

Minutes of a meeting of the **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** held in Committee Room 1 East Pallant House Chichester West Sussex on Thursday 13 June 2013 at 10:00

## **Members (15)**

Mrs C M M Apel (Chairman)

|                     |                   |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| Mr A D Chaplin      | Mr H C Potter     |
| Mrs P Dignum        | Mrs J A E Tassell |
| Mrs E Hamilton      | Mr N R D Thomas   |
| Mr G H Hicks        | Mrs B A Tinson    |
| Mr S Lloyd-Williams | Mr M Woolley      |
| Mr G V McAra        |                   |

were present (12)

## **Overview and Scrutiny Members Absent**

Mr R J Hayes (Vice-Chairman)  
Mrs N Graves  
Mr F Robertson

## **Chichester District Council Members Present as Observers or Contributors**

Mrs H P Caird  
Mr J L Cherry  
Mr P Clementson  
Mr M A Cullen  
Mrs E P Lintill  
Mr S J Oakley  
Mrs C Purnell

## **Officers Present for All Agenda Items**

Mrs L Gallacher – Member Services Assistant  
Mrs B Jones – Principal Scrutiny Officer  
Mr S Kane – Commissioning Manager

## **Outside Representatives Present for Specific Agenda Items**

### **Agenda Item 9 – Pallant House Gallery Chichester**

Mr G Perry – Director  
Mr M Steene – Deputy Director and Head of Learning and Community Programmes

## **Agenda Item 10 – Chichester Festival Theatre**

Mr A Finch – Executive Director

Mr R Rowbotham – Learning and Participation Director

### **134 Chairman's Announcements**

Mrs Apel greeted everyone present to the committee's first ordinary meeting of the 2013/2014 Council. She welcomed Mr Woolley as the new member on the committee and expressed her thanks to Mr Myers, whom Mr Woolley had replaced, for his valuable contribution to the committee.

This was the first meeting to commence at the new time of 10:00 as agreed as part of the recent scrutiny review. This would subsequently be reviewed to establish whether the new time was appropriate when future meetings were likely to have full agendas and potentially last into the early afternoon.

Apologies for absence had been received from Mrs Graves, Mr Hayes and Mr Robertson.

### **135 Approval of Minutes**

Mrs Apel advised that an amendment was needed to the minutes of 11 April 2013. Minute number 129 (2) (a) Chichester Festival Theatre/Pallant House Gallery Task and Finish Group, the membership should read *Mrs Apel, Mr Hayes, Mr Hicks and Mr Thomas and non-scrutiny member Mr French.*

Mrs Hamilton said minute 124 bullet point 6 on page 6 was misleading and suggested it be revised to read: *Mrs Hamilton said that Independents' Day in Midhurst had been disappointing as shopkeepers had only discovered about the event through a trade magazine a month before the event, so there was a limited time for publicity.*

Regarding minute 128 and Mr Robertson's request that a report on the use of consultants be referred to the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee, Mrs Apel advised that Mrs Tull and Mr Robertson had met with officers and it was agreed that it was not appropriate to review this using a wholesale approach. Mr Ward and Mrs Hotchkiss would provide a timeline giving details of the procurement of the Novium consultants and the outputs received. This would be circulated to committee members.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's ordinary meeting on Thursday 11 April 2013 are approved subject to the amendment of Minute numbers 124 bullet point 6, and 129 (2) (a) as indicated above, and the minutes of the committee's special meeting on Tuesday 21 May 2013 are approved without amendment (copies of both had been circulated with the agenda papers).

Accordingly, Mrs Apel signed and dated the official version of each set of minutes.

### **136 Urgent Items**

Mrs Apel advised that a Call-In request had been received to reconsider a decision made by the Cabinet on 4 June 2013 relating to agenda item 8 (Appointments to Outside Organisations) and the appointment of a member as a Chichester District Council representative on the Chichester Ship Canal Restoration Project Board. This would be

considered under agenda item 13 (b) Late Items.

### **137 Declarations of Interest**

Mrs Apel declared a personal interest in respect of agenda items 9 and 10 as a Friend of both Chichester Festival Theatre and the Pallant House Gallery.

Mrs Dignum declared a personal interest in respect of agenda items 9 and 10 as a Friend of both Chichester Festival Theatre and the Pallant House Gallery. Mrs Dignum also declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 13 (b) as a member of the Chichester Canal Society.

Mrs Tassell declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 9 as a Friend of the Pallant House Gallery.

Mr Woolley declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 as a Friend of Chichester Festival Theatre.

### **138 Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted for this meeting.

### **139 Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2012/13 Annual Report**

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

Mrs Apel introduced the report and said she felt that the committee had achieved some valuable work in the last year. She informed the committee that she had attended the Centre for Public Scrutiny Annual Conference earlier this week. The key note speaker had emphasised the importance of external scrutiny and the Council that had won the Overall Impact Award for scrutiny had used scrutiny to review the impact on communities caused by an influx of migrant workers. Mr Chaplin said he fully agreed that external scrutiny was vital and referred to the Council's good working relationship with Sussex Police, who had previously attended committee meetings. Mrs Apel expressed her thanks to Mrs Jones for all her work supporting the committee over the last year.

Mrs Jones (Principal Scrutiny Officer) advised that Mrs Graves had suggested some amended wording on page 5 of the report relating to the work of the Housing Standing Panel and the Local Authority Mortgage Scheme. The second sentence would now read: *The Panel did not feel it could make a recommendation on this scheme without further financial and risk information and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee referred it to the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee for consideration of the risks involved. It was not ultimately supported by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee or by Cabinet.*

The committee agreed with this amendment and had no comments to make on the report.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2012/13 is approved, subject to the above amendment to page 5.

- (2) That delegated power is given to the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to sign off the final version of the report prior to its presentation to Council.

#### **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

That the Council meeting approves the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2012/13 Annual Report.

### **140 Recommendations from the Housing Standing Panel**

The committee considered the agenda report and accompanying appendices (copy attached to the official minutes).

#### **Housing Strategy**

Mr Woolley, Chairman of the Housing Standing Panel (HSP) introduced this item. Mrs Grange (Housing Delivery Manager) explained that the Housing Strategy had been developed over the last six months following extensive consultation both internally and externally. The affordable housing target had been reviewed to take into account the level of housing that could realistically be delivered through the planning system across the district including the South Downs National Park (SDNP) area. Officers felt that a minimum of 550 affordable home units to be delivered on market sites was an appropriate target over the five year strategy period. The Council would also aim to achieve an additional 150 affordable home units through the use of registered provider assets and by using Council funds to lever in investment where opportunities arise through a new housing delivery partnership. The target was slightly lower due to the current economic climate, the very limited government grant available and increased viability issues.

Mrs Grange explained that a number of issues had been raised by the HSP when considering the Housing Strategy. The first was the relationship between affordability and house prices/rents and whether house prices had increased over the last 10 years. She had reviewed the Land Registry figures which indicated that prices did drop considerably in 2009, but since then they had overall increased. The HSP had also questioned some of the demographic figures relating to the population within the 15-24 age group, as in the report it stated that there would be a net loss in population in this group. She had reviewed the figures and the population in this group would in fact increase and the population of the 40-59 age group would decrease, and the strategy had subsequently been amended to reflect this. The HSP had asked for census figures for the number of second homes; however these had only recently begun to be recorded so were not available from the 2001 census. It had been questioned by the HSP whether a capital amount should be included for the delivery of gypsy and traveller sites. Mrs Grange had discussed this with the Executive Director of Home and Communities and it was felt that this was not appropriate as a decision was yet to be made on whether the transit site would be located within Chichester District.

Mrs L Grange and Mr R Dunmall (Housing Operations Manager) responded to members' questions and requests for clarification on points of detail. Among the matters covered were:

- The Local Plan made provision for 395 homes a year for the district. This however would not be adopted until the end of 2014 so officers had looked at sites that they knew would come forward for housing during this period. A large

number of sites had fewer than five units.

- Prices of homes in the district were generally increasing although there were some variations within the district. The former Rural Housing Enabler Officer had visited several estate agents in the district who were confident that house prices would increase.
- Mr Chaplin asked whether a consequence of the 'spare bedroom tax' was that limited resources would be available for discretionary housing allowance payments. Mr Dunmall said it was very early in the new regime so he was unable to advise, but suggested that Mrs Dring, Housing Benefit Manager would perhaps be better placed to answer this. Officers were working with those people affected to advise of their options and to encourage them to join the housing register. If they were willing to move to a smaller property their discretionary housing payments could continue, provided that they remain on the housing register and actively bid for suitable properties. Mrs Jones added that a review of welfare reforms was due to be reviewed by the committee in March 2014.
- 103 affordable homes were achieved in 2012/13 against a target of 150 as a result of the economy and market housing sites not coming forward. The target number of homes in the strategy was 140 a year which was slightly lower, but officers felt this was a challenging and realistic target.
- The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment identified a need for 59 additional pitches in the district which were allocated in the Local Plan. One pitch was made up of a mobile home, a caravan and any necessary parking. The provision of sites was an issue and a transit site was required in coastal West Sussex. It was currently unknown whether this would be in Chichester District.
- The delivery plan would include milestones and targets for delivery. This would be completed prior to the Housing Strategy being considered by the Cabinet in September. Mr Lloyd-Williams asked whether the committee could review the delivery plan and officers advised this could be reviewed at the next committee.
- Officers had been in discussion with Chichester University regarding the supply of purpose built student accommodation. There were a number of sites allocated in the Local Plan for this, but the Council had no direct control and currently no plans had come forward.
- Mrs Dignum referred to the statement in the report that older people could be encouraged to downsize to more suitable accommodation. She asked whether there were enough one and two bedroomed homes available and said that many older people would find the moving process difficult. Mr Dunmall said it was difficult to predict but there was a greater churn of one and two bedroom houses. Seamless Relocations were a service who specialised in helping older people and others requiring support to move. They provide information on the options for moving and this was allied with the disabled facilities grant.
- It was the responsibility of Social Services to house 16/17 year olds who were homeless. A lot of prevention work was completed in this area however, and Children Bouncing Back was a successful WSCC organisation that delivered work in this area. There were also a number of bed places available through *My Place*.

- The Council had good relationships with local letting agents and a seminar had been organised in July to continue to build relationships with them. Most local landlords had joined the council's accreditation scheme which would ensure that they cannot charge high administration fees.
- There was currently an issue with the funding of extra care housing and sheltered housing. No registered providers were looking to provide this. The housing register did not show any significant demand despite there being a demand for people in the private sector requiring this who do not wish to move into residential care. There were a number of sites in the city that had been allocated by developers as extra care schemes but due to the market they were yet to come forward.
- The 150 additional units over the next five years would be part funded through the Housing Delivery Partnership. This would build on the success of the Rural Housing Partnership. HydeMartlet had identified a number of sites to attract funding from the Homes and Communities Agency and the Council would look to lever in investment with funds from the Capital Investment Programme budget.

Members congratulated officers on the Strategy and said that a huge amount of work had gone into this.

### **Housing Allocations Scheme**

Mr Dunmall explained that the Housing Allocations Scheme had been updated to make the register much tighter and reflect the needs of households who had a local connection to the district. Currently 1600 people were on the register that did not have a local connection. All members were consulted on this scheme as were the Citizen's Advice Bureau and Shelter. There were a few minor amendments suggested which had been incorporated into the scheme. He summarised the main changes which included changes to who was eligible to join and remain on the housing register, and now reflected the government regulations that members of the Armed Forces and those that had been discharged within the previous five years, were allowed to join the register.

Mr Dunmall responded to members' questions and requests for clarification on points of detail. Among the matters covered were:

- Additional bedroom because of a medical need was separate to 'bedroom tax'. This would only be considered if people could demonstrate a medical need and could produce the required evidence.
- The Council had no powers to remove tenancies as the housing contracts and policies were provided by the registered housing providers. When fixed term tenancies became the norm, it was assumed that at the end of a tenancy the housing provider would assess the income of the applicant and assess whether they should remain in social housing or seek housing in the private sector.
- Government guidance stated that for a property to be affordable a person should spend no more than 25% of their income on housing costs, so if their income was four times the local housing allowance rate they should be able to find private rented accommodation. A member commented that this was a low threshold and officers advised they were aware that often people spend much more of their income on housing, but had erred on the side of caution when deciding to adopt the government definition.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) That having considered the recommendations of the Housing Standing Panel and accompanying appendices, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee endorses its findings and recommendations.
- (2) That the rural allocations policy elements of the Housing Allocations Scheme are reviewed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee every three years.
- (3) That the Housing Delivery Plan is reviewed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee annually.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CABINET**

- (1) That the Housing Strategy is adopted.
- (2) That the Housing Strategy Capital Investment Programme is approved.
- (3) That the Housing Allocations Scheme be adopted.
- (4) That the Executive Director of Home & Community, with the approval of the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, be authorised to make changes of a non-policy nature to the scheme and that any changes are reported back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

### **141 Recommendations from the Economic Strategy Action Plan Task and Finish Group**

The committee considered the agenda report and accompanying appendices (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Garraway (Assistant Director Economy) explained that the five year Economic Development Strategy was recently reviewed to bring it in line with changes to the Localism Act. The action plan was developed by the Economic Development Team in consultation with the strategy's steering group, and included the first year's actions as part of delivering the overall aims of the strategy. The projects on the action plan would not all be able to be delivered at once so the task and finish group were asked to decide what projects to prioritise. There were four objectives in the action plan and each was divided into actions as per the agreed Economic Development Strategy. Each action had a priority level and those with a priority level C or D had been removed from the action plan. Mr Thomas (Chairman of the Economic Strategy Task and Finish Group (TFG)) added that the TFG had prioritised the actions carefully and tried to balance this with the available resources.

It had been agreed that priorities 1.1 and 1.2 would be delivered at a later date and these had been removed from the action plan. The action plan was oversubscribed in terms of the level of current resources by 88 days. Normally the action plan should start with 90% of resources which would allow spare capacity for tasks added during the year; however at present there was not enough resources to deliver all the projects. Mr Garraway asked the committee to focus on areas they considered resources could be reduced further.

Mr Over (Executive Director Support Services and the Economy, Mr Garraway and Mr Oates (Economic Development Manager) responded to members' questions and

requests for clarification on points of detail. Among the matters covered were:

- The towns team in Midhurst was supported by local people and Midhurst Town Council funded £6,000 towards the Rural Towns' Coordinator post, 2.5 days of which was spent working in Midhurst. The Midhurst Vision had been very effective and Petworth were working on the same model. Cabinet approved additional funding for the post and it was hoped that the local community would realise value of this post and offer funding towards the post.
- Training young people in the right area for the jobs available was a national issue. Further education providers receive funding and delivered the courses requested and not necessarily the courses where there was a shortage of skilled people and therefore more guarantee of a job. Mr Garraway had discussed this issue with the Local Enterprise Partnership and was working with them to find a solution to the funding issue.
- Mrs Tinson reported that Selsey Town Council had recently recruited a town coordinator and established a town team which was very positive.

Mrs Apel asked Mr Garraway whether he had a recommendation on potential to reduce the number of days in the action plan. He suggested that the current amount of hours for priority 2.5 *Identify, develop and promote key employment sites to meet the Employment Land Review forecasts for the district*, which involved supporting the planning policy team and commenting on business planning applications, could be halved to 85 days which would make the action plan oversubscribed by just three days. He felt this could be reviewed and perhaps reduced so that economic development officers only comment on the larger planning applications. Mr Over said although the action plan would still not have the 10% leeway after this amendment, he would be much more confident of the action plan with this reduction. Mr Cullen (Cabinet Member for Economy, Tourism and Car Parks), said he had concerns on the impact of this decision on small businesses as it was vital for them to have the support of the economic development officers when submitting a planning application. Mr Over agreed that the businesses that needed the most support from the Council were often the smaller businesses as larger companies had more resources to assist them. He would discuss this with Mr Garraway and agree where the focus of the economic development officers should be. The committee agreed to the amendment of priority 2.5 and this would be reduced to 85 hours from 170 hours.

The Economic Strategy Action Plan Task and Finish group had also recommended that a further TFG should be established to review the impact on tourism following the Council's withdrawal, and to look at ways the Council could support the tourism industry. Mr Cullen said that the term 'withdrawal of tourism' in the report gave the wrong indication and reminded members that the Council decision had not been to withdraw from the tourism industry, but had been asked to find a way of providing the service at cost zero. Mr Kane reminded the committee that in 2010 the Council made a decision to reduce the resources that it put directly into tourism and agreed that it would support *Visit Chichester*, as the delivery vehicle for tourism. He suggested that as the economic development team's resources were already stretched, that instead of setting up a TFG, the committee invite representatives of *Visit Chichester*, including their Chairman, to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to update members on their progress. *Visit Chichester* was undertaking a lot of valuable work and had revised their strategy and redesigned their website within the last year. Mr Over advised that as the Council's representative on the *Visit Chichester* Board he had raised this at their meeting yesterday, and they had advised they were keen to present to the committee and discuss their priorities and business plan. Their preference was not to hold a TFG due to their current workload and advised they would continue to market tourism in the district



nationally. The committee felt this was a sensible approach and agreed that *Visit Chichester* should be invited to the September committee.

#### RESOLVED

- (1) That having considered the recommendations of the Economic Strategy Action Plan Task and Finish Group, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee approve the Action Plan subject to the number of hours for priority 2.5 being amended to 85.
- (2) That the Chairman of *Visit Chichester* be invited to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in September to discuss their priorities and business plan.

#### RECOMMENDATION TO THE CABINET

That the Economic Development Action Plan is approved subject to the amendment to 2.5 of the Plan.

### 142 Annual Report and Review of Service Level Agreement for Pallant House Gallery

The committee considered the agenda report and the four appended reports relating to Pallant House Gallery (PHG) (copies attached to the official minutes).

Mr Perry (Director PHG), Mr Steene (Deputy Director PHG and Head of Learning and Community Programmes) and Mrs J Hotchkiss (Assistant Director Leisure and Wellbeing) appeared before the committee. Mrs Apel welcomed Mr Perry to the meeting as the Gallery's new Director.

Mr Perry highlighted the following matters from the PHG 2012/2013 report appended to the agenda report:

- The 2012/13 season featured over 20 exhibitions and activities through the Learning and Participation Programme. Notable exhibitions that had been well received included (a) working in collaboration with Chichester Festival Theatre for *the Art of Chichester Festival Theatre* celebrating its fiftieth anniversary featuring a number of drawings, paintings and costumes from the early productions (b) the *Peter Blake and Pop Music exhibition* celebrating his eightieth birthday and (c) an exhibition of works produced by artists with disabilities which was shown in the gallery's exhibition space. Presently the Gallery was showcasing a collection of works by *R. B Kitaji* which would end on 16 June 2013.
- Visitor figures for 2012/13 were 53,000, in keeping with past years. The target for visitors for the winter season in 2013/14 was 13,000; this was exceeded and 19,000 visitors came to the Gallery.
- The PHG was one of 34 organisations to receive a grant through the Catalyst Endowments Programme, a joint initiative between the Heritage Lottery Fund, Department for Culture Media and Sport and the Arts Council England (ACE). £1 million match funding was awarded with the Gallery needing to match this by 2016. To date £600,000 had been raised which was a huge achievement.
- The PHG had 300 volunteers which included 50 working in the Learning and Community Programme and 4,000 Friends of the Gallery.
- 25% of visitors lived and worked locally and 40% of visitors came within a 40 mile radius. 25% of visitors travelled between 50 and 100 miles which highlighted the

strong contingent of visitors travelling from London. The Gallery was working on a more detailed analysis of the distances travelled of its visitors and would subsequently be able to report this back to the Council.

Mrs Apel said that some members of the committee had been able to accept the invitation of a visit to the Gallery earlier this week. She informed Mr Perry and Mr Steene that she had gained a valuable insight of the amazing work that the Gallery performs for the community and thanked them for their work.

Mr Steene said that the learning and community programme had built up a very good reputation and referred to the following aspects:

- There were 3,500 separate participations in workshops as part of the Community Programme for 2012/13.
- The Gallery co-organised the *Art of Access* seminar with the National Portrait Gallery. This gave the opportunity for art galleries and museums to hear about other organisations work on arts and community programmes. The Gallery had been called upon for its expertise and experience in this area following the success of its Learning and Community Programme which had achieved significant recognition.
- The Partners in Art project had supported over 180 people during 2012/13. The scheme was about to seek funding to fund a small pilot in the autumn to learn what adjustments needed to be made to the project to include people with dementia and Alzheimer's. There was a growing need for people with these illnesses wanting to have access to creative engagement and this was particularly important with the country's ageing population.
- The Gallery had been shortlisted for an award at the Charity Awards this evening for its Outside In project which was part of the Learning and Community Programme.

**[Post Meeting Note – The Gallery was successful and won the award]**

During the ensuing debate Mr Perry and Mr Steene replied to members' questions on the following matters:

- (a) The administration cost for the volunteers and friends of the PHG was administered by each department rather than centrally. The Friends Programme and volunteers were vital in supporting the Gallery.
- (b) The Gallery was looking to develop the use of their resources for other school subjects. One piece of work could inspire a broad curriculum and be used as a starting point for inspiration.
- (c) The Gallery were focussed on making it more accessible to a wider audience and endeavoured to achieve artistic excellence. Exhibition meetings were regularly held to assess the appeal of exhibitions to various segments of the Gallery's audience, and the museum strives to achieve a balance of presenting material that may be more familiar to visitors with programmes that may be less well known, but that have merit and will be of interest to visitors.

- (d) The Gallery was available to be hired out for birthday parties and other functions and new guidelines were in place for hosting events. The Gallery promoted corporate events more actively.

Mr Chaplin commented that it was a shame that *Field and Fork* were no longer opening in the evenings. Mr Perry advised that a minimal menu was provided on a Thursday evening but the restaurant closed on a Friday and Saturday evening as they catered at Chichester Festival Theatre.

Mrs Apel thanked Mr Perry and Mr Steene for their attendance and the reports. On behalf of the committee she wished PHG every success in 2013.

The committee had no particular recommendations to make in respect of this item.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee endorses Pallant House Gallery's annual report for 2012/13 and endorses the 2013/14 Service Level Agreement.

### **143 Annual Report and Review of Service Level Agreement for Chichester Festival Theatre**

The committee considered the agenda report and the three appended reports relating to Chichester Festival Theatre (CFT) (copies attached to the official minutes).

Mr Finch (Executive Director), Mr Rowbotham (Learning and Participation Director) and Mrs J Hotchkiss (Assistant Director Leisure and Wellbeing) appeared before the committee. Mrs Hotchkiss introduced the item and reminded the committee that the CFT had a very different season to normal due to the *RENEW* Project commencing in October 2012.

Mr Finch highlighted the following matters from the CFT 2012/2013 report appended to the agenda report:

- 2012 was a momentous year with the celebration events for the fiftieth anniversary of the CFT whilst still operating the core festival and ensuring audiences were engaged. It was also the start of the capital investment *RENEW* project to ensure the building was fit for purpose. Many more events and engagement with the public took place in 2012 due to the anniversary celebrations.
- The CFT hosted five productions last year in the main theatre and six in the Minerva Theatre. As part of the fiftieth anniversary the CFT also hosted Theatre on the Fly, a temporary space for more contemporary productions. Three young directors sourced and created the venue with sponsorship and programmed the Fly season. Three productions were shown.
- CFT's production of *Goodnight Mister Tom* which was first produced as part of the 2010/11 winter season transferred to the West End and had gone on to play in two tours. The production had recently won an Olivier award for Best Entertainment and Family. *Sweeney Todd* also went onto show in the West End and won three Olivier awards. A royalty payment was given to CFT for productions that go on to the West End, which was used for the core financing of the Theatre.

Mr Rowbotham summarised the key highlights of the Learning Education and Participation department.

- The largest cast ever with 103 young people was seen in the youth theatre production of NOAH, which was held in the Theatre on the Fly. The expansion of the Chichester Festival Youth Theatre promised to be one of the largest youth theatres in the country. Participation continued to grow and it was estimated to reach over 50,000 this year.
- A £1.2 million grant was awarded by the Heritage Lottery Fund. This was split between a contribution to the capital costs of the *RENEW* project and towards a three year community engagement programme.

Mr Finch highlighted the following matters from the *RENEW* section of the Annual Report:

- The CFT was now in the middle of the *RENEW* Project. The total cost of the project was at least £22 million and to date the Theatre had secured pledges of £21 million. This included a £12 million grant from Arts Council England (ACE) which funding from the District Council and West Sussex County Council helped to unlock. The Theatre had a focussed strategy to raise the remaining £1 million in the next 12 months.
- The last performance in the old theatre was October 2012 and following this the building was demolished and was completed by the end of December. Works on the new theatre commenced in January 2013. Currently there were a few setbacks but the project was currently on time and in budget.
- Theatre staff were desperate not to close the Theatre during the works and a temporary auditorium was being created in Oaklands Park. The Minerva Theatre remained open showing a full programme of events from April – December.
- The Theatre was in its second year of a three year funding arrangement and they would need to apply to ACE for further funding which would be subject to the government spending review. In 2003 all the Theatre's income was made up of 45% grants and in 2012 this had reduced to 15%.

During the ensuing debate Mr Finch and Mr Rowbotham replied to members' questions on the following matters:

- (a) Regarding royalty payments paid to the Theatre for productions shown in the West End, a percentage of the weekly profit was received until the show closed. This was usually a one off payment and the Theatre was mindful not to become dependent on this source of income.
- (b) It was the responsibility of the Artistic Director, Mr Jonathan Church, to find a balance in the productions shown to both challenge and entertain audiences. It was largely uncertain as to whether a show would be successful and Mr Church would need to make a decision to programme what he deemed would appeal to the widest audience and have an aspiration figure in mind for the target number of tickets sold.

- (c) Regarding outreach work for the youth theatre, 9% of people taking part in the Youth Theatre came from PO19 postcode, 13% from PO20 and 3% from GU29. The Theatre also held satellite youth groups at Bognor, Billingshurst, Leigh Park and Midhurst. The programme for expansion involved visiting 20 schools to recruit for the youth theatre and 200 schools had attended the *Anthony and Cleopatra* theatre day.
- (d) The temporary theatre had 1400 seats replicating the seating layout of the old theatre and included a disabled access lift. *Barnum* would be the first performance in the temporary theatre and ticket sales were currently on target with TV advertising, in addition to the usual advertising, being used to promote the show.
- (e) The theatre did not perceive hosting music concerts as one of its main functions as it was not their area of specialism. There were now arenas and other larger venues much more suited to holding this type of event. However, if an opportunity arose for the CFT to hold a music event Mr Finch said the theatre might consider this.
- (f) The tent for the temporary theatre cost £500,000 and the seating cost was £50,000. A contractual framework was in place and a buyer had been found for the tent once the new building was in place.

Mrs Apel thanked Mr Finch and Mr Rowbotham for their attendance and the reports. On behalf of the committee she wished CFT every success in 2013.

The committee had no particular recommendations to make in respect of this item.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee endorses Chichester Festival Theatre's annual report for 2012/13 and endorses the 2013/14 Service Level Agreement.

### **144 Feedback from the Housing Standing Panel, Task and Finish Groups and West Sussex County Council Select Committees**

#### **(1) Housing Standing Panel**

There were no further matters to report from the Housing Standing Panel.

#### **(2) Task and Finish Groups**

There were no further matters to report from the Economic Strategy Action Plan Task and Finish Group.

#### **(3) West Sussex County Council Select Committees**

##### **(a) Children and Young People's Select Committee**

The next meeting of this committee was 19 June 2013.

##### **(b) Environmental and Community Services Select Committee**

Mr Oakley advised that following his appointment as a West Sussex County Councillor he had been appointed onto this Select Committee. A meeting was

held on 12 June 2013 which Mr Oakley had attended and he gave a brief summary. As it was the first meeting since the WSCC election he advised there was a lot of procedural business to agree and discussion on future topics for scrutiny which included items on highways, the fire and rescue service, crime, aviation policy and offshore wind farms. He advised that he would produce a short précis for members to read on the Members' Bulletin Board for future meetings.

#### **(c) Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee**

There had been no meetings of this committee since the last Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the next meeting of this committee was 26 June 2013. Mrs Dignum informed the committee of a message from Marianne Griffiths, Chief Executive of Western Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust. The trust comprises St Richards, Worthing and Southlands hospitals. On 1 July 2013 they were awarded Foundation Trust status which was a great achievement. Mrs Griffiths had praised the 650 staff for their hard work and their high standard of service, and said it was all the more creditable as this Trust was only formed four years ago.

#### **(4) West Sussex Joint Scrutiny**

Mrs Jones advised that joint scrutiny review of flooding across the county would be taking place in September/early October. A joint scrutiny task and finish group would be established to conduct this review and a member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was required as the Council's representative on this group. Mrs Apel asked the committee members' if anyone was interested in becoming the representative and Mr Potter put himself forward for this.

#### **(5) Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2013/14 Update**

Mrs Jones advised that items for the next Overview and Scrutiny Committee in September 2013 included (a) the Wellbeing Programme review of outcomes 2012/13 (b) Access to the private rented sector initiatives and policy (c) review of customer services (d) introduction of Sunday car parking charges (which had been deferred from this meeting) (e) terms of reference for the Voluntary and Community Services Infrastructure Support Arrangements and Corporate Plan task and finish groups, (f) Visit Chichester and (g) review of the Housing Delivery Plan. This would be a very heavy agenda and Mrs Jones advised this many need to be reviewed to see if any items could be prioritised.

Mr Lloyd-Williams asked that the committee review the Westgate Carbon Trust.

#### **145 The Grange, Midhurst – update on progress**

Mrs Hotchkiss circulated some photos which had been taken on the morning of the committee of the leisure centre's current progress. Mrs Hotchkiss advised that phase one of the project commenced on 4 September 2012. This had been completed three weeks late due to the bad weather making difficult ground conditions. The project was now in phase two, which commenced on 19 November 2012 and was due for completion on 9 December 2013. Works were progressing well. Drainage works were carried out in January, the steel frame erected in February, and the external brickwork completed in March. Phase three of the project would start towards the end of 2013 which would involve the final completion of the car park and the demolition of the old building. Regular meetings were held with the Grange Trustees and Mrs Hotchkiss attended a

meeting last week with all staff who would be moving across under TUPE arrangements. Meetings had been held with the clubs and organisations that use the centre on the progress and to ascertain their requirements for the new building. An internal officer working group including officers from IT, Finance and Personnel met regularly and Mrs Hotchkiss had monthly meetings with the Cabinet member for Leisure and Wellbeing and Midhurst ward members on the progress. Members would have the opportunity to visit the site as one of the stops on the Members' Property Tour on 6 September 2013.

The formal opening would be linked to the practical completion date which was currently 9 December 2013. The new leisure centre would then be ready to open 14 days after, however this would take the project into the Christmas period so the opening would likely be during January 2014. It would be a soft opening with the leisure centre opening first followed by the library and registrar service. The aim was to minimise the period of closure between the old centre closing and the new centre opening. In response to a question, Mrs Hotchkiss said she had been in discussions with the Grange Trustees, user groups and Midhurst Town Council regarding the name of the new leisure centre, and it was currently proposed to name the centre The Grange. The motif for the leisure centre would be linked to the Westgate Leisure Centre's motif and have the three feathers in the logo. The project was currently within the £8.1 million budget. In response to a question regarding the effect of the fit out on the availability of parking spaces for Midhurst shoppers, Mrs Hotchkiss said that spaces would be provided for contractor parking and all new equipment would not arrive on the same day. The final number of additional car parking spaces would not become available until February/March 2014 after the demolition of the old building.

#### **146 Late Items – Call-In Request**

Mr Kane advised that a call-in request was received relating to the resolution made by the Cabinet on 4 June 2013 in respect of agenda item 8 (Appointments to Outside Organisations). This related to the appointment of Mr S J Oakley as the Council's representative on the Chichester Ship Canal Restoration Project Board. The call-in request had been made by Mr Clementson and received the support of four other members: Mr Barrett, Mr Montyn, Mr Ridd and Mrs Tull. It had fulfilled the requirements listed in part four of the Constitution paragraph 15.4 and been accepted as a valid call-in request. He referred to paragraph 15.5 of the Constitution and informed the committee that they needed to agree whether the decision should stand, be referred back to the Cabinet or be referred to Full Council.

Mr Clementson was present at the meeting and was given the opportunity to present his reasons for making the call-in request. He raised the following points:

- He referred to the Chichester Ship Canal Restoration Project Board's policy to join the canal basin to Chichester Harbour which he felt was deeply flawed. There would be a number of practical problems and great expense involved in reconnecting the canal basin to the harbour, which the fellow signatories (all of whom were from wards south of the A27) were fully aware of.
- To appoint a member to the Project Board suggested that the Council was in agreement of joining the canal basin with Chichester harbour.
- Policy 52 within the Council's draft Local Plan should be amended to delete any mention of opening up the canal to navigation to the sea.

- He stressed that he thought the Chichester Ship Canal Restoration Project Board was a valuable organisation and the call-in request was nothing personal to Mr Oakley who had been appointed as the Council's representative.
- Mr Clementson had sent an email listing his concerns to the Leader, members and the Chief Executive prior to the appointment being made by the Cabinet on 4 June. He was uncertain whether this had been considered before the decision to appoint a member to the Project Board was made.
- He requested that the decision to appoint a member to the Chichester Ship Canal Restoration Project Board be deferred until policy 52 was removed from the draft Local Plan.

Mr Oakley who was present at the meeting was invited to address the committee as the Chichester Ship Canal Restoration Project Board Council representative and raised the following points:

- It was inappropriate to use the call-in process for this matter. The appointment of a member on this Project Board had never been questioned previously. It had only been highlighted due to the Leader changing the Council's representative.
- Members had been fully consulted on the proposed appointments to outside bodies.
- There had been no objection to the appointment of a member on the Wey and Arun Canal Steering Group.
- Mr Oakley requested that the call-in request be declined and the matter of whether the canal basin should be reconnected to Chichester Harbour should be addressed as part of the Local Plan process.

In response to a question Mr Kane advised that members appointed on outside bodies were there to serve the best interests of that outside organisation and share information two ways between the Council and the outside organisation. Members were representatives rather than delegates.

The committee felt that there were several issues that needed to be discussed further and it would be appropriate for all members to have the opportunity to debate this. Mrs Apel proposed to refer the Cabinet decision to Full Council on 23 July 2013.

#### **RESOLVED**

That following consideration of the call-in request, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agree that the decision regarding agenda item 8 (Appointment to Outside Organisations) made by Cabinet on 4 June 2013 should be referred for debate at Full Council on 23 July 2013.

#### **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

That the Council meeting reconsider the decision made by the Cabinet on 4 June 2013 relating to agenda item 8 (Appointment to Outside Organisations) and the appointment of a Member on the Chichester Ship Canal Restoration Project Board.



[**Note** The meeting ended at 13:30]

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRMAN

Date \_\_\_\_\_