

Minutes of the Meeting of the **Council** held in the Council Chamber, East Pallant House, Chichester on Tuesday 23 September 2014 at 2.30 pm

Members (47)

Mr M J Bell (Chairman)

Mrs C M M Apel	Mr G H Hicks
Mr G A F Barrett	Mr P Jarvis
Mr P J Budge	Mrs E P Lintill
Mrs H P Caird	Mr G V McAra
Mr A D Chaplin	Mr J A P Montyn
Mr J L Cherry	Mr S J Oakley
Mr P Clementson	Mr R T V O'Brien
Mr J C P Connor	Mr H C Potter
Mr Q J R Cox	Mrs L C Purnell
Mr M A Cullen	Mr J J L T Ransley
Mrs J E Duncton	Mr J Ridd
Mr T M E Dunn	Anne Scicluna
Mr J F Elliott	Mr A R H Smith
Mr B Finch	Mr N R D Thomas
Mr A J French	Mrs P M Tull
Mr R J Hayes	Mr S Lloyd-Williams
	Mr M Woolley

were present (34)

Members not present

Mr S L Carr
Mr A P Dignum
Mrs P M Dignum
Mrs N D Graves
Mrs E Hamilton
Mrs P A Hardwick
Mr R M J Marshall

Mr D J Myers
Mr F Robertson
Mr A M Shaxson
Mrs J A E Tassell
Mrs B A Tinson
Mr B J Weekes

Officers Present for All Items

Mrs D Shepherd – Chief Executive
Mr S Carvell – Executive Director
Mr P E Over – Executive Director
Mr J Ward – Head of Finance and Governance
Mr P Coleman – Member Services Manager

251 Membership of the Council

The Council noted, with regret, the death on 27 August 2014 of Mr John Kingston, councillor for the Rogate ward since the 2011 district council election.

252 Minutes

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 22 July 2014 be signed as a correct record.

253 Urgent Items

There were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

254 Declarations of Interests

The Council was reminded that members who were also members of parish councils or the Chichester Harbour Conservancy had declared that fact as a personal non-prejudicial interest when the delegation of decisions on householder planning applications had been debated on 23 July 2013. This applied also to the review of that decision (minute 257(iv) below).

255 Chairman's Announcements

- (1) The Chairman reported that he and the Vice-Chairman had had a busy summer and had represented the Council at many events, ranging from judging the sandcastle competition at West Wittering beach to the very impressive Get Active Festival at Oaklands Park, Chichester on 7 September 2014. He commented on the large number of organisations participating in the latter event and congratulated the staff team who had organised it.
- (2) At the invitation of the Chairman, the Leader of the Council announced, with regret, that Mr Cullen had asked to stand down as Deputy Leader after 3½ years during which he had ably, helpfully and enthusiastically supported her. She had, therefore, appointed Mrs Lintill as Deputy Leader of the Council.

256 Public Question Time

Mr Michael Burton asked the Council a series of questions about the Roussillon Barracks development, Chichester. Mrs Purnell (Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning) replied.

The full text of Mr Burton's questions and Mrs Purnell's replies is set out in the appendix to these minutes.

Decisions made by the Council

257 Recommendations of the Cabinet

Cabinet – 9 September 2014

(i) Minute 629 – Revised Treasury Management Strategy Statement

Mrs Caird (Leader of the Council), seconded by Mrs Tull, moved the recommendation of the Cabinet.

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Finance and Governance, Mr Ward (Head of Finance and Governance) explained that the Treasury Management Strategy was approved before the beginning of each financial year. It had been reviewed and updated by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee and the Cabinet before the Council's approval of the current Strategy on 4 March 2014. On this occasion, the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee had wished to carry out a deeper review and had set up a members' Task and Finish Group, supported by the Council's Accountancy Services Manager and Treasury Adviser, for this purpose. The revised documents recommended by the Cabinet were the product of that review. He drew particular attention to Table 4 on page 19 of the Cabinet report, which showed a reduction from £8m to £5m in the maximum sum to be invested with any counterparty, and Schedule A on pages 26-30, relating to the use of different types of investment.

Mr Ransley drew attention to the note relating to the decision on Scottish independence on pages 19 and 40 of the Cabinet report. Mr Ward confirmed that these notes should be deleted since the decision had now been made.

RESOLVED

That the suggested changes to the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and the Investment Strategy for 2014-15 be approved.

(ii) Minute 630 – Risk Management Policy & Strategy Update

Mrs Caird (Leader of the Council), seconded by Mrs Tull, moved the recommendation of the Cabinet.

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Finance and Governance, Mr Ward (Head of Finance and Governance) explained that the Council had approved the Risk Management Policy and Strategy on 5 March 2013. Responsibility for reviewing risks was delegated to the Strategic Risk Group, consisting of three members each from the Cabinet and the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee with the Senior Leadership Team, who received six-monthly updates of the risk register. The Policy and Strategy had been revised to reflect the new senior management structure. The use of 'shadowplanner' for retention of and access to business continuity plans was being discontinued and managers were now expected to keep plans on mobile devices.

RESOLVED

That the amended Risk Management Policy and Strategy be approved.

(iii) Minute 631 – Public Filming and Recording of Meetings

Mr Ransley (Cabinet Member for Support Services), seconded by Mrs Purnell, moved the recommendation of the Cabinet, explaining that recently introduced Government regulations on openness of Local Government included a requirement to allow any member of the public to take photographs, audio record or film proceedings of all meetings, excluding Part 2 agenda items.

He reminded the Council of the previous proposal of a members' task and finish group to webcast certain meetings, which had failed to gain majority support. He was concerned that the Council would not have its own full record of proceedings to rebut any misrepresentation or out-of-context use of press or public recordings.

Council members agreed with Mr Ransley's concern about this and asked him to bring forward for consideration a further proposal on recording of meetings by the Council.

Members also emphasised the importance of chairmen ensuring that meetings were not disturbed by people moving around the room in order to film proceedings or by the ringing of mobile phones. They were assured that the proposed Standing Order gave chairmen sufficient discretion to exercise control in such circumstances.

RESOLVED

That Standing Order 11.3 be amended to read as follows:

“Subject to the provisions allowing the exclusion of the press and public, the photographing, filming or recording of meetings of the Council and its Committees from the public seating area is permitted. To assist with the management of a meeting, anyone wishing to photograph, film or record is asked to inform the chairman of the meeting of their intentions before the meeting starts. The use of mobile devices for reporting on a meeting by the press and public using social media is permitted. 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 and this could result in expulsion under Standing Order 11.2.”

(iv) Minute 632 – Report of Planning Task and Finish Group

Mrs Purnell (Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning), seconded by Mr Connor, moved the recommendation of the Cabinet. She explained that she had chaired a members' task and finish group to review the operation of the single Planning Committee and the decision to delegate householder applications for decision by officers, even where there was an objection from a parish councillor of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy. The group had recommended a reduction in the number of members on the Planning Committee, an earlier start time for meetings, and other improvements to the operation of the committee. They had also recommended that the delegation of decisions on householder planning applications be made permanent.

The task and finish group's report and recommendations had been presented to and discussed at a meeting for all members before the Planning Committee on 20 August. The report to the Cabinet had included minor changes suggested at that meeting, including the cessation of the practice of asking public speakers clarification questions.

Mr Cox expressed concern that the proposed criteria for the selection of members for service on the Planning Committee should not be used to rule out the appointment of more than one member from a multi-member ward, especially as the intention was to move away from geographical representation. Mrs Purnell and Mr Smith confirmed that the criteria were no more than guidance to political group leaders. It was also confirmed that more than one member of a multi-member ward could register as a public speaker on an application in that ward.

Mr Ransley suggested that criterion 6.12 (e) (v) should read “Exercise reasoned and balanced judgment in making decisions”, and Mrs Purnell accepted that.

At Mr Hayes’ request, Mrs Purnell agreed that the Council’s decision should be conveyed to parish councils.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the single Planning Committee for the whole district should remain, meeting every four weeks, but that:
 - a. Meetings should start at 9.30am and not normally continue beyond 5.00 pm;
 - b. The size of the Planning Committee should be reduced to 15 members with effect from the Annual Meeting of the Council in May 2015.
- (2) That, subject to the requirements of political balance and diversity, party group leaders be encouraged to apply the criteria set out in paragraph 6.12 a) - f) of the Cabinet report in selecting members for service on the Planning Committee, subject to criterion 6.12 (e) (v) being amended to read “Exercise reasoned and balanced judgment in making decisions” .
- (3) That the delegation of householder decisions, as approved by the Council by minute 162(iii) of 23 July 2013, continue, viz:

“That applications for householder development (suffix ‘DOM’ or ‘HOUS’) be determined under powers delegated to officers where an objection is lodged by either a parish, or a town or city council or Chichester Harbour Conservancy. A parish, town or city council, or the Chichester Harbour Conservancy will maintain the opportunity to make oral representations (by telephone or in person) to the officer who will exercise the delegated authority. The onus of making contact with the officers will remain with the parish council, similar to their obligation at present to register to speak at the committee.”
- (v) **Minute 633 – Authority for Cabinet to approve the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule for public consultation**

Mrs Caird (Leader of the Council), seconded by Mr Ransley, moved the recommendation of the Cabinet, explaining that it was important that the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule should be put out to public consultation as soon as possible.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet be authorised to approve at its November 2014 meeting the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule for public consultation as set out in paragraphs 5 and 8 of the Cabinet report.

(vi) Minute 634 – Neighbourhood Planning – delegation of functions

Mrs Purnell (Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning), seconded by Mrs Duncton, moved the recommendation of the Cabinet. She explained that the recommendation sought an amendment to the Constitution to ensure that the management of the neighbourhood planning process was efficient and legally compliant.

RESOLVED

That the Constitution be amended by the alteration of the powers in relation to neighbourhood planning delegated to the Head of Planning Services to read as follows:-

- (a) To determine requests made under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 as to whether or not a strategic environmental assessment (including screening and scoping opinions) is required.
- (b) To approve the designation of neighbourhood areas in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

and in consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member and the relevant ward member(s):

- (c) To make formal comments on a draft Neighbourhood Plan at Pre-Submission stage and Submission stage;
- (d) To accept a Neighbourhood Plan submission and, provided that the proposal complies with the relevant legislation, to publicise and consult on the Plan in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012;
- (e) To appoint an Independent Examiner to hold an examination to assess whether the draft plan meets the basic conditions and in exceptional cases to suspend the holding of an examination;
- (f) Following receipt of the Independent Examiner's report, to publish a decision statement and to make the decision to proceed to referendum where the Independent Examiner's report recommends 'proceed to referendum as submitted' and no significant adverse representations have been made.
- (g) To publish an Adoption Statement;
- (h) To carry out such other procedural processes, requirements assessments and determinations as may be necessary in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and any other relevant regulations to enable preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.
- (i) In relation to High Court challenges of any decisions of the Council throughout the neighbourhood planning process, to reply, defend and/or consent to judgement of any claims and to settle any costs claim arising.

258 Questions to the Executive

Questions to members of the Cabinet and responses given were as follows:

(a) Question: Localism

Mrs Apel asked whether, in view of the high turnout and result of the referendum on Scottish independence, the Leader of the Council would agree that the Government of the UK was too centralised, and whether she would make the Council's feelings known to Government.

Response:

Mrs Caird (Leader of the Council) agreed and commented that it was unfortunate that the Localism Act had not been implemented in the spirit expected. Councils continued to receive instructions from the Government that they would prefer not to receive, including recently on waste collection. The Local Government Association was about to embark on a campaign for more devolution to local authorities, and she would make known the Council's support.

(b) Question: The Novium

Mr Woolley expressed delight at the Cabinet's decision to abolish entry charges to the local collections at The Novium museum. He expressed his pleasure at the appointment of a dynamic new manager and asked whether consideration could be given to paying her a performance related bonus if targets for increased numbers of visitors were met.

Response:

Mr Cullen (Cabinet Member for Commercial Services) replied that Council members had never interfered in the remuneration of officers. His own view was that the staff appointed should be up to doing the job without pay incentives. He felt that the Council was fortunate to have a very enthusiastic manager at The Novium, who was doing a good job. The Chief Executive reminded the Council that its pay policy was approved annually, and that the pay of individual members of staff below senior management level was determined by management.

(c) Question: Local Plan Policy 18: Tangmere Strategic Development Location

Mr Oakley referred to Local Plan Policy 18: Tangmere Strategic Development Location, which stated: "Opportunities will be sought to deliver enhanced recreation, primary education and healthcare facilities". He referred to the proposed change in the method of calculation from one based on the number of dwellings to one based on population. He pointed out that the population profile of Tangmere was different from the rest of the district, with larger household sizes. The parish had the highest precept of any settlement of over 1,000 houses in the district. There was a significant shortfall in recreation and community facilities in the village and it did not have the advantages some of the rest of the District benefitted from. He asked how the Council intended to seek enhanced provision of these facilities.

Response:

Mrs Caird (Leader of the Council) replied that this should be a matter for consideration by the Development Plan Panel, rather than an immediate response. Mr Carvell added that

the topic had been the subject of correspondence between Mr Oakley and the Planning Policy Manager and could be further investigated outside of this meeting.

(d) Question: Volunteering

Mr McAra referred to the willingness of local volunteers to tidy up and maintain the vegetated areas of the car park at The Grange Community and Leisure Centre, Midhurst, and asked whether this could be agreed on an informal basis.

Response:

Mrs Caird (Leader of the Council) replied that it was highly commendable that volunteers in Midhurst sought to do this. Volunteers in the town already maintained the South Pond. Often such voluntary activity was carried out under the auspices of the parish councils for insurance purposes, but this was not appropriate in this case because the District Council owned the car park. Mr Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment) agreed and suggested that a meeting should take place between the volunteers and Mr Howard, the Council's Green Spaces and Street Scene Manager. Mr Over reported that, currently in the short term, the car park was the responsibility of the contractor who had built The Grange. Some reconfiguration of the car park would be required for the proposed food retail store development, but the proposal for maintenance of vegetation by volunteers could be explored further.

(e) Question: Members' ICT Provision

Mr Finch referred to consideration by the Cabinet of provision of ICT facilities for members after the 2015 election. He asked whether consideration could be given to a smartphone app (application), which would provide easy access, with good connectivity and security, to Council communications for those members who travelled a lot.

Response:

Mr Ransley (Cabinet Member for Support Services) replied that the proposed committee management system was web-based and so should be easy to access through mobile devices. He would consider further the possible availability of an app.

(f) Question: Visitors to the Novium

Mrs Scicluna congratulated the Cabinet on the decision to give free entry to the local collections at The Novium museum, because she had always been opposed to admission charges. She felt the priority was now to attract local people and children to visit the museum. She reminded the Cabinet Member that, at the May meeting of the Council, she had asked for figures of visitors to the museum, net of visitors to the Tourist Information Centre only.

Response:

Mr Cullen (Cabinet Member for Commercial Services) replied that these figures were readily available and he would arrange for them to be published.

(g) Question: Rolls-Royce Motor Cars

Mr Smith referred to the event at Rolls-Royce on 8 September, attended by a number of members and officers of the Council, at which the company had announced its proposed development of a new Technology and Logistics Centre at Bognor Regis. He asked whether, given this renewed commitment by the company to the local area, the Cabinet Member was alert to the concern that housing development to the east of Chichester could bring the factory into an urban rather than a rural setting.

Response:

Mr Cullen (Cabinet Member for Commercial Services) replied that could not foresee that housing development would have that impact. He congratulated the company on its success and welcomed its continued good relations with the District Council.

(h) Question: Mobile phone coverage

Mr Dunn asked whether the Cabinet Member was concerned that people in some parts of the district could not even access mobile phone coverage from their homes, let alone broadband.

Response:

Mr Cullen (Cabinet Member for Commercial Services) replied that it was wrong that mobile phone users should be paying for a service that was unavailable. The lack of universal coverage of mobile phones and broadband showed a neglect of rural areas that reflected badly on the nation. He added that the SPARSE Rural Services Network, of which the Council was a member, was continuing to campaign on the issue.

(i) Question: Councillor Tony Dignum

Mr French thanked Mr Cullen for his services to the Council as Leader and Deputy Leader, and welcomed Mrs Lintill to her new appointment as Deputy Leader. He asked that the Council's best wishes should be sent to Councillor Tony Dignum (Cabinet Member for Finance and Governance) for a speedy recovery following his recent surgery.

Response:

Mrs Caird (Leader of the Council) thanked Mr French for his comments and agreed to pass on his best wishes to Mr Dignum.

259 Councillor Fred Robertson

It was reported that Councillor Fred Robertson had been absent from meetings of the authority since 25 June 2014 because of the illness of his wife.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the absence from meetings of the authority of Councillor Fred Robertson from 25 June 2014 for the purpose of caring for his wife during her illness be approved.
- (2) That the Chairman send a message of the Council's support to Mr and Mrs Robertson.

260 Report of Urgent Decision: Increase in Project Costs for the Gypsy and Travellers Transit Site at Westhampnett Depot

The Council noted the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes) of an urgent decision which was contrary to or not wholly in accordance with the budget approved by full Council.

Mr Lloyd-Williams asked whether the Council would receive value for the land that was being made available for the transit site, why the construction costs had been seriously under-estimated, and whether the project manager was confident that the site would be delivered on time and on budget.

The Chief Executive replied that, on reflection, it had been concluded that the Council would retain more control over the land if it leased, rather than sold, the site to West Sussex County Council, and that there had been recent major inflation in building costs. She was as confident as she could be about delivery on time and in budget, but this could be dependent on matters such as ground conditions and weather as the project progressed.

261 Exclusion of the Press and Public

RESOLVED

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

Cabinet – 9 September 2014

262 Leisure Management

Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Community Services), seconded by Mr Cullen, introduced the recommendation of the Cabinet. She reminded the Council of the challenging financial pressures it faced, with cuts in Government funding and suppressed income from services. It was, therefore, necessary to examine opportunities for a sustainable long-term future for the Council's Leisure Services, by transferring risk and improving income. The Cabinet had, therefore, appointed specialist leisure consultants to carry out an options appraisal to investigate, analyse and advise on the options for the future management and operation of the Council's sport and leisure facilities. The appraisal had identified the potential for substantial savings if the Council were to procure an external trust/private sector partner. It was, therefore, recommended that a procurement exercise be developed to test the market for the provision of leisure facilities. The consultants' findings in no way reflected badly on the current service, and the consultant had praised the Council's staff.

Council members expressed some reluctance, but accepted that the options should be explored. They felt it important that provision to assist disabled people should be retained. Mrs Lintill confirmed that a joint member/officer project group would be drawing up the specification for the service, including the services to be made available to people in need and the cost of the service to users.

RESOLVED

That a procurement exercise be undertaken to test the market for future management of leisure services.

[Note The meeting ended at 4.04 pm]

CHAIRMAN

Date _____

Public Questions

From: Michael Burton, Church Farm House, East Lavant, Chichester, PO18 0AL

*To the Chairman,
Chichester District Council. 21 Sept 2014*

Dear Sir,

Roussillon Barracks, Broyle Road - Front Residential Blocks

Thank you for allowing me to address these questions to your council meeting this morning 23rd Sept.

Q1. Now that we can all see how the two Principal Blocks on Broyle Road are unravelling from a visual point of view , I have to ask the Council questions that many residents, overseas visitors to the City , acquaintances some of whom are qualified local architects & surveyors, have raised, that this major development in the beautiful City of Chichester, is not sympathetic with the environment & approach to the Northern Gateway to the City, of which The Council are the City custodians of the future. The two blocks as they are will have a lasting impact for generations to come. Are the Council concerned by the wealth of criticism this has generated?

Q2. To what extent did the Planning dept. take note of the grave concerns of the many residents at the outset regarding the bulky design & use of Grey Bricks, giving a prison- like appearance, in such a sensitive location? Did you think it is what Chichester people want?

A. – The appearance, design and massing of the development were all given full consideration at the Area Development Management Committee (ADMC) (South) in November 2010. These matters were clearly shown in the visual material forming part of the detailed design and access statement submitted with the application. The application was subject to a Members Public Briefing (which included a site visit) and the applicants hosted a community consultation engagement event as well as a specific website during consideration of the application. The scheme that was finally submitted including the grey bricks was therefore fully in the public domain prior to the application being permitted and the Council was able to consider comments received.

The scale and enclosed nature of the development allowed a more bespoke design approach, reflecting the former standalone use of the site as a

barracks. Buildings have been sited and designed to be sympathetic to the former parade ground, the retained 'Keep' and the old flint boundary walls, reflecting the military character of the site and the use of traditional materials. This design approach reinforces local distinctiveness and allows for innovation and originality, without imposing particular tastes or styles. The scale and form of the development then graduates out to a more traditional use of design, scale and materials in the more peripheral residential development. The choice of materials will always be a slightly subjective consideration, but officers and the ADMC considered in this case the choices were appropriate as the brighter reds/oranges reflected the retained military building on the frontage and the grey bricks of the flats reflect the flint walling.

Q.3. Will the Council agree that the 3 Story bulky buildings facing onto Broyle Rd are un-neighbourly and reduce amenities of neighbourly houses opposite, by reason of a reduction of early morning sunlight particularly during the Winter months?

A. The use of three storeys with a recessed roof form in this location is entirely appropriate and reflects local character. The separation distance is across a busy main thoroughfare into Chichester and opposite the junction with Broyle Close. This was a matter which was specifically raised at Committee in representations by third party objectors but which was not accepted by members of the Committee.

Q4. Can the Council explain the excessive leeching (efflorescence) & white staining on the European Grey brickwork, particularly on the front elevations, why it has happened, & what action is the council taking to require the builders to remove/clean it? (It may take several years to weather in). Were the bricks tested by the manufacturers prior to delivery?

A. The discolouring which has occurred on the blocks of flats is likely to be a natural leeching of the brickwork (efflorescence) from the weep holes in the mortar line, which in turn is from the cavity trays between the floors. It is likely that it was exacerbated by the inclement weather immediately following the completion of the build of these units and will disappear over time. The developer has been approached about removing the staining and has informally agreed to do so.

Q5. Do the council consider it is good planning to permit houses to be built with front doors directly opening onto the pavement (Initial block 3.5m, current scaffolded block 1.6m) of a busy main access road Into Chichester, with no separation by way of gates or fences ?

A. There is a wide pavement area separating the houses from Broyle Road and it is not at all uncommon in Chichester to find dwellings addressing the

street with direct access onto the pavement. This is not ‘bad planning’, quite the opposite, it creates strong interaction with the street scene which is a desirable urban design criterion. No safety concerns to this aspect of the development were raised in the consultation responses.

Q 6. Did the developers seek permission to remove some of the trees (including some heritage oaks & lime Trees) from the Road side of the latest phase?

A. In the South West corner of the site a number of cypress trees were felled, the consent to do so was by way of the granting of the planning permission that necessitated their removal. The Planning application proposes planting of further lime trees (much more appropriate) once development complete. Officers are not aware of the removal of oak and lime trees.

Q 7 Has the Council approved the removal of the Heritage landmarks, eg The “Smugglers Stone” & Obelisk from the road side?

A. The planning application proposed relocating these within the site. As planning permission was granted for that scheme their repositioning has been approved by the Council.

The Council’s Archaeological Officer advises that the Smugglers Stone and Obelisk were historically situated within the site. Due to the operational needs of the military, these were moved to outside of the site, along the roadside. The redevelopment of the Barracks brought forward the opportunity to return these heritage assets closer to their original positions and was proposed to do so within the approved planning application. However the precise positioning of the Obelisk and Smugglers Stone is yet to be agreed with Council Officers although it is anticipated that this will be within the public realm as close to their original positions as possible.