



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

**Members Present**

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

**Members Absent**

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

**Officers Present**

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

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

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

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

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

Mr Dignum proposed Mrs Hamilton.

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

No other nominations were received.

Mrs Shepherd requested members to vote on the aforementioned proposal.

### *Decision*

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

#### **RESOLVED**

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

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

## **2 Appointment of the Vice-Chairman of the Council**

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

Mr Dignum proposed Mrs Graves.

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

No other nominations were received.

Mrs Hamilton requested members to vote on the aforementioned proposal.

### *Decision*

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

#### **RESOLVED**

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

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

## **3 Approval of Minutes**

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

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

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

There were no further proposed amendments to the draft minutes.

### *Decision*

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

### **RESOLVED**

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

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

### **4 Late Items**

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

### **5 Declarations of Interests**

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

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

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

## 6 **Chairman's Announcements**

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

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

Mrs Hamilton made the following specific announcements:

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

## 7 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted for this meeting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

### *Decision*

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

### **RESOLVED**

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

## **9 Risk Management**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *Decision*

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

#### **RESOLVED**

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

### **10 Community Governance Review - Chichester City Council**

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

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

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

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

### *Decision*

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

### **RESOLVED**

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

## **11 Review of Political Balance 2018-2019**

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

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

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

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

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

### *Decision*

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

### **RESOLVED**

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

## **12 Appointments to Committees 2018-2019**

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

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

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

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

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

#### *Decision*

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

#### **RESOLVED**

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

### **13 Appointments to External Organisations 2018-2019**

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

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

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

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

#### *Decision*

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

#### **RESOLVED**

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

14      **Questions to the Executive**

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

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

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

*Response by Mr Barrow*

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

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

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

*Response by Mr Barrow*

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

*Response by Mrs Lintill*

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

*Response by Mrs Hamilton*

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

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

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

*Response by Mr Dignum*

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

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

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

*Response by Mrs Lintill*

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

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

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

*Response by Mrs Lintill*

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

*Question by Mr Barrett: Dissatisfaction with police response times*

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

*Response by Mrs Lintill*

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

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

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

*Response by Mrs Taylor and Mr Frost*

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

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

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

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

*Responses by Mr Connor, Mrs Taylor and Mr Hayes*

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

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

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

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

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

*Responses by Mr Connor and Mr Frost*

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

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

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

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

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

*Response by Mr Connor, the Chief Executive and Mr Hobbs*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Response by Mr Dignum*

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Responses by Mr Dignum and Mr Connor*

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

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

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

**15 Concessionary Rent Relief Delegated Decision**

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

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

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

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

**16 Working Towards Making Chichester District Plastic-Free**

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

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

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

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

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

Mr Moss formally proposed his motion.

Mr Morley (Midhurst) seconded Mr Moss' motion.

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

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

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

'That this Council commits to:

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

Mr Connor formally proposed his counter-motion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### *Decision*

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

### **RESOLVED**

That this Council commits to:

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

### **17 Late Items**

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

### **18 Exclusion of the Press and Public**

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

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

---

CHAIRMAN

---

DATE