 – 18 September 2016. Supported by local supermarkets, as well as local media organisations and West Sussex County Council, officers and members spent five days carrying out outreach work across four supermarkets sites, engaging with over 1,500 members of the public, giving out detailed information and answering questions on recycling.

Communal Bin Recycling; pilot project established in partnership with the West Sussex Communications Group aiming to improve the quality of recycling and level of contamination of bulk bins. Reusable bags for transporting recycling to bulk bins were hand delivered to trial areas by the partnership team who explained to the resident the purpose of the trial and how to use the bag. The team also used this as an opportunity to survey the residents on their recycling habits and capture feedback on barriers to recycling. Early results are positive and are currently being reviewed.

Recycling Guidance; prompted by suggestions made during Recycle Week, bin stickers have been produced for waste and recycling bins following extensive consultation. A trial will be conducted from February to October 2017 with the results being reported to the Waste and Recycling Panel (W&RP) in autumn 2017.

- 4.2 In summary, the result of actions completed to date are positive and such a sharp increase in the recycling rate shows that the current approach appears to be working. However the W&RP, who meet quarterly to consider the ongoing delivery of the Action Plan, recognises that whilst current performance is encouraging, it is essential to have a comprehensive and not a piecemeal approach to promoting and educating residents about recycling. The Action Plan has been updated for 2017/18 (Appendix 2) to reflect this approach and it is anticipated that the recycling rate will increase to 45% by March 2018.
- 4.3 Of the £50,000 budget approved by Cabinet in April 2016, £31,000 remains and will carry forward to 2017/18 to support the continued delivery of the Action Plan allocated to:
- Garden Recycling Service promotion.
 - Production of bin stickers for all residents if trial project successful.
 - Contribution to purchasing further recycling bags if trial project successful.
 - Undertaking samples of recycling loads to assess quality and levels of contamination.
 - Communication material to support the Communications Strategy.

5. Alternatives that have been considered

- 5.1 Many of the available alternatives have been considered by the West Sussex Waste Partnership and the W&RP.
- 5.2 The option of separate food waste collections is on hold. Members and officers are conscious of the associated costs and infrastructure development requirements especially as food waste is already utilised beneficially as part of the current residual waste process, diverting waste from landfill. Unfortunately this does not contribute to the recycling rate as it is currently measured. A recent review of Chichester Contract Services urges the Council to be cautious in making significant changes at the present time as it is currently unclear what will happen to recycling rate measurement after the UK leaves the EU.
- 5.3 The viability of each project meeting the expected outcomes are assessed against the cost and effort required with alternative options considered at this stage. In addition, the W&RP support trial projects where practical in order to identify the true impact of each initiative.

6. Resource and legal implications

- 6.1 Following the result of the EU Referendum, it is not yet clear what the implications will be for authorities failing to achieve the 50% recycling target. It is possible that the Council will still be subject to fines if the target is not met by 2020.
- 6.2 Failure to provide recyclate that is of sufficient quality and quantity will directly impact on the income received by the Council from the recycling support payment.

7. Consultation

- 7.1 Consultation on projects within the Action Plan have been carried out with the following:
- (a) The Waste and Recycling Panel.
 - (b) The Resident Recycling Forum.
 - (c) The West Sussex Waste Partnership Communications Group.

8. Community impact and corporate risks

- 8.1 Failure to achieve the 50% recycling target by 2020 has already been identified as a corporate risk to the Council. An important part of each project will be to seek to influence community behaviour towards a higher level of recycling performance.

9. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime & Disorder:		None
Climate Change: Increasing recycling performance reduces waste sent to landfill and does therefore have a positive environmental impact.	Yes	
Human Rights and Equality Impact		None
Safeguarding and Early Help		None

10. Appendices

- 10.1 Appendix 1 - Recycling Action Plan 2016/17 Progress Report.
- 10.2 Appendix 2 - Recycling Action Plan 2017/18.





11. Background Papers



- 11.1 None.


RECYCLING ACTION PLAN 2016/17

Update against the Action Plan approved by Cabinet in April 2016


In April 2016 Cabinet endorsed the Recycling Action Plan based on the Council’s commitment to achieving a 50% recycling rate by 2020 and to reducing the amount of waste going to landfill. A number of key projects have since been delivered and the recycling rate has increased from 39.9% (full year performance 2015/16) and to 43.3% (provisional result July-September 2016). The below summarises progress to date against the original Action Plan approved.

Project Status Key			
	Overdue / on hold		In progress
	Check Progress / key milestone not met		Completed for 2016/17





Status	Project Title	Key Milestone	Due Date	Complete	Update
P 17 	Recycling Project Team - Recruit Recycling Project Officers	Recommendation to Cabinet	April 2016	Yes	Cabinet approved the recruitment of two Recycling Project Officers to deliver the various projects within the Recycling Action Plan. Recruitment was delayed owing to discussions surrounding the Contract Services structure review and a second round of recruitment being required. One officer subsequently appointed in September 2016 rather than the original two as the second post was absorbed alongside existing resources.
		Recruitment process	May 2016	Yes	
		Induction	June 2016	Yes	
	Garden Recycling Service Introductory Offer	Recommendation to Cabinet	April 2016	Yes	During July to October residents who applied online for the Garden Recycling Service were eligible for a discount of three months free. During the promotional period 1,370 new customers joined the service; exceeding targets set for the year. In addition, the total customer base has increased by over 13% which is good progress towards meeting the target of 30% take-up of households using the service by 2020.

Status	Project Title	Key Milestone	Due Date	Complete	Update
		Logistics planning	June 2016	Yes	<p>The end date for the promotional period was adjusted from September to October to take into account changes to the West Sussex County Council Mobile Recycling Sites so those residents affected could take advantage of the offer. With support from the Public Relations Team the service was also re-branded and new advertising routes established as part of the general recycling communications campaign.</p> <p>We are closely monitoring the impact the increased customer base will have on our recycling rate. Early indications are positive as garden waste tonnage is up by 11% compared to the previous year (April to September).</p>
		Introduction	July 2016	Yes	
 Page 18	Communications Strategy 2016/17	Strategy approved	April 2016	Yes	<p>Working closely with the Public Relations Team and the West Sussex Waste Communications Group, the 'Back to Basics' campaign launched in the spring and has focused on raising general awareness of our key recycling messages. The budget approved by Cabinet for communication initiatives has supported the production of a detailed recycling information leaflet; pull up stands; leaflets; postcards; posters; car park banners; web banners; social media assets and media advertising.</p>
		'Back to Basics' campaign launched	April 2016	Yes	
		Residents' Recycling Forum Established	June 2016	Yes	
		Recycle Week	September 2016	Yes	<p>A Residents' Recycling Forum has been established providing residents with the opportunity to engage with us and share their thoughts and ideas on recycling. The Forum has already provided their feedback to a key project as part of the consultation for the bin sticker project (see below).</p> <p>For Recycle Week we took a new approach to engaging with residents. Officers, members and representatives from West Sussex Waste spent five days carrying out outreach work across four supermarkets (Waitrose and Tesco in Chichester, Co-op in Selsey and Budgens in Midhurst), engaging with members of the public and giving out detailed</p>

Status	Project Title	Key Milestone	Due Date	Complete	Update
					<p>recycling information and answering questions. We spoke to over 1,500 residents and received over 100 written comments which have been used to inform our projects going forward. The events were well received and we aim to build on this approach for Recycle Week 2017.</p> <p>In addition to the above, a full survey of all our waste and recycling vehicle panels was carried out, with messaging updated where required. This was part-funded by the West Sussex Communications Group. Messages will be rotated throughout the year and reviewed as part of a rolling programme.</p>
Page 19	Recycling Bin Upsize	Recommendation to Cabinet	April 2016	Yes	<p>Project to offer a bigger recycling bin to residents for free was deferred subject to further evaluation owing to implementation costs. Options have been considered by the W&RP and it has been agreed to provide residents with the opportunity to upsize their recycling bin for free where requested. The objective is to send a positive message to residents enabling them to maximise the amount they recycle. Delivery of the project will roll over into 2017/18.</p>
		Logistics planning	June 2016	No	
		Introduction	July 2016	No	
Page 19	Recycling Guidance for Residents	Investigation	July 2016	Yes	<p>Following the report to Cabinet, the W&RP have assessed various options on the most appropriate method to communicate recycling guidance with residents and have agreed to trial stickers for waste and recycling bins. This decision was prompted by suggestions from residents during Recycle Week and other local authority case studies. The original project milestones agreed by Cabinet (shown here) have been updated to reflect this approach.</p> <p>Following extensive consultation with the Recycling Residents' Forum, West Sussex Communications Group, CDC staff and the W&RP, sticker designs have been selected and a trial will be conducted from February to October 2017. The aim of the stickers is to provide a positive cue for residents when using their domestic bins.</p>
		Report to Waste and Recycling Panel	August 2016	Yes	
		Production	October 2016	No	

Status	Project Title	Key Milestone	Due Date	Complete	Update
					<p>The stickers will provide information to raise awareness and have the potential to change behaviours, particularly where residents are not engaged with other communication channels. The following outcomes are expected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in household waste tonnages where stickers are implemented. • Increase recycling tonnages where stickers are implemented. • Reduction in contamination reports by crew. • Reduction in the amount of recyclable material in the waste stream. <p>The results of the trial will be used to assess whether the viability of the project meeting the expected outcomes compared to the cost and effort required.</p>
 Page 20	Waste and Recycling Crew Training Programme	Recycling project officers to prepare script / programme	August 2016	Yes	<p>Approach to crew training has now changed after an assessment of past barriers to providing support and training. The original expectation was to provide a training guide and bring the crews in for a training session. However, experience from the past has shown that getting crews into the office after their days work is very difficult. Equally to take a crew off their round would require additional resources which can prove difficult. It has been agreed following consultation with various staff that training would be provided on the job during their working day. The purpose of this support is to provide crews with the opportunity to report recycling issues back for action and feel confident in this process. The training element will help bring all the crews and drivers knowledge on recycling to an agreed standard. The support days will be delivered from March 2017 onwards and the success monitored throughout the year.</p>
		Deliver training	December 2016	No	
		Annual refresher	2017/18	No	

Joint Projects with the West Sussex Waste Partnership

Status	Project Title	Key Milestone	Due Date	Complete	Update
	Communal Bin Recycling	Commence pilot scheme with WSCC	July 2016	Yes	Pilot project established in partnership with the West Sussex Communications Group aiming to improve the quality of recycling and level of contamination of bulk bins. Phase one has seen the introduction of reusable bags for transporting recycling to bulk bins, new signage and a door stepping campaign for trial areas in West Sussex. Initial results are positive and recycling load samples for Chichester have improved from a Grade B to Grade A. The project will continue in 2017/18, with a phase one report scheduled for April 2017. If successful the joint working group will decide how the project can be rolled out further.
		Sample recycling	August 2016	Yes	
		Bags delivered to trial area by door steppers	October 2016	Yes	
		Sample recycling	November 2016	Yes	
		Sample recycling	February 2017	No	
		Review	April 2017	No	
	County-wide street sweeping recycling	Initial scoping	July 2016	Yes	Project objective is to develop a process to recycle material from street sweeping operations. An analysis of logistical requirements across the county has been completed and the contract to treat the street sweeping arisings has been specified and tendered. It is expected that the project will be operational by the beginning of April 2017 and is expected to deliver a 2% improvement to CDC's recycling rate.
		Final report	September 2016	Yes	
		Possible implementation (2017/18)	April 2017	No	
	County-wide food waste project	Initial scoping	July 2016	Yes	Decision made to put the food waste collection project on hold. If we were to invest in food waste collections it is likely to make little difference to landfill amounts as food is already extracted by the MBT from our residual waste and diverted from landfill to the anaerobic digesters. In view of this, and in view of the recent consultant's report of CCS, members of the Waste and Recycling Panel and Leader of the Council believe it is time to abandon any idea of food waste collection for the foreseeable future. It has been agreed that investment in public education should continue.
		Final report	September 2016	Yes	
		W&RP visits to other local authorities	July 2016	No	
		Cabinet report	November 2016	No	
		Possible implementation (2019/20)	2019/20	No	
	County-wide textile & WEEE collection	Initial scoping	June 2016	Yes	Trial for collections currently being undertaken by Crawley BC using a separate container fixed to waste freighters to

Status	Project Title	Key Milestone	Due Date	Complete	Update
		Final report	July 2016	No	collect textiles and small WEEE (waste electrical and electronic equipment).
		Possible implementation (2017/18)	April 2017	No	Current CDC vehicles do not have sufficient space for container. Project to deliver this service efficiently is therefore dependent on decisions on food waste collection and re-configuration of vehicle fleet.

RECYCLING ACTION PLAN

Version 2: Updated for 2017/18

Action	Action Due Date	Key Milestones	Milestone Due Date	Additional Support
<p>Title: Garden Recycling Service – targeted promotion.</p> <p>Description: Building on the successful promotion in 2016/17, the service will look to adopt targeted promotional methods to increase the customer base. Working closely with Public Relations, the service will also explore sponsorship and advertising opportunities with a suitable business to work in partnership on the garden recycling campaign throughout 2017.</p> <p>Expected Outcomes: Overall objective is to increase the customer base from 20% of the district to 30% by 2020. Additional garden waste tonnage to increase the overall recycling rate by 2%.</p> <p>2017/18 targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14,100 customers using the service. • 5,700 tonnes of garden waste collected. <p>Budget requirements: Advertising – approx. £500 (met from existing budget approved).</p>	March 2018	<p>Map customer base to identify gaps in market area.</p> <p>Operational capacity – finalise analysis of growth predictions against resource requirements.</p> <p>Establish links with other services e.g. Community Wardens to support delivery of targeted promotion.</p> <p>Advertising and sponsorship opportunities established and promotional campaign developed.</p> <p>Service promotion where garden waste is reported by crews in domestic waste bin.</p> <p>Identify ‘upsell’ opportunities and apply.</p> <p>‘Recommend a friend’ promotion – explore options and implementation method established for 2018/19.</p> <p>Internal staff promotion.</p> <p>Seasonal advertising.</p> <p>Evaluation and finalise strategy for 2018/19.</p>	<p>April 2017</p> <p>April 2017</p> <p>June 2017</p> <p>June 2017</p> <p>June 2017 onwards</p> <p>September 2017</p> <p>December 2017</p> <p>TBC</p> <p>March 2018</p> <p>January – March 2018</p>	<p>Public Relations</p> <p>Community Engagement</p> <p>Customer Services</p> <p>Web team (promo code re-applied to website if needed and exploration of options for handling ‘Recommend a Friend’ promo)</p>

Action	Action Due Date	Key Milestones	Milestone Due Date	Additional Support
<p>Title: Bin Sticker Trial.</p> <p>Description: To provide bin stickers for domestic waste and recycling bins providing advice on waste reduction and to reinforce correct material and quality messages. Trial project approved by the Waste and Recycling Panel (W&RP) in December 2016. Three trial areas have been identified across the district (rural, urban and coastal) and cover approximately 3,500 properties.</p> <p>Expected Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in household waste tonnages where stickers are implemented. • Increase recycling tonnages where stickers are implemented. • Reduction in contamination reports by crew. • Reduction in the amount of recyclable material in the waste stream. <p>Specific targets to be established following the trial which will provide the opportunity to assess the viability of the project meeting the expected outcomes compared to the cost and effort required.</p> <p>Budget requirements: Direct costs for sticker production for the trial approx. £3,500 (met from existing budget approved). If trial deemed successful, options for further roll out and associated costs will be evaluated and presented to the W&RP for consideration.</p>	<p>TBC – dependent of trial results</p>	<p>Stickers produced.</p> <p>Establish baseline performance including sample of current recycling quality.</p> <p>Stickers rolled out to trial areas.</p> <p>Press release and article in Initiatives.</p> <p>Door steppers – survey residents with stickers.</p> <p>Evaluate results including sample of recycling quality.</p> <p>Report trial outcomes to the W&RP and decision made on way forward.</p> <p>‘Thank you’ postcard to residents to reinforce key messages and the difference their actions have made.</p> <p>Further milestones to be established depending on success of trial.</p>	<p>February 2017</p> <p>April 2017</p> <p>April 2017</p> <p>April 2017</p> <p>May 2017</p> <p>October 2017</p> <p>November 2017</p> <p>November 2017</p> <p>March 2018</p>	<p>Customer Services (at point of implementation)</p> <p>Public Relations (communications)</p> <p>WSCC Communications Group (Door steppers)</p>

Action	Action Due Date	Key Milestones	Milestone Due Date	Additional Support
<p>Title: Communal Bin Recycling – Bag trial. Description: A trial started in 2016 in partnership with West Sussex County Council where reusable bags have been issued to residents of flats and shared houses. The bags are designed to give residents information on what can and can't be recycled, as well as making it easier for them to transport their recycling to their communal waste areas. Expected Outcomes: Improve quality of recycling to reduce rejected loads and increase recycling. Specific targets to be established following the trial. The trial provides the opportunity to assess the viability of the project meeting the expected outcomes compared to the cost and effort required. Budget requirements: Direct costs currently funded by WSCC Communications Group. If trial is deemed successful it is likely that further funding opportunities will be available from WSCC however this will be dependent on how wide the project is rolled out.</p>	<p>TBC – dependent of trial results</p>	<p>West Sussex door stepping team to distribute 'Thank you' postcard with key messages and to reinforce the difference the resident's actions have made since receiving their recycling bags.</p> <p>Final report produced by WSCC covering results of trial, lessons learned and next steps.</p> <p>Press release: update on trial.</p> <p>Progress report to the W&RP and decision made on way forward. Milestones to be determined following evaluation. Expectation is to roll out further to specific problem area bulk sites.</p>	<p>February 2017</p> <p>March 2017</p> <p>March 2017</p> <p>May 2017 (dependent on WSCC report)</p>	<p>In partnership with the WSCC Communications Group.</p> <p>Public Relations.</p>
<p>Title: Waste and Recycling Crew Training. Description: All crews need to be on message with recycling and be confident with what can or cannot be recycled. On the job training – Support Days – to be provided to all crews. Expected Outcomes: Bring all crews knowledge on recycling to an agreed standard. Provide crews with the opportunity to report recycling issues back for action. Budget requirements: N/a.</p>	<p>March 2018</p>	<p>Support Day – soft launch.</p> <p>Programme signed off.</p> <p>Establish baseline measures.</p> <p>Each crew member to complete a support day.</p> <p>Evaluation.</p> <p>Annual refresher.</p>	<p>January 2017</p> <p>March 2017</p> <p>March 2017</p> <p>June 2017</p> <p>October 2017</p> <p>2018</p>	

Action	Action Due Date	Key Milestones	Milestone Due Date	Additional Support
<p>Title: Recycling Bin Upsize</p> <p>Description: Where residents request a larger recycling bin, swap to the next size up free of charge.</p> <p>Expected Outcomes: Send a positive message to residents enabling them to maximise the amount they recycle. Increase in recycling tonnages as each property that upsizes has the potential to increase their recycling by 20%.</p> <p>Budget requirements: £10,000 per annum to cover bin stocks from Domestic Waste revenue account.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Report to Cabinet.</p> <p>Evaluate existing stock levels.</p> <p>Finalise procedures (admin and operations including communications to resident at point of swap) and go live.</p> <p>Monitor take-up and stock levels. Evaluate impact on recycling tonnages.</p> <p>Update to the W&RP.</p> <p>Evaluation to build into 2018/19 stock requirements and budget.</p>	<p>April 2017</p> <p>April 2017</p> <p>May 2017</p> <p>Monthly</p> <p>November 2017</p> <p>December 2017</p>	<p>Customer Services</p> <p>ICT Applications (if update to Lagan scripting required)</p>
<p>Title: Communications Action Plan 2017/18.</p> <p>Description: phase 2 of the communications campaign which is to take a more targeted approach on specific recycling messages and build on the communication tools already developed.</p> <p>Expected Outcomes: To provide a consistent message to residents and external stakeholders, communicate key messages as new recycling projects are implemented and work closely with West Sussex County Council to make sure we are communicating the same messages and maximising use of resources.</p> <p>Budget requirements: Approx. £5,000 met from existing approved budget.</p>	March 2018	<p>Campaign development focused on targeted messages including waste minimisation.</p> <p>Launch of e-newsletter.</p> <p>Assessment of Community Rewards schemes.</p> <p>Develop efficient process to communicate with residents where crews have reported contamination.</p> <p>Key messages video development.</p> <p>Establish cross service collaboration (e.g. with Community Engagement, Housing, Customer Services) and deliver training as required.</p> <p>Recycle Week 2017.</p>	<p>March 2017</p> <p>April 2017</p> <p>May 2017</p> <p>July 2017</p> <p>August 2017</p> <p>August 2017</p> <p>September 2017</p>	<p>Public Relations</p> <p>West Sussex Communications Group</p> <p>Housing Services</p> <p>Community Engagement</p>

Action	Action Due Date	Key Milestones	Milestone Due Date	Additional Support
Page 27		<p>Use of WSCC Door steppers – trial and assess.</p> <p>Review design of bin hangers (used by crews to alert the resident of contamination) and investigate advertising opportunities to cover costs.</p> <p>Creation of informative welcome packs for new residents moving in to area.</p> <p>Develop existing connections with managing agents and private landlords in order to better utilise their communication channels with residents, with a view to reducing contamination and increasing recycling tonnages.</p> <p>Investigate the costs involved with decontaminating bins, or removing as waste, and research how other local authorities pass these on to the managing agents as charges to offset the cost of service delivery.</p>	<p>October 2017</p> <p>November 2017</p> <p>January 2018</p> <p>January 2018</p> <p>February 2018</p>	<p>Housing Services</p> <p>Public Relations</p>
<p>Title: Review county-wide street sweeping recycling project.</p> <p>Description: Material from street sweeping arising to be collected and treated for recycling.</p> <p>Expected Outcomes: Direct contribution to recycling rate. Anticipate 2% improvement.</p> <p>Budget requirements: None. Processing operation can be accommodated at existing waste disposal facilities.</p>	<p>March 2018</p>	<p>Assess impact on recycling rate following implementation in April 2017.</p> <p>Update to the W&RP.</p>	<p>September 2017</p> <p>November 2017</p>	<p>Strategic Waste Officers Group</p>

Action	Action Due Date	Key Milestones	Milestone Due Date	Additional Support
<p>Title: County-wide textile & WEEE collection</p> <p>Description: trial for collections being undertaken by Crawley BC using a separate container fixed to waste freighter to collect textiles and small WEEE (waste electrical and electronic equipment).</p> <p>Expected Outcomes: This could achieve a 1-2% increase on the recycling rate.</p> <p>Budget requirements: Processing operation can be accommodated at existing waste disposal facilities. However, current CDC vehicles do not have sufficient space for container. If trial project successful options would need to be assessed.</p>		<p>Review outcome of Crawley trial and agree way forward for District and Boroughs.</p> <p>Update to the W&RP.</p>	<p>September 2017</p> <p>November 2017</p>	<p>Strategic Waste Officers Group</p>

Chichester District Council

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 March 2017

Education Review
Final report from the Task and Finish Group

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Pam Dignum Task and Finish Group Chairman
01243 538585 pdignum@chichester.gov.uk

2. Executive Summary

This report summarises the presentations and research undertaken by the Education Review Task and Finish Group in reviewing the progress of both primary and secondary school attainment levels in the district. The group heard presentations from WSCC, Academy schools and Early Years. Assessment mechanisms have changed but there was reassurance that investment in support for schools and Early Years was being made and positive progress in achievements had been made.

3. Recommendation

- 1) That the committee notes the effect of changes to the assessment process on the comparative performance of schools but notes the overall positive direction of travel.**
- 2) That the committee notes the recommendation at 6.2 for a future Task and Finish Group focus on the preparedness for further education and work.**

4. Background

- 4.1. Chichester District Council has an interest in the skills of its young people entering the workforce and contributing economically. Educational attainment is a key influence on people's quality of life long term, as well as an important factor in the vibrancy of the district.
- 4.2. A Task and Finish Group examined educational attainment in 2012 and 2014; and were reassured that progress was being made. They reviewed the County's "Start of life" Programme, nursery provision, standards and inspection, "value added", and working with academies. Concern arose in 2016 over test results after two years of a new National Curriculum, when both testing and results were profoundly different from previous years, and some schools expressed dismay at their new rating.
- 4.3. The Task and Finish Group comprised Mrs P Dignum (Chairman), Mr N Galloway, Mrs N Graves and Mrs J Tassell and met twice in February 2017,

4.4. The following witnesses were invited to present to the group:

- Mr Simon Lockwood – Head of School Improvement, West Sussex County Council (WSCC)
- Mr David Linsell, - Director of Education, The Kemnal Academy Trust (TKAT)
- Mr James Munt - Executive Head of three TKAT primary schools
- Ms Lesley Jallow – Early Years' Service Manager - Commissioning, WSCC

4.5. The task and finish group was asked to examine and understand the new performance tables at Key stage 2 (end of primary) and Key Stage 4 (GCSE stage); to look at new requirements for Maths and English at KS2; to see how WSCC was monitoring this and academies' performance; and to revisit the Readiness for School data.

5. Evidence

5.1. The group heard first from Mr Lockwood who explained the results of testing at KS2 and KS4 in 2016. The tests were the first to be based on the new 2014 National Curriculum.

Primary results

Previously assessed by Levels, it was now by Age Related Expectations (ARE), with each year from 1--6 being set its own goals. By year 6 this requires 60 different statements of achievement grouped under seven headings. WSCC had guided its schools to apply the new criteria with a rigour not necessarily applied in some other areas, and may account for lower results in West Sussex against the National average. However that rigour had been recognised by the Department for Education (DfE) in using West Sussex examples of marked work for assessment training, and in selecting a West Sussex trainer for its official team. In Chichester district the results for Reading, Writing and Maths (the core subjects) varied from 78% to 14%, with an average of 45%, below the national average measure of 54%.

Members were pleased to hear that WSCC, following cuts in Government funding, had reversed the 2010 policy of cutting back spending on support in favour of developing academies which had led to fewer staff and special advisers. More time and money has now been invested, with Maths and English having been specially checked. Since April 2016 every school had been visited and had a link adviser.

Secondary results

Again, the assessments were radically different, with no comparison possible against previous years' figures. There were two headline measures for schools' GCSE results: Attainment 8 and Progress 8. Attainment 8 measured pupils performing well across 8 subjects in GCSE (not the 5A*--Cs as previously). The national average score is 50; Bishop Luffa scored 60; Chichester High School for Girls 53. Other local schools scored between 46 and 8. Progress 8 measures the "value added" by the school by measuring pupils' progress across 8 subjects from the age of 11-16. A score of Plus 1 means pupils were achieving one grade more than the benchmark (0) across all 8 subjects. The national average in 2016 was -0.3. Bishop Luffa and Chichester High School for Girls were above zero

(0.34 and 0.15) but the other Chichester secondary schools were below the national average.

Mr Lockwood identified the challenges facing schools but said that progress had been made in Ofsted inspection outcomes. Despite the scores Chichester schools' GCSE results were successful with many more 8s than other areas.

- 4.2 Members then received a presentation from Mr Linsell, and Mr Munt to give an insight into academies.

Mr Linsell said five of their 40 academies were in the district; Chichester High School and Selsey secondaries and Seal, Portfield and Tangmere primaries. Ofsted inspections in all schools indicated improving standards and results. The recent merger of the Boys and Girls High schools had been caused by falling roll numbers and the need to improve boys' standards and this had been successful in both. Progress 8 at GCSE level (for girls only last year), 0.15, was just above "average" into "good".

The Selsey Academy, destroyed by fire in late summer 2016, showed the value of co-operation between school, community, WSCC, and TKAT, as it was able to open in temporary accommodation within a week. The roll at 450 was too small for the DfE to fund a rebuild, but with the addition of a new co-located specialist junior school (the senior element of Seal school) it had won approval for funding. This specialism would include science, ICT and art, and be accessible to all primary schools. The Selsey Academy's results used to be below average but had moved to average (-0.03) in three years, and its Ofsted status from Inadequate to Requiring Improvement.

Mr Munt then spoke of the primary academies in his care at Portfield (formerly St James) and Seal and included Tangmere. Portfield was one-form entry with a specialist unit dealing with children needing specialist help for speech and language which meant it was 11 times the national average for such pupils some of whom come from the surrounding areas. It also has 58% of pupils eligible for free school meals, more than twice the national average. Under a new head good progress had been made, increasing the roll and results were in the top 10% for progress nationally. Its early years' development was moving towards national standards. Seal had fewer children with special needs and lower levels of free school meal entitlement. Its early years and phonics were above national levels, but improvement was needed higher up the school after a plateau in results. Tangmere was improving to a "Good", coming from below the "floor" level to a high, being consistently above the West Sussex average at Key Stage 1 (age 7).

TKAT was pleased with the overall progress in their schools' results.

- 4.3 The TKAT representatives said that despite the reductions in current funding, 8% in 3 years, they would not be introducing four-day weeks; that TKAT top slices 3% to support academy structures which is lower than the average trust and Local Authorities who take between 5 and 8%; that TKAT academies benefit from collaboration between schools and were free to engage with the local authorities if they wanted to; and that TKAT made their buildings/facilities available for community use.

Members were reasonably reassured by all the information on academies, with questions largely answered, and felt better informed about how academies run, and their successful contribution to the education scene locally.

- 4.4 Ms Jallow gave a presentation on Readiness for School and Early Years Provision. The aim of focusing on the earliest years was to develop the cognitive, linguistic and self-regulatory skills of children so they were ready for school and action was aimed to counter a disadvantaged background.

Early Years' provision included private childminders, play groups and nursery schools and was subject to Ofsted inspection. WSCC early year's staff visited each establishment termly checking standards and targeted resources where improvements were needed. Children & Family centres (CFCs) supported families and encouraged take up of free school places for 3-4 year olds and special funded places for 2 year olds seen as vulnerable (there are 107 aged 2 children funded in the district). Take-up of 15 hours' free nursery places for 3-4 year olds was fairly good, e.g. in Chichester central (city) in autumn 2016 it was 97%, in the rural areas 89%.

Early years' development is measured at 24/36 months by a short statement observing personal, social, emotional development, physical, communication and language development. Ofsted rated the quality of funded pre-school highly, rating Chichester 100%. The second statutory assessment comes at the end of Reception, comprising teacher judgements on communication and language, physical development, personal, social and emotional development, literacy, maths, understanding the world, expressive arts and design, ability to solve problems. To achieve a good level of development (GLD) a child has to achieve the expected level in all 17 aspects of learning. In 2016 West Sussex achieved 68%, just below the national average, up from 53% in 2013. The 2016 Chichester area results ranged from 60-71% and improved overall on 2015 results.

5. Outcomes to be achieved

- 5.1 The terms of reference set out the agreed outcomes as a) Understand progress in GCSE performance; b) Note change in the Key Stage regime and compulsory Maths and English; c) Understand WSCC role in monitoring academy performance, and d) Understand issues related to readiness for school.
- 5.2 At the end of the review the task and finish group members:
- considered that they had been presented with comprehensive data and explanations which allowed them to understand GCSE performance under the new curriculum and the testing methods
 - felt reassured that results were satisfactory and improving despite comparisons with previous years being impossible
 - noted and understood the assessment changes at primary level
 - noted the improvement progress in Ofsted inspection outcomes
 - understood early years' provision and noted the improvements in GLD
 - noted the efforts to counter deprivation and vulnerability

- noted the invaluable contribution made by WSCC, private provision and CFCs to children's readiness for school and that focusing resources led to improvements.

6. Recommendations

- 6.1 At the conclusion of the review, the task and finish group feels able to reassure the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that, despite the complexities and changing assessment criteria, overall positive progress is being made in early years' readiness for school, and primary and secondary outcomes.
- 6.2 The task and finish group recommends that, should the Overview and Scrutiny Committee wish to revisit educational attainment when the new curriculum and testing regime are better established, they could look more broadly at temporary and permanent exclusions and the readiness of school leavers for further education or employment.

7. Alternatives that have been considered

- 7.1 For the purposes of the review the topics and speakers were constrained by time and the terms of reference. Wider topics could be considered in future by engaging with elements of the education provision beyond secondary education and with local employers.

8. Appendices

None

9. Background papers

Education Review Task and Finish Group Terms of Reference – available online under the Overview & Scrutiny Committee agenda 17 January 2017

Agenda Item 9

Chichester District Council

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 March 2017

Community Safety Review – Final report from the Task & Finish Group (TFG)

1. Contacts

Author: Mr M Cullen, Chairman of the Task and Finish
Phone: 01243 573850 email: mcullen@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

That the committee:

- 1) Notes that the TFG considered that the required level of scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership had been achieved.
- 2) Notes that members will receive brief case studies highlighting key areas of the Community Safety Partnership's (CSP) achievement in the District via the Members' Bulletin.
- 3) Notes that members should be encouraged to promote community safety and crime prevention messages within their wards.

3. Background

- 3.1 Chichester District Council has a statutory responsibility to participate in the CSP for the area under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. Overview and Scrutiny committees of local authorities have a responsibility to scrutinise the activity of CSPs on an annual basis.
- 3.2 The TFG comprised of Mr M Cullen (Chairman), Mr H Potter and Mr J Brown and met twice in February 2017.
- 3.3 At the first meeting Mrs P Bushby and Mr S Hansford, from the Council's Communities Team, explained the structures of the CSP, the CSP business plan and progress made against those targets and explained the funding, setting out the budget and current spend. At the second meeting the following witnesses gave evidence:
 - Mrs Eileen Lintill, Cabinet Member for Community Services, Chairman of the Chichester CSP 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
 - Ms Emily King, Principal Manager Community Safety and Wellbeing, WSCC described WSCC role and that of the County Agreement
 - Justin Burtenshaw, Chief Inspector of Sussex Police and District Commander for Arun and Chichester, described the structures and challenges of Policing the combined area

4. Evidence

- 4.1 In reviewing the latest performance, Mrs Bushby and Mr Hansford highlighted key statistics which showed that in March 2015 there were less than 5,000 reported crimes in the district following year on year reductions over the last 10 years. However during the summer of 2016 there were increases in vehicle crime and burglaries which in December 2016 had led to an 11% increase in all reported crime compared to December 2015. A number of contributing factors were discussed such as changes in recording methods for assaults, the reporting of historic sexual offences, the encouragement and increasing confidence to report issues such as domestic violence and types of hate crime which meant that across the county there had been increases in overall crime.
- 4.2 Chichester was also perceived to be an area of 'rich pickings' and attracted offenders from across the borders. Mrs Bushby explained that the CSP set strategic priorities in its plans and the Joint Action Group (JAG) was the operational delivery group which shared intelligence and responded to trends. She gave examples of joint activity with the police and other agencies to reduce bicycle theft, theft from vehicles in beauty spot car parks, and burglaries of sheds and out buildings for garden equipment – some could be predicted from historic seasonal trends and some responded to current offending.
- 4.3 Mrs Bushby explained that the CSP received funds from the PCC which had significantly reduced over time and currently stood at c£42,000. A significant proportion of that money funded an Anti-Social Behaviour Coordinator, located at the police station and a critical point of contact for information.
- 4.4 Mrs Bushby explained that under the JAG there were several sub-groups which focused on particular types of offending. One such group was the Road Safety Action Group, combined with the Arun District, which had run events targeted at giving older people refresher driving lessons as there had been a number of accidents involving older drivers in the district.
- 4.5 Mrs Bushby also described the work of the Child Exploitation and Human Trafficking Group, identifying this as a relatively new area of work the full scale of which was as yet unknown. A lot of work was being done to raise awareness among young people, such as cyber safety in schools, and by engaging with the service industries to build confidence to report potentially suspicious activity.
- 4.6 The CSP business plan and budget were then explained, highlighting the priorities, the progress and success of the activities to deliver them. The budget was explained, pointing out that over the last few years a cautious approach to spending had been taken to protect against further reductions in funding.
- 4.7 Members were satisfied with the explanations in response to their questions and generally satisfied with the priorities and performance of CSP.
- 4.8 At the group's next meeting Cllr Lintill set out the role of the PCC to maintain an efficient and effective police force and to hold the Chief Constable to account; the role of the PCP which in turn held the PCC to account for her decisions primarily in respect of setting the Police and Crime Plan and the policing precept. She gave examples of how members of the PCP had challenged elements of the plan

and rigorously reviewed the justification for an increase in new precept. Cllr Lintill closed by announcing that she had just received a letter from the PCC setting out the CSP's allocation of funding for 2017-18 of £42,000, so no reduction.

4.9 The group then heard from Ms King who explained the role of the WSCC in producing a strategic agreement between the key county agencies which interpret the priorities of the PCC and set priorities which CSPs would take into account when formulating their own plans. The plan was approved by the Safer West Sussex Partnership Executive group after consultation with the CSP Chairs group and the Community Safety managers group. The current agreement runs to 2020 and is refreshed annually. It has seven strategic areas of business :

- Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE)
- Economic crime
- Prevent
- Serious organised crime
- Rape and serious sexual assault
- Preventing offending
- Reducing repeat demand

4.10 Following a review it had been decided that economic crime, rape and serious sexual assault would be removed next year as they were key issues for the police and difficult for partners to influence. They would be replaced with modern slavery and cybercrime as there was more scope for joint agency activity. Discussions explored the prevalence of CSE and modern slavery and preventative activity undertaken. Finally Ms King stated she could reassure Members that in her experience Chichester was the most effective CSP.

4.11 The group then heard from Chief Inspector Burtenshaw. He outlined the restructures that had taken place in Sussex Police following a reduction in funding, which had resulted in a joint Chichester and Arun command. This meant more shared resources could be brought to bear on identified problems. He stressed the importance of partnership working to the police in trying to resolve issues, particularly those which were not really policing matters. He stated that the increase in crime locally had been experienced across the county and that responses are now prioritised on threat, harm and risk and used intelligence to focus on particular offenders illustrating a number of successes.

4.12 He was questioned about the change in the alignment of Police Community Support Officers (PCSO) to parishes. He explained that the way PCSOs had been employed had meant that they could not be deployed flexibly to support issues elsewhere; that some were aligned to areas where very little crime happened; and that no cover could be provided absences. The new arrangement had pooled PCSOs into a single team, increased their powers and skills through training and that they could not be directed to a place or problem in sufficient number to resolve the issue or to make a significant difference to it.

4.13 He also addressed issues about police presence in the city centre and the support for the Chichester Business Against Crime (CHIBAC) initiative stating that the CHIBAC Coordinator was hosted within the police station and that whenever possible resources were directed to patrol the city centre. However he

also stressed that some shops had to take responsibility for the way they displayed goods without regard to preventing opportunities for thefts.

5. Outcomes to be achieved

5.1 The terms of reference set the outcomes as reviewing the CSP's performance over the last year; identifying areas of concern for further in depth review and giving input into the strategic direction of the CSP over the following year.

5.2 At the end of the review the Task and Finish Group considered:

- That the required outcomes of the Community Safety review had been achieved
- That despite recent rises in crime, Chichester district still had one of the lowest rates of crime in the county
- That effective partnership working existed in the district
- That they supported the proposed priorities
- That they felt better informed about the 'newer challenges' from child sexual exploitation and modern slavery and understood that the current activity was in order to understand the problem and respond better and this activity would not be disproportionate to other crime issues in the district
- They understood some of the principles of crime prevention; how a wide range of factors influenced crime and how the different elements of service undertaken by the district council could help and support that activity; and that Members could also support the safety and crime prevention messages.

6. Recommendations

6.1 The TFG felt able to reassure the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that, despite the rise in crime, the performance of the CSP had been good and that there was effective partnership working in this district.

6.2 The TFG recommends that it would wish members to receive brief case studies highlighting the key areas of the CSP's achievement via the Members' Bulletin.

6.3 The TFG considered that members should be encouraged to promote community safety within their wards.

7. Alternatives that have been considered.

7.1 The nature of the statutory duty to review performance does constrain the topic. The speakers invited were to evidence those specific elements, however in future opportunity could be taken to explore other areas of work in more detail and introduce other partners and witnesses to the committee.

8. Appendices

None

9. Background Papers

The Community Safety Review 2017 Task and Finish Group terms of reference are available online (Overview and Scrutiny Committee agenda of 17 January 2017)

Agenda Item 10

CULTURAL GRANTS REVIEW 2017

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND SCOPING OF REVIEW

Review topic	Cultural Grants Review 2017
TFG members	Members and Chairman to be appointed at OSC meeting on 14 March 2017
Officer Support	Steve Hansford, Lisa Higenbottam
Background	The Council has a funding agreement in place with both Chichester Festival Theatre (CFT) and Pallant House Gallery (PHG) until 2018. The Council negotiates a Service Level Agreement (SLA) with both organisations annually to ensure that appropriate outcomes are achieved for the local community, schools, etc.
Purpose of review	The Council reviews progress annually against the expected outcomes in these SLAs. Every third year a fuller review is undertaken with representatives from the theatre and gallery reporting to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee with regard to their performance and progress. This will take place in 2018, the final year of the current funding agreement.
Outcomes to be achieved	Good levels of performance against the previous years' SLAs. A negotiated and focused SLA for the following year. A final report to the OSC.
Methodology/ approach	As set out in the project plan.
In scope	Review of performance against current 2016/17 SLAs and development of 2017/18 SLAs.
Excluded from scope	Financial information and funding arrangements.
Consultation	In consultation with representatives of the theatre and gallery.
Evidence sources	SLAs; annual reports on performance from both organisations; financial reports
Site visits/ attendance by representatives	Site visits to CFT/PHG.
Review completion date	Report to OSC 13 June 2017.
Does the review link to strategic aims/priorities?	Links to strategic priorities in the council's Corporate Plan.

PROJECT PLAN

The following Project Plan interprets the above action plan into a programme of work.

	Action	Timescale
1	TFG to meet to review the performance of both organisations over the last year and to review the draft SLAs for 2016/17	Early April 2017
2	Lead Officer to communicate with both organisations regarding any further clarification requests from the TFG to finalise the reports to the OSC.	April/May 2017

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

FORWARD PLAN

**For the period
1 March 2017 to 30 June 2017**

An outline of the decisions expected to be made by the Council's Cabinet

Re-published 2 February 2017

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL
FORWARD PLAN FOR THE PERIOD 1 MARCH 2017 TO 30 JUNE 2017

This Forward Plan outlines the decisions which are expected to be made by the Council's Cabinet during the period of four months from 1 March 2017 to 30 June 2017. On occasions the timetable for reports may change due to unforeseen circumstances. Additionally the Forward Plan also identifies decisions which are likely to be taken by the Cabinet in the coming year beyond the four month period covered by the Plan.

The meetings of the Cabinet due to be held during this period are, 7 March 2017, 4 April 2017, 9 May 2017 and 6 June 2017 to be held at the offices of Chichester District Council, East Pallant House, East Pallant, Chichester.

Parts of these meetings may be held in private if the Cabinet considers it likely that there will be disclosure of confidential information or exempt information of a description specified in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

The Forward Plan includes key decisions, which are those which if taken by the Cabinet will have significant financial implications or significant impact in the District, and other decisions which may be of interest to the public.

The Forward Plan includes information on the person to contact to inspect relevant documents.

The Cabinet may also consider other documents or items which are not included in the Forward Plan due to changing circumstances.

The Membership of the Cabinet is currently as follows:

Councillors Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr P R Barrow, Mrs G Keegan, Mrs P A Hardwick Mrs P Plant, Mrs C Purnell and Mrs S T Taylor.

The Forward Plan will be revised each month and rolled forward to the next four monthly period.

Any person who wishes to make representations about any matter in the Forward Plan should contact the report author or Member Services, Chichester District Council, East Pallant House, Chichester, PO19 1TY (e-mail memberservices@chichester.gov.uk) at least a week before the meeting at which the decision is to be made. Any person who wishes to receive a copy of any document relevant to the matters listed in the Forward Plan should contact the same people.

If you have any general queries on the contents of the Forward Plan please contact Katherine Jeram, Member Services Officer on 01243 534674 (e-mail kjeram@chichester.gov.uk)

Tony Dignum
Leader of the Council

Topics due to be considered are as follows:

Topic	Page
7 March 2017	
Chichester Contract Services Staff Grading Review	3
Financial Management System Upgrade - Post Project Evaluation	4
Grant Application - St Wilfrids Hospice	4
Infrastructure Business Plan - Approval	4
Litter Clearance Programme for A27 Trunk Road	5
Pallant House Gallery - Approval of Revised Articles of Association	5
Proposed Acquisition of Freeland Close Property	6
Proposed Submission Draft West Sussex Minerals Local Plan - Consultation Response	6
Senior Staff Pay Policy	6
Sussex Energy Tariff	7
4 April 2017	
Joint Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Supplementary Planning Document Adoption	7
Recycling Action Plan	8
Review of CCTV Assets, Functions and Costs	8
Southern Gateway - Approval of Draft Masterplan and Consultation Process	8
9 May 2017	
Housing Allocations Scheme Review	9
6 June 2017	
Chichester Vision - Approval of Final Document	9
Market Consultation Timetable	10
Parking Strategy Review	10
Public Space Protection Order for Dog and Environmental Related Offences	10
Road Space Audit	11
Southern Gateway - Approval of Masterplan and the Reporting of a Project Initiation Document	12
11 July 2017	
Plot 21, Terminus Road, Chichester	12
Selsey Haven Project	13

Date of Meeting	7 Mar 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Chichester Contract Services Staff Grading Review To agree the revised grading structure for the grounds maintenance, street cleaning and waste staff.
Report author	Mr Bob Riley, Contracts Manager briley@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Mar 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Financial Management System Upgrade - Post Project Evaluation To receive a review of how the project has performed following implementation of the upgrade.
Report author	Mrs Helen Belenger, Accountancy Services Manager hbelenger@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Mar 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Grant Application - St Wilfrids Hospice St Wilfrid's Hospice seeks a £50,000 contribution to their "Dreambuilding" capital fundraising, to build a new Hospice for the 21st Century in the District. An application is before the Grants and Concessions Panel but the amount exceeds the delegation to the Cabinet Member for Community Services. The recommendations of the Panel will be presented to Cabinet for determination. (Recommendation from Grants and Concessions Panel)
Report author	Mr Steve Hansford, Head of Community Services, Miss Chloe Williams, Community Liaison Officer shansford@chichester.gov.uk, cwilliams@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Mar 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Infrastructure Business Plan - Approval To consider the proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Business Plan for approval following consultation. (recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mrs Karen Dower, Principal Planning Officer (Infrastructure Planning) kdower@chichester.gov.uk

List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Mar 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Litter Clearance Programme for A27 Trunk Road The Council is the Primary Litter Authority and is responsible for keeping relevant land clear of litter and debris. This responsibility includes the A27 trunk road.</p> <p>A change to the way that traffic management legislation is applied to work on the highway has meant that the previous litter clearance methodology is no longer adequate.</p> <p>The report will outline proposals for a revised cleansing regime and request funding to carry out one full clean of the trunk road during spring 2017. The street cleaning budget for 2017/18 onwards will be adjusted to allow for additional costs (Recommendation to Council)</p>
Report author	Mr Bob Riley, Contracts Manager briley@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Mar 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Pallant House Gallery - Approval of Revised Articles of Association Following a Governance Review, the Pallant House Gallery Board have made a series of recommendations that require amendments to their Articles of Association. Given the context of the establishment of the Gallery, the Articles have been referred to CDC for comment</p>
Report author	Mr David Hyland, Community and Partnerships Support Manager dhyland@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet

Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Mar 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Proposed Acquisition of Freeland Close Property The purchase of a property in Freeland Close, Chichester, comprising 3 self-contained 1 bedroom flats with shared communal lounge and an office, together with associated works to provide additional short term accommodation for homeless families and single vulnerable persons. (Recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mrs Linda Grange, Housing Delivery Manager lgrange@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Fully exempt

Date of Meeting	7 Mar 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Proposed Submission Draft West Sussex Minerals Local Plan - Consultation Response
Report author	Ms Tracey Flitcroft, Principal Planning Officer (Local Planning) tflitcroft@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Mar 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Senior Staff Pay Policy Publication of the Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement as required by Section 38(1) of the localism Act 2011. (recommendation to Council)

Report author	Mr Tim Radcliffe, Human Resources Manager tradcliffe@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Mar 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Sussex Energy Tariff CDC is a partner in Your Energy Sussex (YES), led by WSCC. YES are undertaking procurement of an energy supply company in order to launch a Sussex Energy Tariff in late 2017, to be offered to householders and small businesses. This report recommends that CDC offer a letter of support to the project including a commitment to promote it once launched and so are included in future procurement processes and notices.
Report author	Mr Tom Day, Environmental Coordinator tday@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	4 Apr 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Joint Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Supplementary Planning Document Adoption Following consultation on the draft document, the representations received during the consultation (10 November - 22 December 2016) have been considered and amendments proposed. These have been incorporated into the final document for adoption by the Council. Recommendation: to adopt the Joint Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Supplementary Planning Document.
Report author	Ms Sue Payne, Planning Policy Officer spayne@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet

Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	4 Apr 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Recycling Action Plan To approve the Recycling Action Plan that aims to achieve the EU and national recycling and waste minimisation targets. (Recommendation from Waste Panel and Overview and Scrutiny Committee)
Report author	Mr Bob Riley, Contracts Manager briley@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	4 Apr 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Review of CCTV Assets, Functions and Costs To consider how to provide the service more efficiently. Consider data on the use of CCTV in prosecutions and reducing crime. (Recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee)
Report author	Mrs Tania Murphy, Parking Services Manager tmurphy@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	4 Apr 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Southern Gateway - Approval of Draft Masterplan and Consultation Process (Recommendation to Special Council)
Report author	Miss Amy Loaring, Partnerships Officer, Mr Mike Allgrove, Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager

	aloaring@chichester.gov.uk, mallgrove@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	9 May 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Housing Allocations Scheme Review Three yearly review of the Housing Allocations Scheme. The scheme determines applicants that are eligible and qualify to join the Housing Register and decides the priority that applicants are given on the Register. (Recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee)
Report author	Mr Rob Dunmall, Housing Operations Manager rdunmall@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Jun 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Chichester Vision - Approval of Final Document To approve the final Chichester Vision document and the accompanying project plan and timetable. To note any comments and recommendations from OSC. To agree any funding to commence implementation of initial projects. (Recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee) (Recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mr Stephen Oates, Economic Development Manager soates@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Jun 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Market Consultation Timetable To consider the results of the six week business and public consultation held during March/April 2017 and recommendations for future operation.
Report author	Mr Laurence Foord, Licensing Manager, Mr Peter Legood, Valuation and Estates Manager lfoord@chichester.gov.uk, plegood@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Jun 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Parking Strategy Review The Chichester District Car Park Strategy 2010 – 2020 sets out the principles and vision for the provision of parking by the authority. It is considered that now is a good time to review and re-refresh this document, to enable changes which have been seen over recent years to be considered and to allow consideration of emerging policies and strategies to be included. Links to other projects – such as the Road Space Audit and Smarter Choices – will also be considered. The document will be considered first by the Chichester District Parking Forum and is being submitted to Cabinet for final agreement.
Report author	Mrs Tania Murphy, Parking Services Manager tmurphy@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Jun 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Public Space Protection Order for Dog and Environmental Related Offences Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPO's) are intended to provide means of preventing individuals or groups committing anti-social behaviour in a public space where

	<p>the behaviour is having, or likely to have, a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality; be persistent or continuing in nature and be unreasonable. An order, if granted, gives additional powers to the Council and Police to issue notices to individuals breaching the PSPO by carrying out specific identified types of nuisance. The initial view is that a district wide consultation will be undertaken for various environmental and dog offences including dog fouling, dogs on lead by direction, prohibition of dogs.</p> <p>The dog offences are currently controlled by Dog Control Orders but in accordance with the transition provisions in the anti-social behaviour legislation, these must be replaced by a PSPO by 1 October 2017.</p> <p>To consider the results of the consultation.</p>
Report author	Mrs Alison Stevens, Environment Manager astevens@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Jun 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Road Space Audit</p> <p>Along with many towns and cities across the UK Chichester faces a number of challenges – it must accommodate significant new development, both residential and commercial, whilst preserving its historic character. Parking is particularly problematic, with high demands and constraints in meeting supply in the area of greatest demand. West Sussex County Council has appointed consultants (WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff) to consider the parking issues and use of road space in Chichester city to consider the challenges and consider how these might be affected by emerging strategies and plans in the area, along with consideration of the changing role of the high street. The work undertaken will set the way for a strategic vision for parking within the city.</p> <p>This report to members will provide an update on the work undertaken so far and will request consideration of the proposals which are being put forward.</p>
Report author	Mrs Tania Murphy, Parking Services Manager tmurphy@chichester.gov.uk

List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Jun 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Southern Gateway - Approval of Masterplan and the Reporting of a Project Initiation Document To approve the Masterplan and a Project Initiation Document that will propose the arrangements for the implementation of the Southern Gateway project.</p> <p>(Recommendation to Special Council)</p>
Report author	Mr Mike Allgrove, Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager, Miss Amy Loaring, Partnerships Officer mallgrove@chichester.gov.uk, aloaring@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	11 Jul 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Plot 21, Terminus Road, Chichester Tender analysis and contract award. Development of a six-unit speculative development, but in two stages – initially to draw up a detailed design, obtain detailed planning permission and tender for construction, to be followed by a further report to Cabinet on current market conditions and expected return on investment before proceeding with a construction contract.</p>
Report author	Mr Patrick Harrison, Strategic Asset Management Surveyor pharrison@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Fully exempt

Date of Meeting	11 Jul 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Selsey Haven Project To report back to Cabinet on phase 2 - the findings of the economic and technical feasibility studies. To outline the possible proposals on the way forward of the project.
Report author	Mrs Alison Stevens, Environment Manager astevens@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open