

# Public Document Pack

## JOHN WARD

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Democratic Services

Email: [democraticservices@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@chichester.gov.uk)

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

[www.chichester.gov.uk](http://www.chichester.gov.uk)



A meeting of the **Cabinet** will be held in The Assembly Room - The Council House (Chichester City Council), North Street, Chichester on **Tuesday 3 December 2019 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mrs E Lintill (Chairman), Mrs S Taylor (Vice-Chairman), Mr M Bell, Mr R Briscoe, Mrs N Graves, Mrs P Plant and Mr P Wilding

## AGENDA

### 1 Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman will make any specific announcements for this meeting and advise of any late items which due to special circumstances will be given urgent consideration under agenda item 10 b).

### 2 Approval of Minutes (Pages 1 - 10)

The Cabinet is requested to approve as a correct record the minutes of its meeting on Tuesday 5 November 2019.

### 3 Declarations of Interests

Members are requested to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests they might have in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.

### 4 Public Question Time

In accordance with Chichester District Council's scheme for public question time as amended by Full Council on 24 September 2019 the Cabinet will receive any questions which have been submitted by members of the public in writing by noon two working days before the meeting. Each questioner will be given up to three minutes to ask their question. The total time allocated for public question time is 15 minutes subject to the Chairman's discretion to extend that period.

## RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

### 5 Extending Ultrafast Public Connectivity (Pages 11 - 14)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and make the following resolutions and recommendation to Council:

1. That the Cabinet resolves to enter into an agreement with Cityfibre for an

extension of the Council's full fibre connectivity using the West Sussex County Council's framework using the seven year revenue model.

2. That the Cabinet delegates authority to the Director of Corporate Services and the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services the final approval of sites and contract detail.
3. That Cabinet recommends to Council to underwrite the cost of the contract and that any costs not met by the Business Rates Pool for 2019/20 up to a maximum of £743,000 over a seven year period starting no earlier than 2021.

## **6 Local Plan Review - Responses to Preferred Approach Consultation and Way Forward (Pages 15 - 28)**

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its appendices and make the following recommendations to the Council:

1. That:
  - a. the Summary of Representations included as Appendix 1 to this report is noted.
  - b. the proposed Council responses to the representations set out in that document are agreed, and
  - c. the Director of Planning and the Environment be authorised, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services, to make minor amendments to the Summary of Representations and Responses prior to its publication.
2. That the issues raised in the Summary of Representations document and the other relevant issues summarised in section 9 of this report are noted as key considerations for the ongoing production of the Local Plan.
3. That the programme of further technical work set out in section 11 of this report is endorsed.
4. That the implications for the distribution of development set out in section 12 of this report are endorsed, subject to further technical work and testing through Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment being completed.

## **7 Resurfacing, Improved Drainage and additional site enhancements at Westhampnett Depot (Pages 29 - 37)**

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its appendices and make the following resolutions and recommendations to the Council:

1. That Cabinet approves the inclusion of environmental and operational enhancements to the scheme set out section 5, subject to Council's approval of the additional costs.
2. That Cabinet approves the appointment of Contractor B for undertaking the resurfacing, improved drainage, environmental and operational enhancements and associated work at CCS Depot, and delegates authority to the Director of Corporate Services to conclude the detail of the contract following consultation with the Cabinet member for the Environment and

Contract Services.

3. That Cabinet recommends to Council to increase the budget from £592,000 to £850, 000, £650,000 funded from reserves and £200,000 from the Asset Replacement Programme. To enable the inclusion of additional works as set out in Section 5.

**Please note that the appendix to this report is part II on the grounds of exemption in Schedule 12A to the *Local Government Act 1972* namely Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.**

### **NON-EXEMPT KEY DECISION**

#### **8 Determination of the Council Tax Base 2020-2021 (Pages 39 - 46)**

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its appendices and in order to comply with section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 make the following resolutions:

1. No item of expenditure shall be treated as 'special expenses' for the purposes of section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
2. This resolution in (2.2) shall remain in force for the 2020-2021 financial year.
3. The calculation of the Chichester District Council's taxbase for the year 2020-2021 be approved.
4. The amounts calculated by Chichester District Council as its council taxbase be those set out in appendices 1 and 2 to this report.

### **OTHER DECISION**

#### **9 Disabled Facilities Grants - Staff Resources (Pages 47 - 49)**

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and make the following resolution:

That a Senior Environmental Health Officer (DFG Specialist) and two Specialist Housing Standards Officers are appointed to deliver the West Sussex Disabled Facilities Grants Policy 2020-24 within Chichester District to be funded from the Council's annual Disabled Facilities Grant funding.

#### **10 Late Items**

- a) Items added to the agenda papers and made available for public inspection
- b) Items which the chairman has agreed should be taken as matters of

urgency by reason of special circumstances to be reported at the meeting

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

The Cabinet is asked to consider in respect of agenda item 14 (Southern Gateway) and agenda item 15 (Proposed pre-let at St James Industrial Estate) whether the public including the press should be excluded from the meeting on the following ground of exemption in Schedule 12A to the *Local Government Act 1972* namely Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

(**Note:** The report and its appendices within this part of the agenda are attached for members of the Council and relevant only officers only and are printed on salmon paper)

### **EXEMPT RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

## 12 **Southern Gateway**

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its appendices and make the following recommendations to the Council (**please note the report and appendices will follow**):

1. Following “standstill” and dealing with any issues arising, and confirmation that WSCC have cleared their own governance processes, including call-in, that the Council select Developer A on Heads of Terms shown in Appendix 1 to deliver the Southern Gateway Masterplan regeneration project pursuant to the outcome of the Evaluation Report at Appendix 2 once matters of detail are finalised with the bidder.
2. On the assumption that Council approve the selection of Developer A that Cabinet:
  - 2.1. Delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive or the Director of Growth and Place, after consultation with the Strategic Leadership Team, the Leader and Cabinet Member for Growth, Place and Regeneration, (and the Growth Lead at WSCC assuming WSCC are a party to the agreement) to approve and execute the Development Agreement based on Heads of Terms.
  - 2.2. Approve the appointment of Jones Lang LeSalle and Browne Jacobson LLP to support the Council in the implementation of the project, funded from the cost undertaking to be entered into by the appointed development partner and/or the balance of One Public Estate (OPE) funding.
  - 2.3. Subject to the appointment of a development partner that the land owned by the District Council be formally declared surplus to requirements and be offered up to support the regeneration on the terms set out in paragraph 6 and to remove the land from the Councils parking order at the appropriate time.

2.4. Note that authorise officers will investigate a “Land equalisation” proposal and bring forward options to a future Cabinet.

2.5. That the District Council requests WSCC to and County officers agree a scheme of delegation that enables District Council officers as project lead to grant consents required on behalf of WSCC provided there is no financial detriment to WSCC.

### **EXEMPT KEY DECISION**

#### **13 St James Industrial Estate Chichester (Pages 51 - 56)**

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its appendix and make the following resolution:

Following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Growth, Place and Regeneration, the Director of Growth & Place be authorised to agree terms for a pre-let of space at St James Industrial Estate in accordance with the proposal set out in section 5 of the report.

### **NOTES**

- (1) The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any item of business wherever it is likely that there would be disclosure of ‘exempt information’ as defined in section 100A of and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.
- (2) The press and public may view the report appendices which are not included with their copy of the agenda on the Council’s website at [Chichester District Council - Minutes, agendas and reports](#) unless they contain exempt information.
- (3) Subject to the provisions allowing the exclusion of the press and public, the photographing, filming or recording of this meeting from the public seating area is permitted. To assist with the management of the meeting, anyone wishing to do this is asked to inform the chairman of the meeting of their intentions before the meeting starts. The use of mobile devices for access to social media is permitted, but these should be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting. Those undertaking such activities must do so discreetly and not disrupt the meeting, for example by oral commentary, excessive noise, distracting movement or flash photography. Filming of children, vulnerable adults or members of the audience who object should be avoided. [Standing Order 11.3 of Chichester District Council’s Constitution]
- (4) A key decision means an executive decision which is likely to:
  - result in Chichester District Council (CDC) incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the CDC’s budget for the service or function to which the decision relates or
  - be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards in the CDC’s area or
  - incur expenditure, generate income, or produce savings greater than £100,000

## **NON-CABINET MEMBER COUNCILLORS SPEAKING AT THE CABINET**

Standing Order 22.3 of Chichester District Council's Constitution provides that members of the Council may, with the Chairman's consent, speak at a committee meeting of which they are not a member, or temporarily sit and speak at the committee table on a particular item but shall then return to the public seating area.

The Leader of the Council intends to apply this standing order at Cabinet meetings by requesting that members should *normally* seek the Chairman's consent in writing by email in advance of the meeting. They should do this by noon on the Friday before the Cabinet meeting, outlining the substance of the matter that they wish to raise. The word normally is emphasised because there may be unforeseen circumstances where a member can assist the conduct of business by his or her contribution and where the Chairman would therefore retain their discretion to allow the contribution without the aforesaid notice.



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 2 - East Pallant House on Tuesday 5 November 2019 at 9.30 am

**Members Present** Mrs E Lintill (Chairman), Mrs S Taylor (Vice-Chairman), Mr M Bell, Mr R Briscoe, Mrs N Graves and Mr P Wilding

**Members Absent** Mrs P Plant

**In attendance by invitation**

**Officers Present** Mrs H Belenger (Divisional Manager for Financial Services), Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Ms M Burgoyne (Economic Development Manager), Mr M Catlow (Group Accountant (Technical and Exchequer)), Mrs L Grange (Divisional Manager for Housing), Miss L Higenbottom (Democratic Services Manager), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mrs V McKay (Divisional Manager for Growth), Mrs T Murphy (Divisional Manager for Place), Mrs K Neglia (Economic Development Planning Officer), Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services), Mrs E Reed (Environmental Housing Manager), Mrs M Rogers (Benefits Manager) and Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive)

## 58 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mrs Lintill greeted Chichester District Council (CDC) members and officers and the two press representatives who were present for this meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Plant.

## 59 **Approval of Minutes**

The Cabinet received the minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2019 which had been circulated with the agenda.

There were no proposed changes to the minutes.

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 1 October 2019 be approved.

60     **Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

61     **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted.

62     **Determination of Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2020 - 2021**

Mr Wilding introduced the item. He explained that the Welfare Reform Act and Local Government Finance Acts of 2012 abolished the national Council Tax Benefit (CTB) scheme and a framework for local authorities to create their own local Council Tax Reduction (CTR) schemes was put in place from 1 April 2013. The council has been operating a CTR scheme for the last seven years and it is proposed to keep the scheme unchanged for the eighth year with the exception of alterations that bring the scheme in line with changes to legislation which have already occurred within the Housing Benefit scheme. These changes include the uprating of premiums, personal allowances and deductions. Mr Wilding confirmed that the council's main aim remains to maintain levels of support to the least well off in its communities by maintaining levels of support which existed prior to April 2013 when localised CTR commenced. He explained that the council is one of a small number of councils that continues to provide a CTR scheme with up to a maximum award of 100%.

Mrs Lintill commented on the positive impact for local communities in maintaining the reduction scheme.

*Decision*

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the recommendation below.

**RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL**

That the proposed Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2020-2021 be approved.

63     **Financial Strategy and Plan 2020-21 to 2024-25**

Mr Wilding introduced the item. He explained that the report updates the Financial Strategy and Plan for 2020/21 and creates the framework for how the council's budget and council tax is set which will be considered by the Cabinet in February 2020. The 2020/21 financial strategy is set in the context of current political uncertainty and the continuing expectation of reduced central government funding for local government. The major changes that were expected to come in from the 2020-21 settlement have been delayed by a year, so now the 2020-21 settlement will be for one year only. Due to the delay the council will retain the business rates growth achieved so far for one year longer than anticipated. Much of the council's other income remains dependent on the local economy and is therefore less predictable.



Mr Wilding outlined Appendix 1 which describes the council's key priorities, one of which is to manage its finances prudently and effectively. He explained that the financial strategy is linked to this specific priority along with the council's key financial principles that underpin the Council's financial planning approach. Appendix 2 outlines the updated 5 Year Financial Model, reflecting the consolidated budget from the service areas, central government funding and the most up-to-date estimates for the wider council activities. There are a number of estimates contained within the Model including the assumption of a 2% increase in council tax each year. However, Mr Wilding explained that low taxing local authorities like Chichester District Council may be allowed to set a £5 increase in council tax. The final decision on the council tax rates will be made by Full Council in March 2020.

Mr Wilding then referred to the assumptions relating to pensions, West Sussex County Council cuts and the New Homes Bonus scheme and how it is likely that the Financial Model will continue to evolve. He then outlined Appendix 3 which sets out the anticipated resources position of reserves and assets in the medium term and confirmed that the capital programme remains affordable without the need to borrow.

It was also noted that the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee (CGAC) had recommended a minimum level of reserves at £6.3 million to provide flexibility in managing the council's financial risks.

Mrs Taylor commented that the report illustrates prudent management of the council's resources. Mr Briscoe added that it illustrates a good use of investments.

Mrs Lintill congratulated officers involved in the report. She emphasised that the 5 Year Model remains fluid. She requested clarification on the new cost pressures against benefit administration reduction referring to the figures £0 for 2019/20 and £400,000 for 2020/21. Mrs Belenger explained that the figures reflect the change in housing benefit repayment recovery as fewer claimants are overpaid due to various initiatives, which creates a smaller recovery base. Mr Ward added that if a claimant is overpaid the council receives subsidy payment for the claimant and in addition if the council is successful in recouping the overpayment that can also be retained. He explained that changes impacting the retained income were a one off. Mrs Belenger added that the introduction of Universal Credit had also resulted in a smaller caseload.

### *Decision*

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the recommendations below.

### **RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL**

1. That the key financial principles and actions of the five year Financial Strategy set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report be approved.
2. That the current five year Financial Model detailed in appendix 2 and the Resources Statement in appendix 3 to the agenda report be noted.

3. That, having considered the recommendations from the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee, the Minimum Level of the General Fund Reserves is set at £6.3 million.

#### 64 **Disabled Facilities Grants Policy 2020 - 2024**

Mrs Graves introduced the item. She explained that the Disabled Facilities Grant is a mandatory grant which was introduced to enable disabled persons on low income to live independently. The funds can be used for wet rooms, stair lifts, ramps, kitchen adaptations and extensions to a maximum of £30,000. In 2015 the management of funds changed so funding was no longer provided by central government and instead comes from a larger pooled *Better Care* fund managed by West Sussex County Council. In September 2017 the Cabinet agreed a more flexible way of using the funds in order to reach the greatest number of residents. Subsequently the local district and borough councils have collaborated to produce the new *Disabled Facilities Grants Policy*. The new Policy provides a more consistent approach across the county and offers disabled residents a package of grants to reduce hospital stays, provide a safe, warm home and help to move to a more suitable property. Mrs Graves explained that the Policy is pioneering based on the research carried out which indicates that there are no other policies of this type.

Mrs Taylor supported the Policy and indicated the positive impact of assisting more residents to recover from hospital in their own home.

Mr Briscoe and Mrs Lintill requested clarification relating to recommendation two and how amendments will be agreed my multi agencies. Mrs Reed confirmed that the County Adaptations Manager would be responsible for negotiating amendments with all parties. Mrs Shepherd added that if in the unlikely event that one authority fundamentally disagreed with a proposal it would be their choice whether to continue with the partnership or work independently. Mrs Shepherd then confirmed that all the local authorities involved would need to seek Cabinet approval in order for the Policy to commence from 1 April 2020.

#### *Decision*

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions below.

#### **RESOLVED**

1. That the proposed West Sussex Disabled Facilities Grant Policy 2020 to 2024 contained in Appendix 1 to the report be approved.
2. That delegated powers be approved to the Divisional Manager for Housing Services, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, to make amendments and updates to the policy.

#### 65 **Appointment to Panels and Outside Bodies**

Mr Bennett was invited to introduce the item. He explained that the recommendations follow the recent changes to the Cabinet Portfolio holders responsibilities.

### *Decision*

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions below.

#### **RESOLVED**

1. That Cllr Peter Wilding replaces Cllr Norma Graves as Chairman of the Joint Employee Consultative Panel.
2. That Cllr Martyn Bell replaces Cllr Tony Dignum on the Chichester Vision Steering Group.

#### **66 2019-2020 Treasury Management half yearly update**

Mr Wilding introduced the item. He explained that the 2019-2020 Treasury Management half yearly update represents a summary of the council's treasury activity for the six months ending 30 September 2019. The update includes a summary of the council's investment portfolio at 30 September 2019 including the split between short term and long term investments and the increase in treasury funds under management over the first half of the year to £82 million. He explained that the position reversed in December due to the fall in the number of local taxation receipts in February and March.

Mr Wilding then referred to how a number of significant short term investments have yielded a low rate of interest. He drew attention to Table 2 which details the external pooled funds with further details highlighted in Appendix A. Although there was a fall of £377,000 in fair value of the investments to the end of September due to initial transaction costs related to the local authority property fund, the income generated from the investments over the same period totalled approximately £2 million. Mr Wilding clarified that the £377,000 therefore remains a notional figure unless the council chooses to dispose of any of the investments. It is anticipated that there will be further investment in external pool funds of up to £17 million following careful consideration by officers and financial guidance from the council's advisors Arlingclose. The investments will include:

- Increasing the Multi Asset Funds from £3.65 million to a maximum £10 million
- £5 million in the UK Equity Fund
- Increasing the Corporate Bond Fund from £4.3 million to £10 million
- Maintaining the £10 million in the Local Authority Property Fund

Mr Wilding emphasised that the investments offer an opportunity to generate a significant additional income to support front line services. He then drew attention to Section 9 which outlines the latest economic forecast which remains dependent on the wider global economy.

Mrs Lintill gave her support to further investment.

It was noted that no concerns or recommendations had been raised by the CGAC.

### *Decision*

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolution below.

### **RESOLVED**

That the Cabinet reviews and notes the summary of treasury management activities and performance for the six months to 30 September 2019.

### **67 Economic Development Strategy and Inward Investment & Growth Strategy**

Mr Bell introduced the item. He explained the two strategies for consideration; the Economic Development Strategy and the Inward Investment & Growth Strategy. A number of aspects of the current strategy remain relevant and have therefore been included in addition to some new aims. The strategies also outline the council's links with Coast to Capital and West Sussex County Council. Within the Economic Development Strategy key priority areas such as supporting the high street, supporting growth orientated businesses and making the most of the districts natural assets are included. Mr Bell emphasised that the strategies are high level documents and further detailed action plans would follow.

Ms Burgoyne confirmed that the Economic Development Annual Service Plan will consider the action points raised.

Mrs Lintill invited Mr Plowman to the table following a request to speak on the item. Mr Plowman noted the impact of Brexit on the district and requested consideration be given to a flexible approach for the future. He also referenced car parking but acknowledged that he would discuss that further in the next item.

Mr Briscoe and Mrs Graves gave their support to the strategies.

With reference to page 85 Mrs Taylor requested clarification of the abbreviation SEP. Ms Burgoyne confirmed that it stands for Strategic Economic Plan.

Mr Bell clarified that Chichester, Midhurst, Petworth and Selsey high streets were all included in the Strategy. He also supported the inclusion of references to horticulture.

Mrs Lintill noted the opportunity to work positively in partnership with other organisations and local authorities.

Mr Briscoe emphasised the importance of acknowledging the districts heritage.

Mrs Lintill requested clarification of the timescale for the action plans. Ms Burgoyne confirmed that work will start on the Service Action plans in January.

### *Decision*

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolution below.

## **RESOLVED**

That the adoption of the Economic Development Strategy (appendix 1) and Inward Investment & Growth Strategy (appendix 2) in accordance with the proposal set out in section 5 of this report.

### **68 Parking Proposals and Off-street Parking Charges**

Mrs Lintill explained that she would allow Mr Moss, Mr Plowman and Mrs Sharp to speak but reminded members that the report requests agreement to go out to consultation on car parking charges rather than agreement to make the changes to car parking charges.

Mr Bell then introduced the item. He drew attention to the first recommendation which should refer to section 5.1 of the report rather than section 6.1 of the report. He explained that changes are being proposed to some of the council's car parks from 1 April 2020 in order to help balance demand for parking across the districts car parks. The proposals have been discussed by the Chichester District Council Parking Forum. Following a two year freeze on pay and display prices it is proposed that some charges will remain the same for a further two years whilst others would change as follows:

- Free of charge evening charges to remain the same.
- Parking to remain free all days and hours in Crossfield, Fernhurst, Sylvia Beaufoy in Petworth, Florence Park in Chichester and Selsey Marine and East Beach Selsey from 1 November and 31 March each year.
- Free of charge periods in the rural car parks in Midhurst, Petworth, Selsey and East Wittering to remain in place.
- A 3% increase to pay and display tariffs in line with inflation.
- Little London and Baffins Lane car parks in Chichester subject to a greater increase.
- Discounted season tickets to be frozen for two years in the city.
- Rural season tickets to be increased; £17.50 to £20 per month in Bosham and £15 to £17.50 per month for other rural car parks.

Mr Bell then proposed an amendment to the first recommendation to add the suggestion of a £2 per hour rate for both Little London and Baffins Lane car parks in Chichester to the consultation. By example an hour in Little London would cost £2 and three hours would cost £6. Mrs Taylor seconded the proposal.

Mrs Murphy explained that the consultation process would involve notices in all car parks, notices in the press and information on the council's website. In addition officers will write to all key stakeholders. She explained that a two year period would be most effective for the facilitation and operation of the car parks. She drew attention to the agenda pack which details the options considered by the Chichester District Parking Forum as well as comparisons from other local authorities.

Mrs Murphy then explained the request to consolidate all the current Parking Orders in to one document as all changes since 2012 have been added to the Order as amendments. She confirmed that it is a legal requirement for the council to have a

Parking Order. The Parking Order provides clarity to customers and is also used when considering appeals against Penalty Charge Notices.

Mrs Lintill then invited Mr Moss to the table following a request to speak on the item. Mr Moss raised concerns relating to the Chichester District Parking Forum meeting and the number of people missing from that meeting. He also explained that he felt that not all new members had been fully consulted in the process. He further explained reservations about the proposals and whether they provide enough of a progressive approach. He referenced the idea of incentive parking to encourage visitors to stay for longer. He confirmed that he supported the changes to car parks such as Little London but felt it could go further. He then suggested taking the proposals back for further work.

Mrs Lintill then invited Mr Plowman to the table following a request to speak on the item. Mr Plowman referred to competition of other local shopping areas and the Chichester out of town shopping area which has free parking. He then explained the figures for footfall in Chichester high street and confirmed that compared with the UK average decrease 3% year on year Chichester has a year on year decrease of 19%. He asked the Cabinet to consider maintaining the prices for Chichester car parks in order not to discourage visitors. With regard to the evening economy he confirmed that the footfall in Chichester had increased by 24%. He then requested removing the evening charges for Chichester Festival Theatre and New Park car parks.

Mrs Lintill then invited Mrs Sharp to the table following a request to speak on the item. Mrs Sharp asked whether the Cabinet felt that the changes to car parking charges were enough to encourage people onto sustainable transport such as buses. She then asked whether a workplace parking levy could be considered.

With regard to the consultation Mrs Murphy clarified the timescales and explained that they currently enable officers to go out to consultation, bring back results to the Cabinet and then facilitate any amendments to signage and machines within the car parks. She emphasised that the timescales had been thought through to allow all required tasks to take place.

With regard to evening charges Mrs Murphy confirmed that two car parks charge Monday to Saturday for two hours between 6pm and 8pm. The proposal is not to extend the charges to other car parks. Mrs Murphy then explained that the principal is that the user pays for parking and the car park should therefore be able to cover its cost.

With regard to setting the charges Mrs Murphy confirmed that user patterns and behaviours are analysed.

In response to the suggestion of a workplace parking levy Mrs Murphy outlined how a number of reduced price parking season tickets are available which respond to feedback from local businesses. A park and ride scheme has been considered and continues to be run over the Christmas period. In the longer term the Parking Strategy is being reviewed.

With regard to the wider economic impact of parking charges Mrs Hotchkiss explained that the dwell time of visitors in the city's car parks is on the increase. With regard to reducing car use in the city she outlined how there are opportunities around events where visitors could be encouraged via incentives to park in car parks further out of the city. This would not only reduce the congestion caused by the queues to get into the central car parks but could also mitigate against some of the environmental impact of queuing cars.

With regard to the attendance at the Chichester District Parking Forum Mrs Hotchkiss confirmed that there were business representatives from Chichester BID, Petworth and Selsey in addition to a number of representatives from local community groups, members and officers.

Mrs Hotchkiss explained that there are a number of initiatives to target the reduction in footfall in the city centre and to generally encourage more visitors to the high street.

Mrs Hotchkiss then reminded members that if there were to be significant changes to the proposals the council's 5 Year Financial Strategy would be impacted.

Mr Bell then referred to the roadworks across the city centre over the last few weeks and whether that had any impact on visitor numbers.

Mrs Shepherd suggested that the appropriate forums for a number of the ideas raised would be as part of the upcoming review and setting of the council's priorities and the upcoming review of the Parking Strategy.

Mr Briscoe noted the cost of running and maintaining car parks as there has already been a two year price freeze.

Mrs Graves noted her support of the consultation.

Mr Wilding requested clarification on whether the free period of parking would remain in Midhurst and Petworth. He suggested considering the impact on the Grange, Midhurst if it was not.

Mrs Lintill then invited Mr Oakley to the table. Mr Oakley as a West Sussex County (WSCC) Councillor confirmed that the roadworks on Spitafeld Lane had commenced after the Goodwood events and would be finished prior to the main Christmas build up. With regards to the WSCC city wide parking management plan Mr Oakley confirmed that it would be out to consultation in the new year.

Mr Briscoe with reference to agenda item 10 drew attention to the fact that businesses had not included parking charges in their list of concerns.

### *Decision*

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions below.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the proposal be approved as set out in 5.1 of this report to increase car parking charges with the additional amendment of a £2 per hour rate for both Little London and Baffins Lane car parks, which subject to consultation responses be implemented from 1 April 2020 for a two year period.
2. That the Director of Growth and Place be authorised to give appropriate notice of any revised charges or changes as set out within this report pursuant to the Off-street Parking Places (Consolidation) Order 2018 and Road Traffic Act 1984.
3. That the consolidation of all Parking Orders since 2012 into one document be approved. This document will further clarify the provision for electric payments and the exemption from daily charges for Blue Badge holders (with the exception of Pay on Foot parking) which subject to consultation be implemented from 1 April 2020.

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

There was no requirement to exclude the press or public.

### **70 Late Items**

There were no late items.

The meeting ended at 10.51 am

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date:



**Chichester District Council**

**Cabinet**

**3 December 2019**

**Extending Ultrafast Public Connectivity**

**1. Contacts**

**Report Author:**

Joe Mildred – Divisional Manager Business Support  
Telephone: 01243 53728 E-mail: [jmildred@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:jmildred@chichester.gov.uk)

**Cabinet Member:**

Peter Wilding - Cabinet Member for Corporate Services  
Telephone: 01428 707324 E-mail: [pwilding@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:pwilding@chichester.gov.uk)

**2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the Cabinet resolves to enter into an agreement with Cityfibre for an extension of the Council's full fibre connectivity using the West Sussex County Council's framework using the seven year revenue model.**
- 2.2 That the Cabinet delegates authority to the Director of Corporate Services and the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services the final approval of sites and contract detail.**
- 2.3 That Cabinet recommends to Council to underwrite the cost of the contract and that any costs not met by the Business Rates Pool for 2019/20 up to a maximum of £743,000 over a seven year period starting no earlier than 2021.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1** In order for us to take advantage of new technologies, get future-ready and not be left behind the Council needs infrastructure that can compete with other economies at home and internationally. We need reliability, speed, high capacity, high density and resilient networks that unlock new ways of living and working for residents, businesses, visitors and public services.
- 3.2** In September 2017, Cabinet agreed to join a countywide project, led by the County Council to roll out ultrafast broadband to some of the Council's buildings. In May 2018 West Sussex County Council (WSCC) awarded a contract for gigabit capable dark fibre infrastructure. Network construction is completed in Chichester and Midhurst and nearing its end in the rest of West Sussex with an expected go live date of early 2020.
- 3.3** We have continued to work with WSCC and the other West Sussex Districts and Boroughs to maximise the benefits of gigabit-capable full fibre across our areas and our operations.

- 3.4** In addition to this proposal to increase connectivity to the Council's assets within Chichester, the Council is also working on a rural project with WSCC and Horsham DC to deliver a new spine providing backhaul which will enable the ability to roll out better connectivity in the surrounding rural areas. A separate report will come back on this project at a later date.

#### **4. Outcomes to be Achieved**

- 4.1** Extending the number of public sector assets connected to a dark fibre network will enable ultra-fast connectivity to support the transformation of services delivered within the city, whether they be through the delivery of traditional council services or innovative new services to the public such as public Wi-Fi.
- 4.2** Increasing the amount of gigabit capable fibre within the city will enable it to be future-ready, ensuring that it is not left behind. Signalling our commitment to full fibre as an ambition for Chichester and the wider county also increases the likelihood of accelerating the investment from commercial organisations to lead to a roll out of fibre to the premise. This would enable homes and businesses to realise the benefits of ultra-fast connectivity.

#### **5. Proposal**

- 5.1** The original Gigabit contract with Cityfibre allowed for call offs under the existing procurement arrangement. The Everything Connects working group, which consists of all District and Borough Councils within West Sussex along with WSCC, has developed a joint approach to a further provision of dark fibre. Worthing and Adur have already agreed to roll out connectivity to additional assets and Horsham, Crawley and Arun councils are all currently in the process of seeking approval to do so. The proposal from Cityfibre covers Chichester, Bognor Regis and Littlehampton and CDC will be working closely with Arun District Council to ensure the benefits are realised.
- 5.2** 50 public sector assets within Chichester would be connected to the dark fibre network. The final site list is to be agreed from a long list and it is proposed that the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and the Director of Corporate Services are delegated the authority to agree the final list of assets to be connected.
- 5.3** The potential benefits of this project will be realised by those who use public services within Chichester, as well as residents, businesses and visitors to Chichester. This project does not extend beyond Chichester city, however surrounding areas are likely to benefit over time.
- 5.4** The proposed timescales are that design and build work would start in 2020, with the first sites being completed in late 2021 with completion expected in late 2022. The project will be managed by Cityfibre and the seven year payment period will not commence until 90% of the sites have been connected and handed over.
- 5.5** After seven years, the council will review its requirement for connected assets and renegotiate a contract with the option to extend including a minimum of a 10% reduction in ongoing costs included in the contract.

## **6. Alternatives Considered**

- 6.1** An alternative commercial model option was offered by City Fibre which set a term of 30 years and required an upfront investment of £1.35m with minimal on-going monthly payments giving a total cost of £1.5m. The seven year model is preferred as it enables us to review the requirement of connected assets in light of the inevitable developments in digital infrastructure in around ten years' time.
- 6.2** Independently of this public sector network build, it is hoped that suppliers would invest commercially in Fibre to the premise in Chichester as the market develops further. It is our expectation that suppliers will view Chichester as a forward thinking city with a digital agenda and one that would welcome accelerated commercial roll out of full fibre. If this is the case, the project would seek to minimise disruption and align civil engineering works if there is an opportunity to do so.
- 6.3** In any event, Government has made the commitment that national gigabit coverage will take place by 2033. However, there is no guarantee on timescales and there is a risk that Chichester and the Council would miss out on opportunities to improve and transform services in the medium term.

## **7. Resource and Legal Implications**

- 7.1** The total cost of the project is £743,000 and the council is asked to underwrite this cost. The countywide business rate retention pilot pool for 2019/20 focusses on digital infrastructure and this project is included on the list of potential projects for the pooled fund to support. Although as yet we do not have approval to fund this project from the pool funding is likely to be confirmed in early 2020. Any contribution agreed from the 2019/20 business rates pool will lessen the overall costs for the Council.
- 7.2** Future projects to maximise the benefit of the improved connectivity will come back to Cabinet and Council with individual business cases as the opportunities develop.
- 7.3** Some support is likely to be provided by the WSCC Digital Infrastructure Team. At this stage no additional staffing resources are requested however some project management resource for CDC may be required once the project is underway.

## **8. Consultation**

- 8.1** This project was taken to Council on 22 January this year as an Initial Project Proposal Document with the title 'Expanding the Gigabit project to achieve a 'lit up' city'.
- 8.2** Close working with the other councils within the county is ongoing through the Everything Connects working group as well as the County Chief Executives and Leaders groups who oversee the governance of the Business Rates Retention Pool pilot.

## 9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1 The key risk arising from this project is supplier design and build delays, however Chichester and the other D&B's should benefit from Adur & Worthing experiences and with close monitoring and lessons learnt from CityFibre this should be minimal.

## 10. Other Implications

<b>Are there any implications for the following?</b> If you tick "Yes", list your impact assessment as a background paper in paragraph 13 and explain any major risks in paragraph 9		
	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>		
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b> Improved digital connectivity has the potential to aid the reduction of carbon through the use of technology to avoid travel.	x	
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b>		x
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>		x
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		x
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>		x
<b>Other</b> (please specify)		

## 11. Appendices

None

## 12. Background Papers

Gigabit West Sussex Districts and Boroughs - 5 September 2017

Initial Project Proposals 2019- 2020 – Council 22 January 2019

**Chichester District Council**

**Cabinet**

**3 December 2019**

**Local Plan Review - Responses to Preferred Approach  
Consultation and Way Forward**

**Contacts**

**Report Author:**

Toby Ayling – Divisional Manager Planning Policy  
Telephone: 01243 521050 E-mail: [tayling@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:tayling@chichester.gov.uk)

**Cabinet Member:**

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Planning Services  
Telephone: 01243 514034 E-mail: [sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk)

**1. Executive Summary**

This report sets out the representations received to the Local Plan Preferred Approach consultation and reports on the consultation arrangements themselves. It advises on other relevant issues and the requirement of the Council to deliver sustainable development. It sets out a range of work to be undertaken in response to inform the Local Plan Review and seeks Member endorsement of the proposed approach.

**2. Recommendation**

**That Cabinet recommends to Council:**

**1. That:**

- a. the Summary of Representations included as Appendix 1 to this report is noted.
  - b. the proposed Council responses to the representations set out in that document are agreed, and
  - c. the Director of Planning and the Environment be authorised, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services, to make minor amendments to the Summary of Representations and Responses prior to its publication.
2. That the issues raised in the Summary of Representations document and the other relevant issues summarised in section 9 of this report are noted as key considerations for the ongoing production of the Local Plan.
  3. That the programme of further technical work set out in section 11 of this report is endorsed.
  4. That the implications for the distribution of development set out in section 12 of this report are endorsed, subject to further technical work and testing

**through Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment being completed.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 On 20 November 2018, Council approved the publication of the Preferred Approach document along with supporting documents for an 8 week period of public consultation.
- 3.2 The Local Plan Review: Preferred Approach document and supporting material was the subject of public consultation from 13 December 2018 until 7 February 2019. The purpose of the consultation was to seek views on the Council's proposals for strategic development locations for new homes, employment and other uses, and essential infrastructure, a set of area based strategic policies and the detailed strategic delivery policies designed to provide the policy framework for the emerging draft Local Plan Review.
- 3.3. The Local Plan Review: Preferred Approach document included sections on:
- The overall strategy;
  - An overarching vision and strategic objectives for how the Chichester plan area should evolve over the plan period;
  - A set of visions for the three sub areas identified in the strategy
  - The housing requirement for the plan period;
  - Proposed locations for housing, a settlement hierarchy and development strategy
  - Area-based strategic delivery policies.
- 3.4 The consultation documents consisted of five components:
- A key policies consultation document: Draft Local Plan Review 2016-2035 Preferred Approach. This document sets out the overall strategy; area based strategic policies and strategic delivery policies for the Local Plan area. The introduction to the document explained what the consultation was about, how to get involved and what happens next;
  - A schedule of proposed changes to the Policies Map.
  - An initial Sustainability Appraisal. This document included an assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of options for policies considered against the sustainability objectives;
  - A Habitats Regulations Assessment to consider the implications of the Plan on sensitive designated ecological assets;
  - A range of supporting evidence studies covering a range of topics, including transport, infrastructure requirements, landscape sensitivity, water quality and capacity, and housing and employment land requirements.
- 3.5 The Local Plan Review: Preferred Approach was prepared taking account of the matters raised in the Issues and Options consultation undertaken in the summer of 2017, the input of officers in other relevant services within the Council and meetings of the Council's Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel.

### **4. Purpose of this report**

- 4.1 The purpose of this report is to advise members of the outcomes of the public consultation on the Chichester Local Plan Review Preferred Approach document under

Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012; to update Members on relevant government announcements on planning; and to seek Member endorsement for the way forward for the Local Plan Review.

## 5. Consultation

5.1 The following measures were undertaken to publicise the Local Plan Review: Preferred Approach consultation:

- a) Advance notification of the Preferred Approach consultation was placed in a special pull out (which set out key issues) included in the Council magazine **Initiatives**, which is delivered to all addresses in the District.
- b) Publication of the evidence base and background papers on the **Council's website** with consultation responses invited via the online consultation portal, via email or in writing;
- c) **Specific contact** of statutory bodies, including parish councils, neighbouring local authorities, Natural England, Highways England, Historic England and the Environment Agency;
- d) **Local press releases** in all newspapers within the District, and a formal notice in the Chichester Observer;
- e) Direct contact of all parties currently on the **Planning Policy consultation database** (this includes all statutory consultees, agents, developers and interest groups, as well as residents); and
- f) Features on the **Council's social media accounts** (Facebook and Twitter);
- g) **Publicity materials including posters, leaflets and postcards** were distributed to Members, Parish Councils and to a variety of locations around the plan area.
- h) freestanding banners were displayed in the **reception at East Pallant House** for the duration of the consultation.
- i) **Parish Councils were invited to meetings** with officers at East Pallant House.
- j) The Planning Policy Divisional Manager attended **Local Community Forums** to talk in detail about the Local Plan Review and answer questions.
- k) The Planning Policy Team held **10 public exhibitions** around the plan area, where Officers were able to provide information about the Local Plan review and answer questions from the public. A total of over 800 people attended these events.
- l) In addition, paper copies of the main consultation materials were made available at the following **libraries** (Chichester, Selsey, and Southbourne) and the **District Offices and the South Downs National Park Authority Offices** (Midhurst) including access to computers to allow public internet access. A copy of the Local Plan Review: Preferred Approach along with response forms was also sent to all **community centres**.

## 6. Effectiveness of the consultation

- 6.1 As the Local Plan Review progresses it is important to assess the effectiveness of the process, to evaluate performance and see if improvements can be made to how consultation is undertaken.
- 6.2 In total, just over 3200 representations were made by 729 respondents to the Preferred Approach. This is an increase on the 2221 representations made in response to the Issues and Options consultation held in 2017. However, by comparison the Adopted Local Plan Preferred Approach Consultation (i.e., the previous Local Plan Review at a comparable stage) produced a total of 4968 responses from 868 consultees. Therefore the level of response, though broadly in line with previous experience, is low as a proportion of the Chichester District population (less than 1% of 2018 Mid-Year Estimates).
- 6.3 Achieving high levels of engagement with planning policy matters is often a challenge, and this is not an issue unique to Chichester District. It should also be noted that high levels of response are not an indicator that people are content with a consultation document. Looking at the publicity measures set out in section 5 above, it is considered that no obvious publicity opportunities were missed, though further consideration will be given to this matter.
- 6.4 Nonetheless, the numbers of respondent could be higher and it is important when considering future rounds of consultation that efforts are made to ensure that the process of making representations is as easy as possible.
- 6.5 Further consideration will be given to the use of more accessible materials, such as executive summaries and “key points” documents, to make it easier for the public to engage with the Plan process going forward.

## 7. Outcomes of the consultation

- 7.1 Part One of the Preferred Approach Plan contained 32 Strategic Policies and 15 Strategic Allocations. Part Two set out 35 detailed Development Management Policies. In addition, a document set out proposed changes to the policies map and a Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment were also published. The broad breakdown of consultation responses was as follows –

**Table 1: Consultation responses received to  
Local Plan Review Preferred Approach consultation**

	Representations	Support	Object	Comment
Part 1	2742	389	1444	909
Part 2	401	92	136	173
Appendices to document	25	1	12	12
Sustainability Appraisal	17	0	2	15
Policies Map	20	4	6	10
Habitats Regulations Assessment	3	0	0	3



- 7.2 The consultation portal, available on the Council's website at <https://chichester.jdi-consult.net/localplan/> sets out a web-based version of the Plan which includes all the comments made in response. In addition, summaries of all representations have been prepared and are also available on the council's website at <https://www.chichester.gov.uk/article/30923/Preferred-approach---consultation-December-2018>.
- 7.3 To enable the way forward for the Local Plan Review to be considered, a document summarising the representations received to Part One (strategic policies and allocations) follows at Appendix 1 of this report. The document includes proposed responses made to the Strategic Policies and Strategic Allocations in the Preferred Approach. A similar document concerning the remaining representations (detailed Development Management Policies and other comments) will follow in due course, and full consideration of all representations received will inform any final decisions on the Plan –but this approach enables the main strategic issues to be considered first.
- 7.4 In terms of the number of representations received, the following strategic policies and allocations of the Preferred Approach Plan received the most responses –
- Policy S3: Development Strategy (117 responses), Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs (127 responses), Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements (203 responses), Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility (194 responses), Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (194 responses) and Policy AL11: Hunston Parish (145 responses).

## 8. Issues Raised

- 8.1 Significant issues raised in the representations include the following:
- Concerns over the **high levels of housing development** proposed. Many respondents questioned the need for the scale of housing, or questioned whether it was sustainable or possible to deliver the number of homes set out in the preferred approach document.
  - Concerns over the **Development Strategy**, including the focus on the east-west corridor.
  - Concerns regarding the impact of development upon sensitive landscapes within and adjacent to the Plan area, the **Chichester Harbour AONB** and the **South Downs National Park**.
  - Concerns over **traffic congestion**, and in particular the known issues on the A27.
  - Concerns regarding the **capacity of schools, health facilities and other infrastructure** to meet existing needs and future growth
  - Concerns over the suitability, sustainability and capacity of Strategic Allocations and Parish** requirements to deliver the levels of development needed.
- 8.2 These and other significant issues raised in the representations are outlined in this report. Members should, however, review the full schedule of representations set out in the accompanying summary document and consider the draft Council responses to them. The intention is for the document, subject to any minor amendments to include legibility and give greater clarity on links to ongoing technical work, to be placed on the Council's website.

## 9. Other Relevant Issues

9.1 Since the publication of the Preferred Approach Plan there have been a number of relevant developments including;

a) Climate Emergency

In July 2019 the Council declared a Climate Emergency. The Council's Environment Panel is now working on developing a detailed action plan to address climate change, and there is a need to ensure that the implications of climate change and the UK's net zero carbon target are embedded in the Local Plan review.

b) Changes to national planning policy and guidance

Earlier this year changes to the National Planning Policy Framework were confirmed, including the approach to assessing local housing need, and subsequent changes to national planning practice guidance have been made, which provide additional detail on aspects such as climate change, appropriate assessment, assessing the deliverability of sites and water quality and supply. This guidance, along with other Government initiatives such as the emerging *National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England* will need to be reflected as appropriate in the ongoing technical work for the Local Plan Review.

c) Uncertainty over the A27 bypass

The discussions regarding strategic improvements to the A27 are ongoing. West Sussex County Council, with input from Chichester District Council, has written to Highways England asking that the A27 Chichester scheme is included in Road Investment Strategy 2 with sufficient scope and flexibility to progress proposals. Whilst these discussions continue it is essential that the Council continues to progress its local plan. The developing evidence base on the costs and deliverability of the works to deliver the A27 mitigation scheme that is necessary to enable traffic arising from the housing and employment growth expected to be identified in the Local Plan Review is relevant to the broader discussion regarding the more long term future of the A27 and the Plan will need to address the present uncertainty on that issue.

## 10 Considering further spatial options for distribution of development

10.1 Following the Preferred Approach consultation, two additional options for the spatial distribution of development were developed to inform the development of the plan, and in particular the development strategy. A schedule setting out all the development strategies assessed to date is set out in Appendix 3 to this report. The Sustainability Appraisal process has considered and tested each to consider the relative sustainability for each option. The full details are set out in the accompanying document Sustainability Appraisal for the *Chichester Local Plan Review – Alternative Spatial Development Strategies for Testing Through Evidence Base*, which forms Appendix 4 to this report. The additional options are -

### Option 1B – Revisions to the preferred approach strategy

- 10.2 The first new option (Option 1B) was developed from the Preferred Approach Option 1A, but sought to maximise numbers at the locations East of Chichester and South West of Chichester. With a small increase in the Parish numbers, this leads to an increase in housing provision from 4,900 to 5,625 (c.700 dpa).
- 10.3 Overall the profile of impacts was similar to the other variations of Option 1 from which it was derived. The increase in housing numbers compared to 1 and 1A increased the positive impacts on meeting housing needs and also on the economic assessment criteria, especially as most of the increase is close to Chichester city. Environmental pressures remain elevated, especially as since the Preferred Approach consultation, the issue of nutrient impacts on Chichester Harbour has become more urgent. Those impacts should be capable of being mitigated, particularly for greenfield sites, but options that add significant numbers across the Bournes (1A, 1B, 2, 4), may pose additional risks for WwTW capacity and nutrient loading in the Harbour.

### Option 6 – Northern Focus

- 10.4 The second new option (option 6) takes a very different approach and tests a scenario for delivering primarily in the north east of the plan area. This area has been proposed for only low levels of housing development in all the other options. This had meant that the advantages and disadvantages of significant development in this area had not been tested or drawn out in the SA process before this stage. The greenfield locations in the south of the plan area were retained but reduced to 100 dwellings each. The brownfield sites were kept as per the other options. The 3,250 allocation for the north east was not specifically parcelled out to specific locations, so could imply one very large location (in effect a new village) or several large extensions to existing settlements. As with the other new option at this stage, the overall number of additional dwellings is 5,625.
- 10.5 The new Option 6 has a range of impacts quite distinct from the other options assessed. On the positive side, the large reduction in numbers across the east-west corridor aids habitat connectivity and reduces the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. If it were to be implemented through one very large development there would be opportunities for low carbon energy infrastructure and on-site habitat gains. The negative impacts are primarily due to a disconnection between the location of new housing and the location of new and existing jobs. This results in poor assessments for reduced need to travel, achieving modal shift and meeting local housing needs as well as on the range of economic objectives. The effects on congestion and air quality are uncertain and would require further work on supporting evidence to allow a fuller assessment in the future.

### Conclusion on Sustainability Appraisal

- 10.6 The Sustainability Appraisal process does not determine the Local Plan Review's content but helps to inform decision makers as to the relative sustainability implications of the options and draft policies before them. The findings of these additional scenarios is helping to inform further work as follows.

- 10.7 First, the assessment of the Northern Focus option is highlighting a number of significant negative effects. Whilst further work is needed to confirm the consideration of this option, initial testing to date does not indicate that it is likely to be more sustainable than other options even if it could be demonstrated to be deliverable.
- 10.8 Second, the consideration of the Option 1B (Revisions to the preferred approach strategy) demonstrates at a plan level the benefits of some revisions to the distribution strategy set out in the Preferred Approach Plan. However, some potential allocations have significant issues which require further consideration as outlined in the summary responses report.
- 10.9 This report will now outline further work required, and identifies some known issues regarding strategic sites. Therefore the identification and appraisal of alternatives will continue to be undertaken as the plan progresses.

## **11. Further technical work**

- 11.1 The proposed responses to the summaries of representations report (Appendix 1) highlights a number of workstreams underway to take the Local Plan Review forward. They include, but are not limited to –
- a. A review of the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment;
  - b. A Gypsy Sites Delivery Plan to provide further detail on the need identified in the original assessment;
  - c. An update to the Transport Assessment work to review the reference Case Models, consider the implications of the removal of the proposed Stockbridge Link Road, assessment of the cumulative impact of additional spatial options, and revised employment allocation locations, the need for any likely phasing of development, and justification in planning terms for a new road link over the railway line at Southbourne.
  - d. Further transport feasibility work on critical local plan mitigation works on the A27 in response to comments raised by Highways England;
  - e. A focused review of the Water Quality Assessment, focused on the key elements to consider the capacity of wastewater treatment works and the provision of additional capacity that needs to be addressed for the Local Plan;
  - f. Further work to understand the implications of nitrates in Chichester Harbour and elsewhere;
  - g. An update to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and stage 2 assessment;
  - h. A Whole Plan Viability Assessment to consider the deliverability of development and test the implications of increased requirements for affordable housing and low carbon future homes standards;
  - i. An update to the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment to include confirmation of the availability of suitable previously developed “brownfield” sites and the appropriate density of development;
  - j. Confirmation of the wildlife corridors and landscape gaps ;
  - k. Ongoing Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment as the Plan progresses.
  - l. Amendments and Updates to the the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to include water supply .

## **12. Implications for the Distribution of Development**

12.1 Members will be aware that significant further work is required before the final shape of the Local Plan Review can be determined. However, the findings of the consultation and technical work to date is highlighting some areas where the capacity, suitability and deliverability of sites and allocations requires further consideration.

12.2 At present, the implications identified at this point are as follows –

S8 Meeting Employment Land needs

12.3 Comments received in response to the Preferred Approach have highlighted concerns regarding the suitability and deliverability of proposed allocation AL6 (see below), and proposed alternative or additional sites in the vicinity of Goodwood and adjacent to Rolls Royce. The need and potential suitability of these areas for employment use will be considered further through a review of the Housing and Economic Development Needs assessment; a review of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and further Sustainability Appraisal work. That work will include consideration of any particular issues arising from a future expansion of the Rolls Royce site.

AL3 Land East of Chichester

12.4 As noted in the Preferred Approach, the site may have capacity for up to 1,000 dwellings. However, further work is needed to confirm whether or not this is deliverable along with a local centre, open space and appropriate green infrastructure. Work is also required to test the transport impacts of that level of development. Therefore compared to the Preferred Approach plan the capacity of this allocation may possibly be increased by 400 dwellings

AL4 Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester

12.5 This site has been carried forward as a strategic allocation from the adopted Local Plan. There may be potential for part of the site to accommodate additional development (including employment development), and this will continue to be investigated and kept under review, particularly with regards to the need and deliverability of other potential allocations.

AL6 Land South-West of Chichester

12.6 Significant objections received to this policy highlight a number of environmental, availability and delivery issues with this proposal. Further evidence on the deliverability of this proposal will be required before it can be included in the next iteration of the Plan. Further transport work has been commissioned to consider the implications for the A27 mitigation scheme if the proposed Stockbridge Link Road is excluded. Therefore at present the delivery, suitability and acceptability of this site, which was included in the Preferred Approach plan for 85 hectares of employment land and residential development, remains to be determined.

AL8 East Wittering Parish

12.7 It is understood that the parish council does not intend to include housing sites within its neighbourhood plan. Therefore sites will be considered for allocation at East Wittering and Bracklesham in the next iteration of the Local Plan Review following an appraisal of options in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulations Assessment and other relevant evidence studies.

#### AL9 Fishbourne Parish

- 12.8 The level of development which could be accommodated within this parish may be impacted significantly by the proposal for a strategic wildlife corridor to the east of Fishbourne. Further work is required to determine the final location and extent of the wildlife corridor, and to assess the impact that may have on capacity. Such reassessment should include the potential for and implications of a significant reduction in the allocation compared to the Preferred Approach Plan, depending upon the confirmation of the location of the wildlife corridor and update of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment to consider the availability of suitable sites and the opportunities and constraints on further significant development within the parish.

#### AL10 Chidham and Hambrook Parish

- 12.9 Further consideration will need to be given to the capacity of this service village to accommodate significant additional development, particularly with regards to landscape capacity and proximity to the sensitive environment of the AONB. These considerations affect other parishes but the impacts arising from the Preferred Approach allocation of 500 homes for this service village warrant further assessment in light of the overall capacity and suitability of the cumulative allocations in that broader area.

#### AL11 Hunston Parish

- 12.10 The representations received have highlighted a wide range of issues. Consideration needs to be given to the appropriate level of development in this area, and the balance between proposed levels of development in Hunston and neighbouring parishes.

#### S5 Parish Housing Requirements

- 12.11 Following the Preferred Approach consultation a number of comments were received regarding the parish housing requirements. Many concerned the appropriate approach to the parishes north of the national park area. In response, the Sustainability Appraisal assessed a “northern focus” option to consider further a significant development (such as a new settlement) in that location, though this has not highlighted significant sustainability gains for reasons set out in that report. It has also considered minor increases to parish numbers in the north of the national park as part of Option 1B.
- 12.12 However, it is the case that a number of additional sites have been promoted to the Council for consideration in the north of the Chichester plan area and it is considered that a refresh of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment will be necessary to inform a decision as to the availability, sustainability and deliverability of development in that location. Given the disadvantages in sustainability terms of this area, including the lack of public transport and that it falls within a different housing market area to where the bulk of the housing needs are generated, this means that the suitability of a substantial amount of development along the lines of the Northern Focus Option 6 considered in the Sustainability Appraisal is considered unlikely to be appropriate.
- 12.13 Nonetheless, the potential for this area to accommodate a more appropriate increase in the level of development compared to that included in the Preferred Approach Plan is under review and the findings of the update to the Housing and

Economic Land Availability Assessment will inform consideration as to whether the balance of development between the plan sub areas is appropriate.

- 12.14 Taking account of the details above, it is clear that further work will be required to be undertaken on all sites and allocations, including the cumulative impact of development with regards to matters such as transport, but the explanation above is intended to highlight the main potential “showstoppers” or impacts on capacity, sustainability or deliverability identified to date.

### **13 Way Forward**

- 13.1 Members are asked to note the issues raised in this report and to endorse the continuing work on the Local Plan Review. In September 2019, the Council adopted a revised Local Development Scheme which indicates the proposed submission plan will be published for public consultation in March 2020. As noted in this report, significant further work is required and not all the relevant factors are within the Council’s control. Nonetheless the intention at present is to use all endeavours to bring forward a Plan which fulfils the undertaking of the Council to submit a Plan by July 2020. The ongoing work is necessarily iterative and as it progresses, officers will be mindful of the potential benefits and disbenefits of revising either the timetable or the scope of the plan (for instance, by focusing on strategic policies and incorporating Development Management policies in the planned subsequent Site Allocations document) and will keep Members informed.

### **14. Alternatives Considered**

- 14.1 Alternative strategies to meet different levels of development need and options for the spatial distribution of development are explored in the Sustainability Appraisal update set out as Appendix 4 to this report.
- 14.2 Preparing a Local Plan is a statutory requirement. If the Local Plan is not submitted for Examination within 5 years of the adoption of the existing one, i.e. by July 2020 then it will increasingly become out of date, particularly with regards to the outcomes of housing supply and housing delivery test.

### **15. Resource and Legal Implications**

- 15.1 The proposal does not have any additional resourcing implications for the Council over and above the budgets already agreed for this work.
- 15.2 The preparation of the Local Plan Review has to follow the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and associated regulations. The Town and Country Planning Act (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 are of particular relevance.

### **16. Consultation**

- 16.1 The outcomes of the Preferred Approach consultation are set out in full on the Council’s website. A report setting out key issues and proposed response to Part One of the draft Plan is included as Appendix 1 to this document.

## 17. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 17.1 The Local Plan Review is likely to have significant implications for many communities in the plan area. Additional sites and locations to accommodate new development have been identified as preferred sites, with new or improved infrastructure and facilities also expected. Consultation will need to be handled sensitively, recognising that there may be local opposition to some proposals, particularly in areas where new development is proposed.
- 17.2 The Council is committed to working with parish councils to bring forward new development. In many cases, parish councils are proposing to plan for future development in their area through the preparation or review of neighbourhood plans. The draft Local Plan Review provides a framework to enable this.
- 17.3 The Local Plan Review has been prepared to facilitate the allocation of land through neighbourhood planning where there has been a stated interest in preparing or revising a neighbourhood plan from the relevant parish council. This does, however, present a risk to the Council in terms of being able to demonstrate that the plan's housing policies are deliverable. In order to mitigate this risk a timetable for the production of neighbourhood plans, related to different stages of the Local Plan Review timetable, is set out below.

Date	Local Plan Review	Neighbourhood Plans
November 2018	Preferred Approach (Regulation 18) Plan agreed by Council	
Dec-June 2019		Evidence gathering/ identification of issues/appointment of consultants
Early 2020		Strategic Parish Allocations - Reg 14 consultation to be commenced
March 2020	Local Plan Review: Submission Plan (Regulation 19) Plan agreed by Council	
September 2020	Examination hearings start	
December 2020	Inspector's Report received	
March 2021	Adoption	Reg 16 consultation commences

- 17.4 It is recognised that this timetable will be challenging. The timetable has been prepared on the basis that parish councils may wish to seek changes to the Local Plan Review through the consultation and examination processes, but can work on



neighbourhood plans in parallel with these processes to allow those plans to move forward quickly to examination on adoption of the Local Plan Review.

- 17.5 Should insufficient progress be made in identifying land through the neighbourhood planning process then the Council will need to consider allocating the land in the Local Plan Review: Submission Plan to ensure that the development strategy proposed by the Plan is deliverable.
- 17.6 It is understood that East Wittering parish council does not intend to include housing sites within its neighbourhood plan. Therefore sites will be considered for allocation at East Wittering and Bracklesham in the next iteration of the Local Plan Review following an appraisal of options in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulations Assessment and other relevant evidence studies.

## 18. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b> The NPPF requires that local plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area, and that planning policies should ensure that developments create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.	X	
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b> The NPPF identifies the mitigation and adaptation to climate change, and improvements to biodiversity, as fundamental issues to address in order to deliver sustainable development. Local plans are expected to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change in line with the provisions and objectives of the Climate Change Act 2008, and to co-operate to deliver strategic priorities which include climate change. Plans should also seek to minimise the impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity	X	
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b> The Equality Act 2010 sets statutory duties on public bodies such as local authorities with regard to promoting equality and reducing inequalities of outcome. To ensure that the statutory requirements are achieved, it is intended to undertake and publish an equality impact assessment which will be published as one of the supporting documents when the Local Plan Review is submitted to the Secretary of State for formal examination.	X	
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>		X
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		X
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b> The NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places	X	

## 19. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Preferred Approach Local Plan Part One: Summary responses and proposed response -Table of Responses

Appendix 2 – Preferred Approach Local Plan: PBA response to consultation responses on transport evidence (full document available electronically)

Appendix 3 – Chichester District Local Plan – Development strategies assessed to date

Appendix 4 – Chichester Local Plan Review – Alternative Spatial Development Strategies for Testing Through Evidence Base (document available electronically)

## **21. Background Papers**

The emerging evidence base will be published on the Council's website. Key background papers of particular importance include:

Chichester Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment, prepared by GL Hearn

Chichester Local Plan Review Sustainability Appraisal

Chichester Local Plan Review Habitats Regulation Assessment, prepared by Aecom

Chichester Local Plan Review Transport Study, prepared by Peter Brett Associates

## Chichester District Council

### THE CABINET

3 December 2019

### Resurfacing, Improved Drainage and additional site enhancements at Westhampnett Depot

#### 1. Contacts

**Report Author:**

Kevin Carter – Divisional Manager, Contract Services  
Telephone: 01243 E-mail: [kcarter@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:kcarter@chichester.gov.uk)

**Cabinet Member:**

Penny Plant – Cabinet Member for Environment and Contract Services  
Telephone: 01243 575031 E-mail: [pplant@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:pplant@chichester.gov.uk)

#### 2. Executive Summary

Cabinet approved the project to resurface and improve drainage at the CCS depot in June and to seek costs to provide environmental enhancements to the project. The final design has now been completed which also identified a number of other key enhancements that should also be included within the scope of work. Following a tender process Cabinet is asked to approve a preferred contractor. An increase in the approved budget is being requested to include all of the enhancements being considered and to appoint the selected contractor.

#### 3. Recommendation

**3.1. That Cabinet approves the inclusion of environmental and operational enhancements to the scheme set out section 5, subject to Council's approval of the additional costs.**

**3.2. That Cabinet approves the appointment of Contractor B for undertaking the resurfacing, improved drainage, environmental and operational enhancements and associated work at CCS Depot, and delegates authority to the Director of Corporate Services to conclude the detail of the contract following consultation with the Cabinet member for the Environment and Contract Services.**

**3.3. That Cabinet recommends to Council to increase the budget from £592,000 to £850, 000, £650,000 funded from reserves and £200,000 from the Asset Replacement Programme. To enable the inclusion of additional works as set out in Section 5.**

#### 4. Background

4.1. In June 2019 Cabinet approved that the depot resurfacing and enhanced drainage project should be progressed and Council subsequently approved to fund the scheme by allocating funding of £592,000 towards the estimated costs.

- 4.2. Full detailed arrangement drawings suitable for completing the works have been completed and included as part of a formal Invitation to Tender (ITT) conducted in accordance with procurement rules and regulations. Two fully compliant responses were received and evaluated.
- 4.3 In June Cabinet also delegated authority to the Director of Corporate Services, following consultation with the Cabinet member for the Environment and Contract Services, to seek costings to include two environmental enhancements: the provision of a surface water capture system; and electrical vehicle charging infrastructure within the proposed scope of work. This was undertaken and included as options within the ITT
- 4.4 Additionally as the detailed design progressed other works, additional to the main scope were identified that would be very advantageous to the future operation at the depot and cost effective to include at the same time as the main body of works. These items are detailed in the following section.
- 4.5 Cabinet approval to appoint the successful contractor is required for a contract of this size and Council approval is required to increase the budget provision, both of which are the subjects of this report.
- 4.6 For operational reasons the best time for the work to commence at site is January 2020 and the works will last approximately 12-14 weeks. Access to a local site suitable to accommodate the parking of the CCS fleet of vehicles whilst the work is undertaken has been agreed but this is only available until March 2020 after which an alternative more costly and less suitable option would have to be employed.
- 4.7 The successful bid including all of the proposed additions, if approved, will require the budget to be increased to £850,000 (£200,000 of which is already included within the asset replacement plan).
- 4.8 To facilitate this project, temporary off-site parking arrangements have been negotiated with a third party. However they have indicated a fixed window of opportunity for this. A possible call-in of the cabinet decision would make it impossible to utilize the off-site parking which would in turn jeopardise the programme of works at the depot with operational implications and possible increased costs to the Council.
- 4.9 A request was made and approved by the Chairman of the Council that the contract award decision be deemed urgent in accordance with the urgency procedure within the Council's constitution, and therefore exempt from possible call-in.

## **5. Outcomes to be Achieved**

The original required outcome for the project approved by Cabinet was to resurface the west side of the depot site to include an extended and upgraded foul surface water drainage system which is fully compliant including with new rain water gullies, petrol interceptors, soakaway systems, etc. and additional depot lighting, signage, road and bay markings to provide an effective and flexible depot facility to support the waste collection, parks, green spaces, litter clearance and road sweeping services. These

works are considered essential for the effective and safe operation of the depot. Without access to such a facility there may be a degradation of these services, increased Health and Safety concerns, and potentially an increase in the cost of providing these services to the community.

In addition to these outcomes the following are also recommended for inclusion within the contract.

### **5.1 Enhanced Floodlighting**

The current flood lighting for the west side of the depot is a mixture of LED and Halogen units, mounted on columns and depot structures. As part of the main works all of the column mounted units require repositioning and the new lighting levels to be in accordance with British Standards. A new flood lighting scheme has been developed that both meets the necessary standards and minimises light spillage into the neighbouring areas. The new system uses full use of LED lamps that are not only easily adjustable remotely but have motion triggered lighting areas.

### **5.2 CCTV System**

Similar to the floodlighting, the column mounted CCTV heads also require repositioning and two ideally replaced. The main system controller and software are suitable for ongoing future operation. To upgrade the system when the units are being re-sited is cost effective

### **5.3 One way system**

The current depot layout supports routine entry and exit vehicle movements from the front of the depot and exit only from the rear of the depot. Non CDC vehicle movements will increase when the new wash facility is installed and potentially with an increase in vehicle servicing and MOT activities. Working in conjunction with the CDC Health and Safety manager it was considered a review of the overall site movements was required. This was undertaken and a single direction traffic movement system proposed which would negate any need for vehicle reversing and significantly improve the safe operation of the depot for both CDC and Non CDC vehicles alike.

Entry will only be via the front of the depot and exit the rear. This revised scheme requires the entry gate and barrier system to be changed and a reconfiguration of the security barriers. A pedestrian and cycle access point will also be provided to separate pedestrian and vehicle movements as much as possible.

### **5.4 Automatic Number Plate Recognition System (ANPR)**

An ANPR system consists of cameras linked to a computer. When a vehicle passes by the camera the camera records an image of the vehicle registration mark which is automatically 'read' by the computer. CDC and employee vehicles details will be pre-loaded into the system and will automatically allow access or exit with the entry and exit time recorded. This will provide greater operational and security control of the CDC fleet. The system will allow external vehicles to be provided with single day or multiple day access providing a controlled access to the new vehicle wash facility and for regular suppliers vehicles to gain access at pre-determined times.

## **5.5 Storm water capture**

A large user of fresh water are the CCS road sweepers. Currently these vehicles use fresh water to fill their tanks and on average use 3500 ltrs per day, approximately 1 million litres per year. The vehicles are filled using a hose pipe connected to an external water source which on average takes 100 minutes per day ( 8 -9 hours per week) waiting for the tanks to fill.

Whilst capturing storm water is relatively simple, the application and use of it is the challenge. A system has been designed to capture the storm water underground and to pump it to a 10,000 litre holding tank. The holding tank is part of a storage and delivery system which will reduce the total time to fill the fleet to circa to 35 minutes per day (2-3 hrs per week) A saving of 6 hrs per week is equivalent to approximately £150 per week or £7,800 per year and whilst this saving cannot be realised it does provide additional road sweeping capacity.

During the summer months the system will still require fresh water to fill the holding tank but it is estimated that an annual saving of approximately 200,000 - 300,000 litres of fresh water will be possible. The current water supply cost is £800 - £900 per year so a saving of £200 - £300 per year is achievable and in theory provides a pay back of circa 7 years.

Road sweepers deliver the cleaning water using a spray system and as such special consideration has been made to negate the possibility of Legionella and other bacteria contaminants from forming within the storage unit.

## **5.6 Electrical charging infrastructure**

By installing a matrix of electrical ductwork whilst the depot yard is being prepared for resurfacing is a cost effective way to prepare for a future electrical vehicle charging system.

Once known the correct cabling can be pulled through the ductwork matrix reducing both the time and cost to fully install electrical charging infrastructure

The vehicles most likely to be converted to electrical power in the near future are the smaller trucks and road sweepers. Whilst the actual charging system cannot be confirmed at present, provision will be provided (electrical outlets, upgraded supply) for 7 new electrical vehicle charging station sockets within the depot yard, which is possible without significantly upgrading the depot incoming supply.

When operationally viable alternative HGV become available it should be noted that the incoming supply into the depot will have to be significantly enhanced from that which is currently available. Given the largely rural nature of our District, that is not anticipated in the near future and so has not been included in the project at this time.

## **6.0 Proposal**

Following the completion of a full and detailed design specification two fully compliant bids were received in response to the ITT. In accordance with the assessment criteria encompassing financial and qualitative scoring methods, detailed within the ITT,

Contractor B is the preferred contractor. Further details are included within a Part II Appendix A attached

For the main scope of work the bids received were within 5% of each other and for the quality scoring within 12% of each other showing a good understanding and consistency in the responses received.

The assessment criterion applies an agreed formula to combine both cost and quality scores to identify the successful contractor.

An approximate breakdown of the additional costs have been identified below for the main scope of works and the additional recommended items.

An indication of the priority of each of the enhancements, from an operational efficiency and safety basis have also been shown.

	<b>Contractor B</b>	<b>Budget</b>
<b>Planned Scope (in priority order)</b>	<b>£654,900</b>	<b>£595,000</b>
Additional design and support	£12,500	
One way system	£34,300	
Enhanced floodlighting	£26,000	
Ev Charging system	£32,300	
Storm water capture and use	£52,000	
CCTV	£14,000	
APNR	£14,000	
Contingency	£10,000	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£850,000</b>	CDC Cost
Gypsy site	£34,000	WSCC cost
<b><u>Total Contractor price</u></b>	<b><u>£884,000</u></b>	
(excludes contingency)		

It is recommended that all enhancements are approved.

## **7. Alternatives Considered**

The Council's Contract Services depot at Westhampnett has been the subject of a major phased refurbishment and redevelopment programme of works lasting several years. This programme of work completes these improvements and adds further enhancements.

Options were considered prior to commencement of this wider refurbishment at that time and are not included here. These options included the relocation of the depot as well as different depot layout options.

7.1 Continue with previously approved scope of work (only)

This would miss an ideal opportunity to future proof several aspects of the operation of the depot and in particular those with a safety and environmental impact. The enhancements detailed above can be delivered at any time but this would cost more and add further disruption. If this alternative was selected the budget required would be £677,400 (planned scope + additional design + contingency)

## 7.2 Continue with selected enhancements only

Individually each of the enhancements have their own benefit and justification. Each would be supported and recommended to be progressed in the own right. Whilst it is possible to individually select one or more of the enhancements as part of this project the design that has been prepared delivers greater benefit when the all of the enhancements are implemented together as a total scope. If this alternative was selected, direction as to which of the enhancements should be included (or not) would be required and then a revised specification package prepared, possibly requiring a re-run of the tender. If this alternative was selected the budget required would be between £677,400 and £850,000

## 7.3 Cancel the project

Until the contract is awarded CDC have no obligation to incur all of these costs. The only costs incurred to date are the external design consultants and significant internal resource. If selected other urgent projects would have to be approved to bring the depot yard to an acceptable safe standard and considering the planned Government changes to the collection of waste the future viability of the depot would be in doubt.

## 8. Resource and Legal Implications

- 8.1 Overall management of the project is being provided by CCS Divisional Manager. The design consultant will provide the design input of these enhancements and deliver the required specification. Procurement specialist from Hampshire County Council and CDC are providing procurement expertise. Contract services staff will be required to work with the Council's Health and Safety Manager and the design consultant to manage the logistics of the scheme to ensure the depot remains safe and operational during the works. Costs are set in section 6.
- 8.1 The procurement process is being carried out in compliance with the Council's Standing Orders.

## 9 Consultation

- 9.1 Corporate Health and Safety have been consulted in the preparation of the specification and will be prior and during the works to ensure a safe working environment for the Council's staff and contractors.

## 10 Other Implications

	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>		X
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b> The proposed contract will ensure the safe disposal of contaminated water and the ability to charge electric vehicles	X	
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b>		X



<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>		X
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		X
<b>Other</b> (please specify)		X

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

## Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

3 DECEMBER 2019

### Determination of the Council Tax Base 2020-2021

#### 1. Contacts

##### Report Author:

Paul Jobson, Revenues Operations Manager

Tel: 01243 534501

E-mail: [pjobson@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:pjobson@chichester.gov.uk)

##### Cabinet Member:

Peter Wilding, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, Finance, Revenues & Benefits

Tel: 01428 707324

E-mail: [pwilding@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:pwilding@chichester.gov.uk)

#### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1. In order to comply with section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, that the following resolutions be made;
- 2.2. No item of expenditure shall be treated as 'special expenses' for the purposes of section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
- 2.3. This resolution in (2.2) shall remain in force for the 2020-2021 financial year.
- 2.4. The calculation of the Chichester District Council's taxbase for the year 2020-2021 be approved.
- 2.5. The amounts calculated by Chichester District Council as its council taxbase be those set out in appendices 1 and 2 to this report.

#### 3. Background

- 3.1. The taxbase is a measure of the taxable capacity of the district and is set during the period 1 December to 31 January. Parish Councils, West Sussex County Council and the Police Authority are then notified of the proposed taxbase for the area relevant to them. As the billing authority, the District Council is then responsible for the payment of precepts from the collection fund or general fund for levies and parish precepts.
- 3.2. The Council Taxbase represents the estimated full year number of chargeable dwellings in the area expressed as the equivalent number of band D dwellings. The taxbase calculations are based upon the numbers by council tax band in the Valuation List, plus the estimated new dwellings likely to enter the Valuation List during 2020/21. The result is adjusted for applicable discounts, exemptions and reductions. The figure of chargeable dwellings is further adjusted by an estimated collection rate of 99% ( see paragraph 5.1 below)
- 3.3. Since 1 April 2013 the taxbase calculation for the District also takes account of our Council Tax Reduction (CTR) scheme. Properties where the resident will be in

receipt of 100% CTR are fully disregarded in this calculation and pro rata for those on lower amounts.

3.4. Summary of the taxbase of each parish is shown in appendix 2.

#### **4. Outcomes to be achieved**

4.1. The purpose of this report is to set the taxbase for the 2020/2021 financial year.

4.2. Following approval the relevant taxbase will be notified to precepting authorities to allow for them to set their budgets for 2020/2021.

#### **5. Proposal**

5.1. **Collection Rate:** An assumed 'collection rate' is used when calculating the taxbase. In determining the rate, a number of factors are taken into consideration, including losses in income through council tax banding reductions, absconds and backdated awards of discounts and exemptions. The assumed collection rate since 2013/14 has been set at 99% and it is proposed to continue with a 99% collection rate for the 2020/21 calculations.

5.2. **Special Items:** Special expense items are those that relate to a part only of the District Council's area. The determination of such special expenses would necessitate the creation of a special expense area which could be the whole of a parish, within a parish, or across parish boundaries. No such areas have been determined previously and it is recommended that the Cabinet resolve that any special expenses should be treated as general expenses for tax setting purposes.

#### **6. Alternatives that have been considered**

6.1. No alternatives have been considered for this report due to the legal requirement to set a taxbase.

#### **7. Resource and legal implications**

7.1. Finance: The Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulations 1992 (as amended) requires the billing authority to calculate the taxbase for its area and notify the figure to the precepting authorities in the period 1 December to 31 January. A delay in notifying the taxbase to precepting authorities could impact on their ability to set their budgets in time for setting council tax, which must be set before 11 March in the financial year preceding that for which it is set.

#### **8. Consultation**

8.1. This report has not been subject to consultation.

#### **9. Community impact and corporate risks**

9.1. The corporate risk of an inaccurate tax base is that there is potential for the collection fund to be in deficit or surplus.

- 9.2. Since April 2013 the Council and precepting authorities have seen a reduction in taxbase resulting from the implementation of the council tax reduction scheme. The income generated from reducing locally defined discounts and increasing the Empty Homes Premium has helped to off-set this loss.

## 10. Other Implications

	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>		No
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b>		No
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b>		No
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>		No
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		No
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>		No
<b>Other</b> (please specify)		No

## 11. Appendices

Appendix 1 - Taxbase for the District of Chichester 2020/21

Appendix 2 – Taxbase for each Parish within the District 2020/21

## 12. Background papers

12.1. None

This page is intentionally left blank



Determination of Taxbase 2020-21  
Appendix 1

	Band@	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Chargeable properties *	3.5	2,328.2	5,115.5	12,873.0	10,764.3	7,891.8	5,448.5	5,293.3	1,143.8	50,861.7
Band D equivalents	1.9	1,552.1	3,978.7	11,442.7	11,044.1	9,645.5	7,870.1	8,822.1	2,287.5	56,644.7
Additional 50% income for prescribed classes A & B (Second Homes) as Band D equivalents**		192.2	90.6	228.4	268.5	266.4	275.2	357.5	171	1,849.8
Additional Income for Empty Homes Premium at 100%										116.5
Taxbase deduction for Council Tax Reduction										-3,931.1
Total Taxbase for the Chichester District for 2020-21										54,679.9
Adjusted for assumed collection rate of 99%										54,133.3

Note;- All calculations are subject to roundings

## Notes

\* Includes adjustments for Crown Property and property with restricted planning permission

\*\*For calculation purposes

This page is intentionally left blank

## Determination of Taxbase 2020/21

## Appendix 2

Parish	Basic Taxbase Second Homes 50%	Second Homes additional 50%	Basic Taxbase for 2020-21	Additional income from Empty Homes Premium	Taxbase deduction for Council Tax Support	Total Taxbase	Adjusted for assumed collection rate of 99%
Apuldrum	91.9	4.0	95.9	0.0	-5.8	90.1	89.2
Barlavington	54.1	3.2	57.3	0.0	-0.2	57.1	56.5
Bepton	146.3	3.4	149.7	0.0	-0.9	148.8	147.3
Bignor	68.3	6.8	75.1	0.0	-0.7	74.4	73.7
Birdham	850.2	37.3	887.5	0.8	-40.3	848.0	839.5
Bosham	1,601.4	120.6	1,722.0	3.3	-78.9	1,646.4	1,629.9
Boxgrove	505.6	9.4	515.0	0.8	-48.6	467.2	462.5
Bury	372.2	14.8	387.0	3.8	-12.1	378.7	374.9
Chichester City	12,153.0	253.3	12,406.3	22.8	-1,172.5	11,256.6	11,144.0
Chidham & Hambrook	1,041.4	13.3	1,054.7	0.0	-71.5	983.2	973.4
Cocking	231.5	3.9	235.4	0.0	-10.9	224.5	222.3
Compton	217.8	12.1	229.9	0.0	-5.4	224.5	222.3
Donnington	1,065.8	8.0	1,073.8	0.0	-41.7	1,032.1	1,021.8
Duncton	226.1	10.0	236.1	0.0	-8.4	227.7	225.4
Earnley	306.6	73.3	379.9	0.0	-8.5	371.4	367.7
Eartham	48.5	4.1	52.6	0.0	-2.2	50.4	49.9
Easebourne	1,125.9	22.2	1,148.1	8.0	-64.4	1,091.7	1,080.8
East Dean	117.4	7.3	124.7	0.0	-10.6	114.1	113.0
East Lavington	119.0	8.4	127.4	5.0	-2.7	129.7	128.4
E.Wittering & Bracklesham	2,276.1	146.2	2,422.3	5.1	-223.6	2,203.8	2,181.8
Ebernoe	129.5	6.7	136.2	0.0	-0.3	135.9	134.5
Elsted & Treyford	161.8	9.8	171.6	3.8	-4.6	170.8	169.1
Fernhurst	1,402.2	17.0	1,419.2	0.0	-72.1	1,347.1	1,333.6
Fishbourne	1,143.3	8.2	1,151.5	1.7	-55.0	1,098.2	1,087.2
Fittleworth	548.3	14.1	562.4	1.6	-19.9	544.1	538.7
Funtington	833.3	19.6	852.9	0.0	-30.3	822.6	814.4
Graffham	325.4	15.8	341.2	3.2	-7.2	337.2	333.8
Harting	750.2	20.9	771.1	0.0	-38.9	732.2	724.9
Heyshott	160.5	13.2	173.7	0.0	-8.7	165.0	163.4
Hunston	494.3	4.6	498.9	0.0	-67.3	431.6	427.3
Kirdford	519.7	15.1	534.8	4.2	-28.3	510.7	505.6
Lavant	760.0	14.7	774.7	0.0	-70.7	704.0	697.0
Linch	41.9	2.5	44.4	0.0	-0.3	44.1	43.7

## Determination of Taxbase 2020/21

## Appendix 2

Parish	Basic Taxbase Second Homes 50%	Second Homes additional 50%	Basic Taxbase for 2020-21	Additional income from Empty Homes Premium	Taxbase deduction for Council Tax Support	Total Taxbase	Adjusted for assumed collection rate of 99%
Lynchemere	1,070.7	10.3	1,081.0	0.0	-31.9	1,049.1	1,038.6
Lodsworth	379.9	19.6	399.5	5.5	-6.1	398.9	394.9
Loxwood	844.7	7.9	852.6	0.0	-32.8	819.8	811.6
Lurgashall	335.7	18.8	354.5	5.7	-9.0	351.2	347.7
Marden	53.1	4.5	57.6	0.0	-1.3	56.3	55.7
Midhurst Town	2,508.7	30.2	2,538.9	1.5	-211.0	2,329.4	2,306.1
Milland	476.6	21.7	498.3	0.0	-7.2	491.1	486.2
North Mundham	643.2	13.8	657.0	0.0	-40.3	616.7	610.5
Northchapel	355.9	3.2	359.1	0.0	-29.7	329.4	326.1
Oving	655.5	10.3	665.8	3.0	-44.9	623.9	617.7
Petworth	1,386.2	54.4	1,440.6	15.4	-120.8	1,335.2	1,321.8
Plaistow & Ifold	1,140.7	14.0	1,154.7	0.0	-17.4	1,137.3	1,125.9
Rogate	807.3	23.2	830.5	0.0	-34.4	796.1	788.1
Selsey Town	4,698.9	198.2	4,897.1	3.5	-467.7	4,432.9	4,388.6
Sidlesham	623.0	25.1	648.1	0.0	-42.5	605.6	599.5
Singleton	259.2	14.5	273.7	0.0	-15.8	257.9	255.3
Southbourne	2,735.1	41.4	2,776.5	2.9	-188.7	2,590.7	2,564.8
Stedham with Iping	436.8	17.0	453.8	0.0	-22.7	431.1	426.8
Stopham	50.8	0.5	51.3	0.0	-2.6	48.7	48.2
Stoughton	345.6	11.5	357.1	0.0	-12.2	344.9	341.5
Sutton	116.7	13.2	129.9	2.0	-1.7	130.2	128.9
Tangmere	1,244.0	10.1	1,254.1	0.8	-122.0	1,132.9	1,121.6
Tillington	304.5	15.6	320.1	0.0	-15.7	304.4	301.4
Trotton with Chithurst	162.1	3.2	165.3	0.0	-8.1	157.2	155.6
Upwaltham	13.8	1.7	15.5	0.0	0.0	15.5	15.3
West Dean	219.6	12.4	232.0	0.0	-11.5	220.5	218.3
West Itchenor	355.1	54.3	409.4	5.7	-3.2	411.9	407.8
West Lavington	165.5	3.1	168.6	0.0	-3.7	164.9	163.3
West Thorney	231.7	0.0	231.7	0.0	0.0	231.7	229.4
West Wittering	1,638.4	234.1	1,872.5	1.7	-76.2	1,798.0	1,780.0
Westbourne	1,031.2	16.5	1,047.7	1.7	-78.1	971.3	961.6
Westhampnett	564.7	5.4	570.1	0.0	-28.6	541.5	536.1
Wisborough Green	806.1	13.7	819.8	3.0	-25.5	797.3	789.3
Woolbeding with Redford	94.2	2.6	96.8	0.0	-4.3	92.5	91.6
<b>Totals</b>	<b>56,644.7</b>	<b>1,849.8</b>	<b>58,494.5</b>	<b>116.5</b>	<b>-3,931.1</b>	<b>54,679.9</b>	<b>54,133.3</b>

**Chichester District Council**

**CABINET**

**3 December 2019**

**Disabled Facilities Grants – Staffing Resources**

**1. Contacts**

**Report Author:**

Liz Reed – Housing Standards and Homemove Manager  
Telephone: 01243 534816 E-mail: [lreed@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:lreed@chichester.gov.uk)

**Cabinet Member:**

Cllr Norma Graves - Cabinet Member for Housing, Revenues and Benefits  
Telephone: 01798 342881 E-mail: [ngraves@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:ngraves@chichester.gov.uk)

**2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 That a Senior Environmental Health Officer (DFG Specialist) and two Specialist Housing Standards Officers are appointed to deliver the West Sussex Disabled Facilities Grants Policy 2020-24 within Chichester District to be funded from the Council's annual Disabled Facilities Grant funding.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1 Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) provide funding to older and disabled people in owner-occupied, privately rented and registered provider properties, to make changes to their home environment, such as the installation of showers, stair lifts and ramps, to help them live as independently and safely as possible.
- 3.2 The Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England and Wales) Order 2002 (RRO) enables Councils to support the wider prevention agenda of housing, social care and health authorities. The Care Act 2014 provided further direction towards earlier intervention and prevention.
- 3.3 In 2015 Government funding was pooled into a single budget for health and social care services to work more closely together – the Better Care Fund (BCF). The BCF provided an increase in funding for home adaptations and other interventions to improve integration between health, social care and housing services.
- 3.4 The implementation of the wider prevention agenda has resulted in increased demand on the adaptations service. During the pilot project in 2017 to 2019 a third more adaptations were delivered and the number of complex cases increased. Following Cabinet's approval of the West Sussex Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) Policy 2020-24 on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2019 and with an aging population, demand is expected to continue to grow. It is therefore proposed to expand and restructure the Housing Standards Team to ensure appropriate staffing resources are in place to deliver the service.

#### **4. Outcomes to be Achieved**

- 4.1 To establish an experienced, robust and resilient team to implement the newly adopted DFG Policy and deliver life-changing home adaptations to residents across the district, enabling them to occupy their homes safely and remain independent longer.

#### **5. Proposal**

- 5.1 The existing team structure consists of two permanent Environmental Housing Technical Officers (both posts are currently vacant) who report directly to the Housing Standards and HomeMove Manager, and throughout the pilot project contractors were employed in order to meet the additional demand. With case volume set to increase it is necessary to establish a self-supporting DFG Team with a senior officer and two highly experienced Specialist Housing Standards Officers.
- 5.2 The appointment of a Senior Environmental Health Officer (DFG Specialist) with a breadth of experience will provide the team with day to day management and support, along with the ability to manage the most complex adaptation works.
- 5.3 The two Specialist Housing Standards Officers will be required to have technical qualifications and relevant experience. These posts will replace the vacant Environmental Housing Technical Officer posts as they have been evaluated at a higher grade.
- 5.4 The proposed expansion and restructure of the team is to ensure the team is equipped with the necessary staffing resources to deliver disabled adaptations to our residents in an efficient and timely manner.

#### **6 Alternatives Considered**

- 6.1 It is not considered possible to absorb the increasing caseload within the existing team.

#### **7 Resource and Legal Implications**

- 7.1 The additional cost of appointing the three proposed new posts, with on costs and expenses is estimated to be £64,000 per annum. This cost would be met from the Council's annual DFG funding from the government's BCF.
- 7.2 The Government had planned to review the BCF during 2019 in order to make decisions about future funding from 2020 onwards. However, it is officers' understanding that this has been delayed and funding for next year is anticipated at the broadly the same level as this financial year.
- 7.3 The West Sussex Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) Policy 2020-24 recently adopted contains provision for a review if the funding significantly changes.

## 8 Consultation

- 8.1 Senior leadership Team have been consulted and are supportive of the proposal.

## 9 Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1 The proposed changes would allow the Council to meet its commitments to deliver a wider adaptations service via the West Sussex Disabled Facilities Grants Policy 2020-24. The additional flexibility provided by this policy would ensure residents are provided with a safe home, which will reduce hospital admissions and hospital stays.
- 9.2 The future of BCF funding is unknown so there is a risk this may be reduced in coming years resulting in an immediate review of the Discretionary Policy the Council is able to offer, including the staffing resource that is required.

## 10 Other Implications

	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>		√
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b>		√
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b>		√
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>		√
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		√
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>		√
<b>Other</b> (please specify)		

- 11 **Appendices** – None

- 12 **Background Papers** - None

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank