

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Democratic Services

Email: democraticservices@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of **Annual Council** will be held virtually on **Tuesday 19 May 2020** at **2.00 pm**.

MEMBERS: Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mrs C Apel (Vice-Chairman), Mrs T Bangert, Mr G Barrett, Miss H Barrie, Mr M Bell, Rev J H Bowden, Mr R Briscoe, Mr J Brown, Mr A Dignum, Mrs J Duncton, Mr J Elliott, Mr G Evans, Mrs J Fowler, Mrs N Graves, Mr F Hobbs, Mr K Hughes, Mrs D Johnson, Mr T Johnson, Mrs E Lintill, Mrs S Lishman, Mr G McAra, Mr A Moss, Mr S Oakley, Dr K O'Kelly, Mr C Page, Mr D Palmer, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mr H Potter, Mrs C Purnell, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp, Mr A Sutton, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

3 **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 26)

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2020.

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 3



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in Committee Rooms - East Pallant House on Tuesday 3 March 2020 at 2.00 pm

Members Present: Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mrs C Apel (Vice-Chairman), Mrs T Bangert, Mr M Bell, Rev J H Bowden, Mr R Briscoe, Mr J Brown, Mr A Dignum, Mrs J Duncton, Mr J Elliott, Mr G Evans, Mrs J Fowler, Mrs N Graves, Mr F Hobbs, Mr K Hughes, Mrs D Johnson, Mr T Johnson, Mrs E Lintill, Mrs S Lishman, Mr G McAra, Mr A Moss, Mr S Oakley, Dr K O'Kelly, Mr D Palmer, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mr H Potter, Mrs C Purnell, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp, Mr A Sutton, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

Members not present: Mr G Barrett, Miss H Barrie and Mr C Page

Officers present: Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services Manager), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

91 **Minutes**

The Chairman extended a warm welcome to all those present and read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

There were two amendments to the minutes:

- Minute 86 to add that several members referred to the motion as a gimmick
- Minute 88 should refer to Mrs Lishman not Miss Lishman

Mr Brown also requested multiple additions to the minutes relating to comments he had made during several of the debates. Mr Ward explained that the minutes are not verbatim. Those who wish to hear the debates in full are referred to the audio recording on the council's website. Mr Bennett added that only factual amendments should be made to the minutes.

In a show of hands the Council voted to approve the minutes of the Council meeting held on 28 January 2020.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 28 January 2020 subject to the above amendments be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record of the meeting.

92 **Urgent Items**

The Chairman confirmed that there were no late items.

93 **Declarations of Interests**

Mrs Apel and M Bell declared personal interests in relation to item 11 as Trustees of Stonepillow.

Mr Plowman declared a personal interest in relation to item 11 as the Chairman of the Mayors Rough Sleepers Forum.

Rev Bowden declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 13 with regard to the Church Commissioners. He confirmed that he received no financial benefit from the Church Commissioners.

Mr Oakley declared a personal interest in relation to item 13 as a member of Tangmere Parish Council.

Mrs Duncton, Dr O'Kelly, Mr Oakley and Mrs Purnell declared personal interests in relation to item 14 as members of West Sussex County Council.

94 **Chairman's Announcements**

Apologies were received from Cllr Barrett, Cllr Barrie and Cllr Page.

95 **Public Question Time**

The following public questions were asked at the meeting (responses in italics). The Chairman explained that on this occasion there would be no supplementary questions and if there was not enough time in the 15 minute allocation for all the questions submitted then a written response would be provided (please see subsequent supplement to the agenda for all agenda items).

Questions from Mr Dicker

The council has recently announced that, and I quote: "Local Plan timetable to be reviewed following Government advice" I believe that it is very convenient for the officers and the council to delay.

I have been warning for 15 months that this is a flawed process that would never succeed with the examiner but I have always been told not to say "I told you so". As a result of this last minute change I would like answers to the following:

Why as a registered consultee and regular contributor to this planning process I still have not been informed directly of these changes.

Answer:

To ensure the widest possible coverage, a press release was issued by the Council which appeared in the Observer newspaper last week together with an email which was sent all

Parish Councils. Further community engagement and consultation options are currently being considered but I can advise that an email will be sent to all respondents regarding the Local Plan timetable as soon as possible.

With the very clear and unambiguous advice of Sir James Bevan, and I quote: “Properties should not be built on the floodplain” what CDC are going to do with the land availability assessment in this inevitable delay period whatever that may be and particularly AL6.

Answer:

The latest information in relation to flooding and advice from the Environment Agency, will be used to inform both the update to the land availability assessment and subsequent site selection, and will form part of the Sustainability Appraisal considerations. As any further updates to flooding evidence are received, these will also be taken into account – this is a normal part of the iterative process of plan preparation. To be clear, only part of site AL6 lies within the floodplain – it was never intended that any housing would be built within those parts of the site subject to flood risk, hence the proposal for a large area of open space and Country Park within the policy.

Having been lied to at full council in responses to my previous questions when will we the public now be reconsulted and when will CDC be submitting this to the examiner.

Answer:

If you believe that officers or members have lied to you, you should write to the Monitoring Officer and ask him to investigate your complaint, in respect of members under the Council’s Code of Conduct and in relation to officers, under the Council’s formal complaints process.

In accordance with the press release and statement on the Council’s website, the timetable for the Chichester Local Plan is being updated and this will be made available as soon as it is ready. It will include proposed dates for both consultation and formal submission of the Plan for examination.

When will the decision to reject the unallocated housing from the SDNP come for decision at this council as it is not on the agenda today as previously PROMISED it would be.

Answer:

At the Cabinet and Council meetings of 3 December, in response to questions, I advised that the unmet need from the South Downs National Park Authority will be considered as this council finalises its proposed submission draft plan. Your question has therefore previously been answered. At the risk of wasting further Council time, I can advise that remains the intention.

What is the impact on housing numbers and in particular the impact on the 40% cap as a result of us failing to have a local plan in place approved by the examiner.

Answer:

The government's standard methodology for assessing housing need includes a 40% cap, with reference to either previous plan targets or household projections. After 15 July 2020 the cap will be applied to household projections rather than the previous Plan figure. The impact of that is that this year the figure derived from the methodology rises from 609 dwellings per annum to 628 dwellings per annum.

What action is being taken as a result of the failure of the plan to be ready for the examiner which has conveniently been obscured by the very helpful advice of Government saving the embarrassment of this council.

Answer:

As stated, the timetable for the Chichester Local Plan is being updated and this will be made available as soon as it is ready. Other measures are being considered as appropriate and will be the subject of further Council reports in due course.

Question from Carolyn Cobbold

In the light of CDC's recent Climate Change Emergency Declaration will CDC implement the latest guidance from the Committee for Climate Change and the Environment Agency and prepare its local plan to allow the district to become as flood resilient as possible with the expectation of a 4 degree Celsius global mean temperature increase by 2100? And how will CDC ensure that developments are not allowed to go ahead in the transition period between local plans that may compromise the district's future flood resilience?

Answer:

Work on the Council's high level Climate Emergency Action Plan will be used to help inform planning policies on this important issue going forwards. The Council does of course work within the context of advice set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and associated Planning Practice Guidance in preparing new planning policies. Latest advice on climate change allowances in relation to sea level rise was issued by the Environment Agency in December 2019 and we will be using this information and any subsequent updates as part of our flood risk assessments and to inform site selection, sustainability appraisal and policy wording as we progress the Local Plan Review. We work closely with the Environment Agency in relation to the Local Plan Review on an ongoing basis to ensure such matters are appropriately addressed.

In respect of applications for planning permission, a flood risk assessment is required for any proposal over 1ha, and proposals of any size in areas at risk of flooding. The flood risk assessment would need to demonstrate that the risk of flooding would be minimised to an acceptable level and that the new development would not increase flood risk elsewhere, taking account of climate change and other relevant strategies such as Shoreline Management Plans. The Environment Agency is consulted on any application in flood zones 2 or 3 and it is extremely unlikely that permission would be granted in the case of any unresolved objection from the Agency. In addition, 'sensitive' development in these locations must be sequentially assessed against other comparable alternative sites before development can be considered acceptable in principle.

Any updated information relating to flood risk will be taken into account in relation to planning applications as and when it is received.

Question from Lucia Withers

With reference to the proposed actions under Chichester District's Climate Emergency Action Plan 2020-25 on communications and promoting lifestyle changes, does the Council envisage stakeholder and public engagement in the process of developing the final plan, and what steps will it take to consult with and learn from the experience of other councils in this regard, including (although not limited to) the establishment of climate commissions, citizens assemblies and public consultations?

Answer:

The development of the final plan will build on the actions and priorities approved in the initial plan. In developing these further we fully intend to engage with stakeholders and the wider public. This will especially be the case in the development funding criteria for the Local Carbon Chichester fund in order to ensure that this is used effectively and in ways that meet the needs of our community. In detailing the tree planting and food waste actions, we will seek the view of stakeholders, as their participation will be vital to success in these areas. The development of planning policy through the Local Plan review will, as always, be subject to extensive consultation and engagement as detailed in our Statement of Community Involvement.

We are already engaged with other councils across Sussex to ensure sharing of best practice and joint working where appropriate through an officer level Climate Emergency Network group. The Initial Action Plan includes a specific action on evaluating a Climate Commission for the District. This will depend on the willingness of other key partners from the public, private and voluntary sectors to participate and to adopt joint actions. Part of that process will be to find out if a commission or similar body is needed and wanted by those partners and what it would add to the achievement of carbon reduction in the district. We are keeping an open mind as to best mechanism, whilst keeping a focus on not working in isolation.

Questions from Cllr Charlotte Pexton, Bosham Parish Council

When did CDC realise the Local Plan timescale was not achievable?

(CDC requested an extension in October 2019 which was refused.)

Has the failure to achieve the July 2020 deadline been formally recognised by CDC Cabinet, Council or other Committee?

Answer:

The Council has always recognised that the Local Plan timetable involving submission of a plan before July 2020 that was likely to be found sound was challenging given the complex planning issues that need to be addressed. These include the identification of sufficient land to meet the area's housing needs, an acceptable scheme of transport mitigation for the A27, including options without a Stockbridge Link Road and waste water capacity. At the Meeting with the Minister for Local Government and Homelessness in October 2019, support was offered to see if the timetable could be met before the July deadline. An independent advisor met with officers before Christmas and advice was received in

January, confirming it would be better to take longer to prepare a robust defensible plan. The Council's Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel has considered the findings, and it is expected that more details will be placed on the council's website next week. It is envisaged that a formal revision to the Plan timetable in the Local Development Scheme will be brought to Cabinet and Council in due course.

Does CDC have a final list of outstanding evidence / items needed to complete a Local Plan for submission?

Answer:

The report Local Plan Review - Responses to Preferred Approach Consultation and Way Forward considered by Cabinet and Council in December 2019 set out a programme of technical work required.

What are the barriers to completing the above such list of outstanding items? If resources then surely the £483,900 uncommitted revenue budget (see item 14: Budget Spending Plan 2020) could be spent on "Getting the Local Plan done" rather than being transferred to 2021/22 to mitigate the expected deficit or being spent on defending unwanted planning applications and consequent appeals - indeed, are the latter costs included in the 2021/22 budget as they will be significant?

Answer:

The Local Plan has not been delayed through lack of financial commitment by the Council. Preparing a Local Plan is an iterative process, informed by evidence and consultation responses. Not all the evidence and work can be undertaken concurrently – there is a sequence to the process so that each step is informed by evidence. This involves the commissioning and timely preparation of evidence based studies by consultants on behalf of the Council but also a reliance on effective and ongoing 3rd party engagement e.g. with Highways England, Environment Agency and Southern Water which means that effective progress is not entirely within the Council's control.

Will the 40% cap be lifted from CDCs housing requirements? What exactly will the revised numbers be?

Answer:

The government's standard methodology for assessing housing need includes a 40% cap, with reference to either previous plan targets or household projections. After 15 July 2020 the cap will be applied to household projections rather than the previous Plan figure. The impact of that is that this year the figure derived from the methodology rises from 609 dwellings per annum to 628 dwellings per annum.

Does the Preferred Option Local Plan still stand or, especially in light of 4 above, is it back to the drawing board?

Answer:

It is not back to the drawing board. The report Local Plan Review - Responses to Preferred Approach Consultation and Way Forward considered by Cabinet and Council in December 2019 outlined how the distribution of development across the Local Plan area

would be subject to further review – but the Preferred Approach document remains the most recent formal iteration of the emerging Local Plan. In addition, evidence studies are still relevant.

If the Local Plan is delayed does this mean that all successful planning applications will count as windfall and therefore be ignored in the delayed Local Plan?

Answer:

No. Any sites with permission, or granted permission after 1 April 2019 will count towards meeting the overall plan target, and will be reflected in the next version of the Plan.

Who is responsible for this fiasco and what is your exact timeline and strategy to reduce the appalling prospect of unplanned housing in the District? Bosham Parish Council is dismayed at the failure of CDC Councillors to “Get the Local Plan done” -

Answer:

The Council recognises and is similarly concerned about the implications of development preceding the Local Plan review and is considering actions to seek to manage and mitigate the impacts. A formal report will be brought to Members as soon as possible on this important matter. However I should explain that even if the Council decided to go ahead and submit its Local Plan prior to 14 July (i.e. within the 5 year period stipulated), this would not benefit the basis on which the Council’s 5 year housing land supply is calculated after that date, or the resulting implications for the determination of planning applications. It is the Council’s view therefore that the 5 year review period imposed on the Council by the last Local Plan Examiner was in reality, unrealistic and unachievable.

96 **2020-21 Treasury Management and Investment Strategies and Capital Strategy update**

The Chairman invited Mr Wilding to introduce the item and drew attention to the report which could be found on pages 15 to 17 of the Cabinet agenda for 4 February 2020. She confirmed that there were two recommendations to Council detailed on the agenda front sheet.

Mr Wilding explained that the council is required by both the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) and the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (MHCLG) to approve a Treasury Management Strategy, an Investment Strategy and Capital Strategy each year. He drew attention to new section to the Treasury Management Strategy (page 14 of the Supplement to the agenda pack). The new section to read as follows:

Ethical Investments

Statutory guidance issued by CIPFA and MHCLG makes it clear that all treasury investments must adopt security, liquidity and yield (SLY) principles; ethical issues then play a subordinate role to those priorities. Nevertheless, there are a growing number of financial institutions and fund managers promoting Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) products. The Director of Corporate Services will consider such investments when deemed appropriate within the Council’s overall treasury management policies, objectives and the risk management framework set out in this document.

Mr Wilding outlined a number of other changes to the draft Treasury Management and Investment Strategy (the page numbers referenced relate to the small figures in the agenda pack):

- On page 6, the figures in Table 2 now include Forecast CIL balances.
- On page 7, a new section on proportionality has been included.
- On page 9 and 10: The limit on non LAPF pooled funds has been increased from £25 million to £30 million and a new investment vehicle, Real Estate Investment Trusts (REITs) included with an investment limit of £4 million.
- On page 14, Table 5 increased Treasury Investment Limits for each type of investment.
- On page 16, Table 6 increased limits for external debt.

Mr Wilding added that last year the council was required to publish a Capital Strategy for the first time. The Strategy is an overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contribute to the provision of local services and how associated risk is managed by the council. The Capital Strategy for 2020/21 to 2024/25 remains unchanged from last year except for updated figures in the tables.

Mr Wilding explained that the Treasury Management, Investment and Capital Strategy were reviewed by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee on 23 January 2020 and the Committee made the following recommendations:

- In the Treasury Management Strategy, a new section on Ethical, Social and Governance Investments should be included at the end of the section on pooled funds on page 12. A copy of this has been distributed to members of the Cabinet.
- Before making a potential investment decision with respect to Real Estate Investment Trusts (REIT) officers will after obtaining the appropriate professional advice consult the Cabinet Member for Financial Services and the chairman of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.

Further to the February Cabinet meeting Dr O'Kelly requested that all the documents related to the item be amalgamated into one easy to read document. Mr Ward agreed to update the document as necessary.

Mr Plowman requested information on the Coronavirus market reactions. Mr Ward explained that the Coronavirus had been an unforeseen risk although the council has £500,000 in reserves specifically to address fluctuations in fair value of investments. He confirmed that any stock market losses would only be recognised at the point of disposal.

Mr Wilding proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Mrs Lintill.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

1. That the Treasury Management Policy Statement, the Treasury Management Strategy Statement, the Investment Strategy, and the relevant Indicators for 2020-21, as amended be approved and;
2. The Capital Strategy for 2020-21 to 2024-25 be approved.

The Chairman invited Mrs Taylor to introduce the item and drew attention to the report which could be found on pages 27 to 31 of the Cabinet agenda for 4 February 2020. She confirmed that there were two recommendations to Council detailed on the agenda front sheet.

Mrs Taylor explained that the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) is updated each year. The IBP prioritises the strategic infrastructure projects from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) necessary to deliver the growth identified in the Chichester Local Plan, particularly within the five year period 2020-2025. It includes updates and new projects put forward by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and the key infrastructure commissioners. The IBP sets out the methodology for selecting which infrastructure projects have been prioritised for funding from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) during the five year period from 2020 to 2025 which will be funded from S106/S278 agreements and which infrastructure projects are or would need to be, funded from other sources.

Mrs Taylor confirmed that the IBP was subject to six weeks consultation from 7 October to 18 November 2019 with the city, town and parish councils, WSCC, Neighbouring Planning Authorities including the South Downs National Park Authority and key infrastructure delivery commissioners.

Mrs Taylor then drew attention to appendix 1 and appendix 2 which details the views of the Chichester Growth Board which met on 9 January 2020 and the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel (DPIP) which met on 16 January 2020 to consider the proposed responses to the representations received as a result of the consultation. Mrs Taylor explained that since the implementation of the CIL on 1 February 2016 a total of £9,828,007 had been collected to date (4 December 2019). At the end of October 2019 the total amount handed over to parishes was £1,666,648.

Mrs Taylor then outlined two new transport projects requested by WSCC:

- IBP/840 - (College Lane/Spitalfields Road Junction improvements) to make it suitable for shared use in years 2021/22 (cost estimate £60,000 to be fully funded from CIL)
- IBP/841 - (Chidham Sustainable Transport Improvements) to widen the existing footways to accommodate shared use to start 2022/23 (requesting £500,000 from CIL together with S106 from new developments at total cost estimate of £1.8 – 2 million)

Mrs Taylor explained that WSCC also sought a number of amendments.

With regard to IBP/349 - A286 Birdham Road/B2201 (Selsey Tram Roundabout) junction WSCC is currently undertaking feasibility work. The project is currently included in the CIL Spending Plan for £111,000 however the costs have increased and the CIL request is now for £440,000. Mrs Taylor explained that the increase is due to a change in the options under consideration which are different from the scheme envisaged at the time planning permission was granted.

With regard to IBP/353 (Sustainable transport corridor, City Centre to Westhampnett) Mrs Taylor explained that the project had been moved back from 2019/20 to 2020/21.

With regard to IBP/659 (school access improvements – drop off and pick up arrangements at expanded primary schools – Manhood Peninsula) Mrs Taylor confirmed that the project had been moved back from 2020/21 to 2021/22.

Mrs Taylor then explained that IBP/665, 655 and 654 had been amalgamated into two projects and the costs equally divided resulting in the deletion of IBP/654. IBP/655 (Phase 2 of the Chichester Road Space Audit) at a cost of £375,000 has been re-phased from 2020/21 to 2021/22 and IBP/665 (Phase 1 of the Chichester Road Space Audit) will cost £375,000 for 2020/21.

Mrs Taylor then outlined additional officer amendments as follows:

- IBP/721 (page 29, 3rd bullet point) to read IBP/721 Drainage improvements, Cheshire Crescent, Tangmere
- IBP/720 (page 135 of the supplement, 4th column) *quote awaited* to read *quote received £1,950*
- IBP/655 (page 142 of the supplement, last row) the figure should read £375,000
- IBP/665 (page 143 of the supplement last project) the figure should read £375,000

With regards to IBP/840 Mrs Lishman wished to clarify that it should refer to Spitafield Lane, rather than Spitafields Road.

Mr Brown requested reassurance that there would be no immediate rush for the parishes to spend the CIL money.

Mr Oakley emphasised the importance of maintaining a robust approach towards the assessment of business cases given that there is a finite level of funding.

Mrs Taylor explained that there is a protocol. Mr Frost added that each allocation of funding requires a detailed business case.

Mr Moss wished to note the inclusion of the cycle route.

Mrs Sharp requested a list of the updates that had been read out. Mrs Taylor agreed to send the updates.

Mrs Taylor proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Mrs Lintill.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

1. That the proposed responses to the representations received and subsequent modifications to the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) as set out in Appendix 1 be approved; and
2. The amended IBP including CIL Spending Plan attached as Appendix 2 be approved.

98 Allocation of Commuted Sums to Deliver Affordable Housing

The Chairman invited Mrs Graves to introduce the item and drew attention to the report which could be found on pages 15 to 18 of the Cabinet agenda for 3 March 2020. She confirmed that there were two recommendations to Council detailed on the agenda front sheet.

Mrs Graves explained that in certain circumstances the council accepts commuted sums from developers in lieu of the provision of affordable housing. The funding is used to support alternative schemes which Registered Providers are able to bring forward. She confirmed that the council is keen to support schemes which deliver homes at social rent levels which both the schemes recommended do. The Worthing Homes scheme in Bracklesham will provide nine homes for rent including one wheelchair accessible unit. The Chichester Greyfriars' scheme will provide eight new homes for older people as part of their existing development at Royal Close, Chichester. Both schemes will also attract Homes England funding.

Mr Brown requested clarification on whether any of the council's registered providers have additional capacity to deliver additional affordable housing. Mrs Graves explained that the schemes addressed by the report are suitable for funding and the council will take such opportunities as they arise. Mrs Rudziak added that the council's registered providers have all been made aware of the funding available (approximately £1 million). She explained that each provider has a different level of capacity that they can offer. In some cases the provider will have to acquire the land and borrow money to build, whereas in other cases the land may already be owned with reserves available.

Mrs Sharp wished to note that when building additional housing consideration should be given to road crossings. Mr Oakley suggested that Mrs Sharp may wish to investigate the West Sussex County Council Communities Highway Scheme further.

Mrs Lintill confirmed that at the Cabinet meeting earlier in the day Mr Moss had read out Mrs Sharp's statement relating to this item in full.

Mr Graves proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Mrs Lintill.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

1. The allocation of grant of £438,750 to Worthing Homes to support the development of 9 social rented homes on a site at Middleton Close, Bracklesham, funded from commuted sums.
2. The allocation of grant of £160,000 to Chichester Greyfriars Housing Association to support the development of 8 social rented homes at Royal Close, Chichester, funded from commuted sums.

99 Housing Strategy 2020-25

The Chairman invited Mrs Graves to introduce the item and drew attention to the report which could be found on pages 19 to 21 of the Cabinet agenda for 3 March 2020. She confirmed that there was one recommendation to Council detailed on the agenda front sheet.

Mrs Graves explained that the purpose of the Housing Strategy is to set out a long term vision of the council's aspirations for meeting housing need over the next five years. The strategy replaces a number of separate documents which have been produced in the past, the intention being to provide a single comprehensive housing strategy covering:

- Homelessness
- Private sector renewal
- The delivery of new affordable housing

Mrs Graves then clarified the aim to provide a concise statement of the council's priorities, indicating the reasons why these priorities had been chosen and setting them in the context of the resources opportunities and constraints. She explained that the Strategy aims to strike a balance between producing something which is detailed enough to be meaningful but concise enough to be readable and accessible. The strategy is the product of work with a variety of stakeholders and partners and has been the subject of consultation with members including the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It represents an ambitious but achievable plan to respond to the pressing housing issues so many residents face.

With reference to page 7 of the agenda pack Mr Johnson drew attention to the number of homes being built on the coastal plains which do not account for the affordable housing numbers set. Mrs Rudziak explained that the affordable housing figures are under review and if the delegation were to be approved could be amended under delegated powers in line with the Local Plan Review.

Mr Johnson requested clarification on whether certain locations would be required to have a specific number of affordable homes or whether the figures are for the district as a whole. Mr Frost explained that how best to meet the affordable housing need would be a matter for Cabinet and Council going forwards.

Dr O'Kelly referring to page 22 of the agenda pack emphasised the need for housing to identify what is needed to boost community resilience. She requested clarification of how the districts housing stock can achieve the zero carbon targets and suggested that a strategy be put in place. Mrs Plant explained that the Environment Panel would be considering the council's own buildings primarily.

Mr Brown requested the addition of a clear definition of affordable housing. Mrs Lintill explained that the same request had been raised at Cabinet in the morning.

Mrs Lishman requested confirmation that the figures detailed at point 6 on page 2 of the appendices pack of 1000 affordable homes by 2025 remain accurate. Mrs Rudziak explained that the figures are intended although the locations are yet to be defined.

Mr Hughes requested the following considerations be made when creating the strategy:

- The green agenda
- Infrastructure
- Enforcement of council standards on Registered Housing Providers
- Relating affordable housing to Hedna
- Challenging developers where necessary
- Ensuring those in private rented accommodation are looked after
- Adequate staffing levels to carry out the work required

Mrs Shepherd confirmed that suitable zero carbon wording would be included. She added that staffing levels had been considered as part of the spending review. She then reminded members that ultimately they would need to agree the future priorities and how the council's funds should be spent. Mrs Rudziak added that Registered Housing

Providers are regulated and the standards for let properties were addressed as part of a Housing Task and Finish Group in the last administration. She clarified that the 30% affordable housing figure in the Local Plan Review had not yet been set.

Mr Oakley requested clarification of the degree to which commuted sums cover the costs of delivering affordable housing. Mrs Rudziak explained that it depends on the organisation and their reserves. It may be part funded by their capital, loans supported by rents, and S106 allocations by the Council.

Members supported the approach of a 'living' document which could be modified as required. Mr Moss as Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) agreed that OSC would be an appropriate place to carry out the review.

Mrs Graves proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Mrs Lintill.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

1. That the Housing Strategy 2020-25 be adopted.
2. That the Director of Housing and Communities is granted delegated authority to make modifications to the Strategy in order to align with the emerging Local Plan Review.

100 Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel

The Chairman welcomed and introduced Mr Pressdee, Mr Bevis and Mr Thompson who make up the council's Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP). Mr Pressdee the IRP Chairman then outlined the methodology used by the Panel and referred members to the recommendations made on pages 4 and 5 of the agenda supplement for the Cabinet meeting of 3 March 2020. Mr Pressdee drew particular attention to the Carers Allowance recommendation to bring the amount in line with the West Sussex County Council Carers Allowance. He added that 25 out of 36 members had responded to the questionnaire sent out and the response to the time taken to carry out tasks had been considered in making the recommendations.

Mrs Apel questioned whether the Overview and Scrutiny (OSC) and Corporate Governance and Audit (CGAC) Chair's should be given the same allowance.

Mr Brown referred members to a proposal which had been circulated in hard copy to members prior to the meeting. The proposal was as follows:

Council has considered the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel and in particular parts 3.13, 3.14 and 3.15. In light of the increased workload and time commitment required of councillors since boundary changes took effect in 2019 this council resolves to accept the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel except for 2.2 and 3.18.

Instead, the Council resolves to increase the Members Basic Allowance such that the total financial impact to the council and the tax-payer after the changes to councillor numbers and ward boundaries is cost-neutral.

Mr Brown emphasised that the proposal is cost neutral and would recognise the additional work of all members since the boundary changes and acknowledge those members who take annual leave to attend meetings.

Mr Moss seconded the proposal.

Mr Oakley requested clarification on where Chichester stands in relation to other council's.

Several members referenced the need for allowances to allow the membership to be more widely representative.

Mrs Johnson wished to note her appreciation for the acknowledgement of carers.

Mr Johnson commented that the Leader of the Opposition and the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny if the same person can only receive one allowance which is less than a Cabinet member although he felt the work was equivalent.

Mrs Purnell reminded members that the allowance should not be viewed as a salary.

Mr Ward confirmed that the draft budget had not been reduced to reflect the reduction in membership from 48 to 36, and could therefore accommodate £35,400 for Mr Brown's proposal.

Mr McAra drew attention to the Licensing Sub-Committee allowance which he explained is no longer relevant and should be removed.

Mrs Duncton explained that the work of the IRP should be supported given the research and time spent on carrying out the review.

Mr Johnson proposed that 3.23 be amended to state:

If the Leader of the Opposition is also the Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee then the allowance shall match that of a Cabinet member.

The proposal was seconded by Rev Bowden.

Mr Pressdee in response to members explained that uplifting the allowance would take Chichester up the South East Employer list of council's allowances. He confirmed that the Licensing Sub-Committee allowance had been included in error and should be removed.

Mrs Lintill then proposed that the standard member's allowance figure be amended to £5,500 with the removal of the Licensing Sub-Committee allowance. Mrs Graves seconded the proposal.

Following a request from Mr Moss, Mr Johnson withdrew his proposal.

Mr Bennett reminded members that the views of the Panel should be respected and should only be disregarded where there is significant evidence to back it up.

Following a request from Mr Dignum, Mrs Lintill withdrew her proposal.

Mr Dignum proposed that the original proposal of the IRP be voted on. Mr Potter seconded the proposal.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

That the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel as set out on pages 4 and 5 of the Cabinet agenda supplement for 3 March 2020 be approved subject to the following amendment:

Removal of the allowance for members of the Licensing Sub-Committees.

Members took a 5 minute break.

101 Budget Spending Plan 2020 - 21 & Council Tax Resolution

The Chairman invited Mr Wilding to introduce the item and drew attention to the report which could be found on the amended document circulated to members prior to the meeting. He confirmed that there were six recommendations to Council detailed on the front sheet.

Mr Wilding explained that the report follows on from Council's approval of the Financial Strategy in December. Cabinet reviewed and then recommended the budget and level of Council tax in February. The Report to February's Cabinet set out the Budget Spending plans of each of the portfolios and these plans together with the various funding streams, underpin the balanced budget. The budget process involves close working between individual budget managers and the Council's finance team. The process ensures that service delivery priorities are met within the constraints on public sector financial resources.

He added that the draft financial settlement from the Government was broadly as anticipated, and this draft was finalised last week unchanged. Effectively the 2020-21 settlement is an extension to the previously agreed four-year settlement due to the Government Funding reforms being delayed until at least 2021-22.

He confirmed that it is an important statutory requirement that the council has a balanced revenue budget over the period of the 5 year financial strategy. Some of the key variables and issues that impact the forthcoming financial year are detailed in this report and supporting appendices, namely, income from fees, charges and rents; use of reserves; and Council tax.

Mr Wilding explained that he recommended that the council takes up central government's offer of allowing a rise in Council Tax by £5 for Band D properties (or less than 10 pence per week) and equivalent increases for other property Bands. The change would help to offset the continued reduction of central government funding. The Council Tax increase will generate an extra £270,667 per year and assist in closing the budget deficit that would otherwise emerge in the medium term. Not to approve would leave the Council with a deficit to address in later years. This measure is taken alongside the continuing work on the 2016 deficit reduction plan which aims to generate further income and savings amounting to just under £1m over the next 5 years. Mr Wilding pointed out that this Council continues to protect the most vulnerable in our community by maintaining 100% council tax relief for those in most need.

Mr Wilding then referred to the agenda supplement for the Cabinet on 4 February where the overall 2020-21 budget is summarised in the income and expenditure statement at page 62 and 63. A corrected page 63 was circulated as a supplementary Cabinet agenda paper. The correction shows a net revenue requirement of £14.236 million. The draft budget shows a net surplus of £484,000 for 2020-21. However, the Council's approved Financial Strategy shows that in the two subsequent years the total deficit is forecast to be £500,000. This deficit is largely due to spending reductions by WSCC which have resulted in additional costs to this Council of approximately £1m per annum. It is therefore prudent to reserve the 2020-21 surplus by transferring it to the Council's General Fund Reserve in order to off-set future deficits and avoid unwanted service reductions.

He then outlined that the budget process identifies major variances by department and service area between the 2019-20 budget and that for 2020-21 in the February Cabinet Supplement pack (on pages 64 and 65). The variances are explained in the notes section on page 66 to 69. The most significant variation is the loss of recycling credits which amounts to £769,000 per year.

He then confirmed that as in previous years members from both Overview and Scrutiny and Corporate Governance and Audit committees nominated members to form a joint Task & Finish group (TFG) to review and scrutinise the budget spending plans as part of the process in drafting this budget that is presented today. The T&F members reported back to their respective committees that they were satisfied with the explanations given by officers at the meeting.

Mr Wilding then drew attention to the budget summaries by portfolio on pages 71-86, in the supplement pack. The details behind these figures can be found in the draft budget book on to the council's website. The Capital and Projects Programme and Asset Replacement Programmes are set out at page 87 and page 93 respectively and the Resources Statement is at page 103. All projects included in the Capital Programme have already had approval from the Cabinet and Council, but some may be subject to a separate future report along with a Project Initiation Document before the funding is released. He confirmed that the Statement of Reserves remains robust and healthy and is shown at pages 105-113. This statement also highlights the purpose of specific reserves and the respective authorisations for their use, and demonstrates that the Capital Programme and Asset Replacement Programmes are fully funded, as demonstrated in the prudential indicators set out in page 115 of the supplement pack, along with the Council's Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy (pages 116-117) which states our arrangements for the repayment of any debt. This is a requirement of the Prudential Code even if the Council is debt free.

With reference to the Council Tax Resolution Report on page 1 of the agenda supplement Mr Wilding explained the proposals through to the legal Resolutions necessary for setting the Council Tax, incorporating the precepts required by West Sussex CC, Town and Parish Councils and The Police and Crime Commissioner for Sussex. The overall proposed Council Tax by band for each parish, broken down by precepting authority, is set out in Appendix B (page 7 to 16).

Mr Wilding then thanked Mr Ward, Mrs Belenger and all the finance team for their hard work and diligence on this year's budget.

Mr Wilding then invited Mr Ward to confirm the amendments to the recommendation following the approval of schemes at Cabinet and Council (3 March 2020). Mr Ward confirmed that recommendation 2.1 v should be amended to read:

That the uncommitted revenue budget of £521,800 be transferred to the General Fund Reserve to mitigate the deficit expected in 2021-22.

Mr Moss then proposed the following amendments:

Amendment to recommendation 1.4

That sufficient part of the uncommitted revenue budget of £521,800 be held in earmarked reserves while Cabinet gives proper consideration to the following initiatives to be funded from these reserves:

- a) The urgent employment of Planning Consultants and Legal Advisors to support Officers of the Council in preparation of the Local Plan and provide direct assistance to Parish Councils in the preparation of their Neighbourhood Plans. The maximum costs to be £150,000.*
- b) £100,000 to be allocated between the 4 Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA's) to deliver projects to decrease air pollution specifically in these hazardous areas. The money could be used flexibly for consultancy as well as being available to fund greening projects.*
- c) Financial support for the delivery of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) to increase safe and sustainable cycle journeys across the District. Consideration to be given to incentive schemes (e.g. Love to Ride), physical infrastructure delivery and the creation of a temporary part or full time post of an Active Travel Officer who would coordinate with colleagues at West Sussex County Council. The total costs to be £120,000.*

Any remaining balance of the uncommitted revenue budget to be placed in the General Fund Reserve.

Amendment to recommendation 1.5

That the capital programme, including the asset renewal programme (appendix 1c and 1d of the agenda report) be approved subject to modification by:

- a) The earmarking of £1,000,000 of what is current General Fund reserves (approximately 10% for the projected 2019-2023 fund) for a new Climate Capital Investment Reserve to be used to stimulate rapid and significant carbon reductions across the District.*
- b) The Environment Panel is tasked to work with the newly appointed Climate Emergency Officer to draw up criteria by which proposals to draw down funding from this reserve could be evaluated.*
- c) Final approval of any uses of the fund to be made by Cabinet and Council.*

Additional recommendation

Council notes that the very positive all-member workshop on the review of the Corporate Plan, facilitated and supported by peers from the Local Government Association, took place too late to feed meaningfully into the budget-making process.

In order that all councillors can contribute fully the Council therefore resolves to:

- a) Begin the Corporate Plan and budget-setting process in June rather than September, or as early as necessary for all councillors to consider the shape of the budget in conjunction with the Corporate Plan.*
- b) Bring forward member workshops in line with the above, including any to which Local Government Association Peers are invited, subject to their availability, so that new priorities may be identified and considered in the new budget.*
- c) Ensure that confident dedicated officer support be allocated to opposition groups early in this process to enable all members to make informed, legal and properly costed contributions to the process including well-drafted amendments and/or to put an alternative budget to the Council for consideration.*
- d) Ensure that nothing in items A, B or C should impact upon deadlines imposed upon the Council by law and/or auditing requirements.*

Mr Johnson added the following amendment recommendation 1.4:

Taking into account any earmarked reserves resulting from amendments to agenda item 14, the remaining balance of the uncommitted revenue budget be transferred to the General Fund Reserve to help mitigate the deficit expected in 2021-22 providing it is available to help staff access the support they need to mitigate stress at work and it is not needed to help independent 'small shop' traders mitigate any negative economic impact of the Covid-19 outbreak by providing assistance with their rent payments.

Both combined proposals were seconded by Mr Hughes.

Members took a short break to allow discussion of the proposals.

Mr Ward responded to the proposals and explained that the proposals would not short cut the approval process for any project funding. Projects would still require a PID and then approval by Cabinet, or if over £100,000 approval by Full Council. He added that putting money into general funds rather than ringfencing allows greater flexibility of spend and less constraints.

With regard to the timescale of the Budget Mr Ward explained that the Budget timetable starts in August. It is then taken to a Cabinet Strategy meeting in September/October. The Business Routeing Panel also see the budget timetable proposals. The Panel includes the Chairs of Corporate Governance and Audit Committee and Overview and Scrutiny Committee. There is also a Budget Task and Finish Group which consists of appointed members from both Committees. The opposition leader is also invited to strategy days.

Mr Ward went on to stress that the council is in an extremely unstable period financially as the government have not confirmed funding beyond one year, and the extent to which we are reliant on the local economy to generate income from fees and charges to balance our budget. The emergence of the Corona virus is a significant threat to the world economy and was not a risk that was foreseen when the financial strategy was approved before Christmas. Mr Ward therefore urged caution when considering committing the balance of the revenue budget.

Members discussed their views in support and against the proposals. Mr Brown referred to his proposal and explained that the amendments had been designed to make sound business cases. He asked that members be given budget options to choose from.

Mr Sutton proposed that a vote be taken. This was seconded by Mr Dignum.

The results of the first recorded vote on the amendment proposed by Cllr Moss and Cllr Tim Johnson which was seconded by Cllr Hughes were as follows:

Cllr Apel – For
Cllr Bangert – For
Cllr Barrett – Absent
Cllr Barrie – Absent
Cllr Bell – Against
Cllr Bowden – For
Cllr Briscoe – Against
Cllr Brown – For
Cllr Dignum – Against
Cllr Duncton – Against
Cllr Elliott – Against
Cllr Evans – For
Cllr Fowler – For
Cllr Graves – Against
Cllr Hamilton – Against
Cllr Hobbs – Against
Cllr Hughes – For
Cllr D Johnson – For
Cllr T Johnson – For
Cllr Lintill – Against
Cllr Lishman – For
Cllr McAra – Against
Cllr Moss – For
Cllr Oakley – Against
Cllr O’Kelly – For
Cllr Page – Absent
Cllr Palmer – Against
Cllr Plant – Against
Cllr Plowman – Absent
Cllr Potter – Against
Cllr Purnell – Against
Cllr Rodgers – For
Cllr Sharp – For
Cllr Sutton – Against
Cllr Taylor – Against
Cllr Wilding - Against

Total – 14 For, 18 Against, 0 Abstain, 4 Absent

The amendment was not carried.

The results of the second recorded vote on the recommendations (as amended) were as follows:

Cllr Apel – Abstain
Cllr Bangert – Abstain
Cllr Barrett – Absent

Cllr Barrie – Absent
Cllr Bell – For
Cllr Bowden – Against
Cllr Briscoe – For
Cllr Brown – Against
Cllr Dignum – For
Cllr Duncton – For
Cllr Elliott – For
Cllr Evans – Against
Cllr Fowler – Abstain
Cllr Graves – For
Cllr Hamilton – For
Cllr Hobbs – For
Cllr Hughes – Abstain
Cllr D Johnson – Against
Cllr T Johnson – Against
Cllr Lintill – For
Cllr Lishman – Abstain
Cllr McAra – For
Cllr Moss – Against
Cllr Oakley – For
Cllr O’Kelly – Against
Cllr Page – Absent
Cllr Palmer – For
Cllr Plant – For
Cllr Plowman – Absent
Cllr Potter – For
Cllr Purnell – For
Cllr Rodgers – Against
Cllr Sharp – Against
Cllr Sutton – For
Cllr Taylor – For
Cllr Wilding - For

Total – 18 For, 9 Against, 5 Abstain, 4 Absent

The recommendation as amended was carried.

RESOLVED

1. That the following as submitted to and recommended by the Cabinet as the Budget for 2020-21 be approved:
 - a) The 2020-21 Net Revenue Budget in respect of the Council’s own services be approved at £14,235,800.
 - b) The 2020-21 Council Tax Requirement in respect of the Council’s own services be approved at £8,975,796.
 - c) That Council approve a Council Tax of £165.81 (Band D equivalent). This represents a £5.00 (3.11%) increase on the Band D charge.
 - d) That the uncommitted revenue budget of £521,800 be transferred to the General Fund Reserve to mitigate the deficit expected in 2021-22.

- e) That the capital programme, including the asset renewal programme (appendix 1c and 1d of the February Cabinet report) be approved.

2. That Council approve the Resolutions in Appendix A.

102 **Request for delegated authority - Carry forward requests**

The Chairman invited Mr Wilding to introduce the item and drew attention to the report which could be found on pages 23 to 25 of the Cabinet agenda for 3 March 2020. She confirmed that there were two recommendations to Council detailed on the agenda front sheet.

Mr Wilding explained that the report seeks permission for an update to be made the Council's Financial Regulations for the approval of budget carry forward requests. The current approval process for budget carry forward requests is now considered to be an inefficient use of both officer and member time as outlined in paragraph 3.1 of the report. It is proposed that the Council's Financial Regulations are updated to delegate authority for the approval of budget carry forward requests to the S151 Officer following consultation with the Chief Executive. These senior officers will scrutinise each request to ensure that there is a genuine reason for slippage on the budget and guarantee that the funds are used for the same purpose as was originally agreed by members when the budget was set. In order to maintain transparency of this new procedure with members, it is proposed that the details of all carry forwards agreed by the S151 officer are included in the Statement of Accounts outturn report considered annually by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee. This new approach will allow officers of the Council to manage the resources made available to them by members in a more efficient and effective way in order to deliver the Council priorities, and free up member time in Committees considering reports on topics that could be dealt with more efficiently by senior officers.

Mr Johnson asked whether given the Coronavirus outbreak members would have an option to decide whether to use the funds to mitigate any impact. Mr Ward explained that if the funds were to be used for a different purpose a report to Cabinet (or Council if over £100,000) would be required as per the Constitution. Mr Hobbs added that officers with delegated authority are held to account via the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.

Mr Wilding proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Mrs Lintill.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

1. That the Council's Financial Regulations are updated in order to delegate authority for the approval of budget carry forward requests to the Director of Corporate Services (the Council's S151 officer) following consultation with the Chief Executive.
2. To ensure transparency of budget carry forwards to members, the details of all carry forwards agreed by the S151 Officer to be included in the draft Statement of Accounts outturn report considered annually by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.

103 **Rough Sleeper Initiative Grant**

The Chairman invited Mrs Graves to introduce the item and drew attention to the report which could be found on pages 27 to 29 of the Cabinet agenda for 3 March 2020. She confirmed that there were two recommendations to Council detailed on the agenda front sheet.

Mrs Graves explained that the Strategy requires collaboration from central and local government as well as the local community. She confirmed that the council has received a total allocation of £230,465 to deliver rough sleeper services in Chichester. The Grant requires the funds to be spent on specific activities in line with the guidance. It is therefore proposed that funding be spent on the following:

- Retention of the Navigator post appointed by Stonepillow last year on a 12 month contract
- Retention of Lettings Officer post appointed by Stonepillow last year on a 12 month contract
- Additional staffing resources to extend the council's support of rough sleepers
- Extending the opening hours of Stonepillow's day services and hub
- A new Dual diagnosis Worker post to be appointed by Stonepillow

Mrs Graves proposed the recommendation which were seconded by Mrs Lintill.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

1. That Cabinet recommends to the Council that delegated authority is given to the Director of Housing and Communities, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing Services, to spend the Rough Sleeper Initiative (RSI) Grant set out in para 5.1 of the agenda report in accordance with the terms of the grant.
2. That Council accommodate receipt and spending of the Rough Sleeper Grant when considering the annual Budget Spending Plan report 2020-21.

104 Senior Staff Policy Statement

The Chairman invited Mr Wilding to introduce the item and drew attention to the report which could be found on pages 31 to 33 of the Cabinet agenda for 3 March 2020. She confirmed that there was one recommendation to Council detailed on the agenda front sheet.

Mr Wilding explained that each year the Council is required to publish a Pay Policy Statement as part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011. The statement must be agreed by Full Council. The intention of the statement is to ensure that as a public body the council is fully transparent in terms of our pay policies and levels of pay for senior staff. The Council publishes the Senior Pay Policy Statement (attached at Appendix A) and the associated appendices (1 to 9). Appendix 1 shows senior staff pay on 1 April 2020 and clarifies that during the last year the number of Directors has reduced from six to four with their responsibilities reallocated to the remaining Directors with an additional reduction in two Divisional Managers. In Appendix 6, relocation expenses have increased in line with CPI. The rest of the appendices remain unchanged since last year's report and so have not been included but they are available on the council's website.

Mr Wilding confirmed that the County Adaptions Manager role manages the Disabled Facilities Grants across West Sussex. The role is hosted by the council with the salary costs split across the West Sussex partnership.

Mr Wilding proposed the recommendation which were seconded by Mrs Lintill.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

That the Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement 2020-2021 be agreed for publication.

105 Tangmere Strategic Development Location - Chichester District Council (Tangmere) Compulsory Purchase Order 2020

The Chairman invited Mrs Taylor to introduce the item and drew attention to the report which could be found on pages 35 to 180 of the Cabinet agenda for 3 March 2020. She confirmed that there were four recommendations to Council detailed on the agenda front sheet.

Mrs Taylor explained that the current Local Plan makes provision for the delivery of 7,388 homes over the period 2012-2029. Of the 7,388 homes, 3,250 are to be provided at the Strategic Development Locations, the second largest of which at 1,000 dwellings at the Tangmere Strategic Development Location (TSDL). It represents approximately 14% of the total housing need for the Local Plan Area and 31% of the total housing need to be provided by the Strategic Development Locations. In addition the emerging Local Plan makes provision for 1,300.00 dwellings. Therefore delivery of the Tangmere TSDL is critical to delivery of the Council's housing target. The land comprises approximately 76 hectares and is shown coloured pink in Appendix 2. The site has been identified for residential development since 2010 and was formerly allocated for residential development since 2015 after adoption of the current Local Plan.

Mrs Taylor further explained that the land has a number of land owners and promoters. Despite the council being assured by the landowners and site promoters over the past ten years that there was progress in terms of commitment to jointly deliver the residential development and associated infrastructure there has been no material progress in terms of comprehensive delivery of the site. It is essential that development comes forward comprehensively in order to provide certainty over delivery of the infrastructure requirements for the planned residential development and to guarantee that such infrastructure be delivered in a cohesive and co-ordinated manner. Comprehensive development is also necessary if best and most efficient use is to be made of the TSDL. A piecemeal approach could render some parcels unviable, resulting in the risk that the TSDL fails to come forward in its entirety and fails to provide the necessary infrastructure required. By taking a piecemeal approach it is highly unlikely the TSDL would deliver the 1000 homes or the 1,300 homes in the emerging Local Plan. Paragraph 6.8 of the report sets out in greater detail the reasons why a piecemeal approach is inappropriate.

Mrs Taylor confirmed that as a result of the lack of progress the council has no alternative but to make use of the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) powers available to it and after a tender exercise appointed a development partner in 2018 and subsequently entered into a Development Agreement with Countryside Properties (UK) Limited on 5 February 2019. A Masterplan of the proposed development was presented to and endorsed by the

Planning Committee on 8 January 2020. Countryside are planning to submit a planning application for 1,300 dwellings in April 2020. Table 1 on page 48 sets out the current timetable for progress of the CPO.

Mrs Taylor added that although work is progressing on the CPO there will continue to be engagement with the landowners to provide for the possibility of voluntary agreements to enable comprehensive development of the site. However, due to the lack of progress with the owners and promoters of the site despite engagement over a ten year period the council considers that it has no alternative but to progress with the CPO as the TSDL is a major contributor to the delivery objectives of both the Local Plan and the emerging LP and to the contribution of the achievement of social, environmental and economic development and wellbeing of the community.

Mr Oakley referred to the 10 year period leading up to the proposed CPO. He then requested an amendment to recommendation 3 to ensure consultation with the Cabinet member and local member. Mrs Taylor explained that the site had first been promoted in 2010 with records of engagement however the time lapsed without any credible proposals being put forward. Mr Bennett added that the legal involvement had been extensive with specialist external legal advice, two internal solicitors and a barrister. He also advised caution regarding amending the recommendation which could carry unforeseen consequences. Both the Leader and Mrs Shepherd reassured Mr Oakley that the relevant members would be consulted at the appropriate times.

Mr Plowman requested a single outline plan for the site. Mrs Taylor explained that it would be a matter for the landowners and promoters. Mr Frost added that that the CPO route was a last resort as the landowners were given as long as possible. He expected a single outline planning application to come forward in April.

Mr Johnson requested clarification of whether any of the housing quotas could be absorbed within the Local Plan. Mr Frost explained that the site had already been allocated within the current Local Plan and is identified with up to 1300 homes in the emerging Local Plan.

Mr Potter questioned the length of time and the cost to the council and commented on whether the use of CPO was excessive. Mr Bennett confirmed that a CPO is a serious step for a council to take but referred members to the justifications set out in section 6 of the report.

Mrs Taylor proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Mrs Lintill.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

1. The Council authorises the use of Compulsory Purchase powers as set out in Section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to compulsorily acquire the Order Land identified within Appendix B, and in particular that the Council makes the Order;
2. The Director of Planning and the Environment be authorised to settle the final form and content of the Order and all associated documentation and take all action needed to pursue the Order and secure its confirmation;

3. The Director of Planning and the Environment be authorised to negotiate, agree terms and enter into agreements with interested parties including agreements for the withdrawal of objections or undertakings not to enforce the Order on specific terms including where appropriate removing land or rights from the Order or to request the modification of the Order by the Secretary of State;
4. The Director of Planning and the Environment be authorised to implement the Order powers following confirmation of the Order, and so acquire title to and/or take possession of the Order Land.

106 **Questions to the Executive**

The Chairman announced that due to the time taken on previous items on this occasion *Questions to the Executive* would be removed from the agenda.

107 **Late Items**

There were no late items.

108 **Exclusion of the press and public**

There was no requirement to exclude the press and the public.

The meeting ended at 6.51 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank