

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD
Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Democratic Services on 01243 534684
Email: democraticservices@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House
1 East Pallant
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1TY
Tel: 01243 785166
www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of the **Cabinet** will be held in Committee Room 2 - East Pallant House on **Tuesday 7 January 2020 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 Late Items.

2 **Approval of Minutes** (Pages 1 - 16)

The Cabinet is requested to approve as a correct record the minutes of its meeting on Tuesday 3 December 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 **Climate Emergency Initial Action Plan** (Pages 17 - 33)

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

1. That the Climate Emergency Initial Action Plan, as presented in Appendix 1, is approved.
2. That Cabinet recommends to Council that a Climate Emergency officer post at a total cost of £120,000, plus an operational budget of £30,000, is funded from reserves for 2 years (full time) to support delivery of the Action Plan.

KEY DECISION

6 Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst Air Quality Management Area (Pages 35 - 47)

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

1. That Cabinet note the responses to the proposed Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst, Air Quality Management Area public consultation exercise.
2. That Cabinet note the authority delegated to the Director of Planning and the Environment in consultation with the Director of Housing and Communities to make and seal an Air Quality Management Area Order at Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst as shown at Appendix 1 of this report and to commence preparation of an Air Quality Action Plan.

OTHER DECISIONS

7 Allocation to Panels

Following the recent Loxwood By-Election the Cabinet is requested to appoint Cllr Janet Duncton to the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel.

8 Off-Street Parking Proposals Response to Consultation (Pages 49 - 73)

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

1. That Cabinet approves the increase in car parking charges as set out in sections 5.1 to 5.3 of this report.
2. That Cabinet approves the consolidation to the Parking Order as set out in section 5.4 of this report.
3. 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 the Road Traffic Act 1984.

9 Revised Fees and Charges 2020 for the Animal Welfare Licensing Regime (Pages 75 - 79)

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

That Cabinet recommends the revised Animal Licensing fees and charges for 2020 as set out in the appendix to this report, for consideration by the General Licensing Committee.

10 South Downs National Park Authority Extension to Development Management Agency Agreement (Pages 81 - 90)

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

That Cabinet approves an extension of the current Agreement with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) under section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 to enable the Council to continue to provide a development management service to the SDNPA for a further two years to 30 September 2022 on the basis of the previously agreed terms of the Section 101 Agreement including the Service Level Agreement and related Protocols.

11 Strategic Wildlife Corridors Project (Pages 91 - 102)

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

1. That Cabinet approve the submission of an application to the National Heritage Lottery Fund for the funding of a 5-year Strategic Wildlife Corridors Project.
2. That Cabinet approve the annual contribution of £10,000 from reserves for 5-years as match funding towards the project and to allow the continued funding of the Council's Community Wildlife Officer Post.

12 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.

13 Exclusion of the Press and Public

There are no restricted items for consideration at this meeting.

Please note for members and senior officers the agenda papers contain exempt appendix 1 and appendix 2 for agenda item 10 *South Downs National Park Authority Extension to Development Management Agency Agreement* (these documents are printed on salmon paper).

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 The Assembly Room - The Council House (Chichester City Council), North Street, Chichester on Tuesday 3 December 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, Mrs P Plant and Mr P Wilding

Members Absent

In attendance by invitation

Officers Present Mr T Ayling (Divisional Manager for Planning Policy), Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mr K Carter (Divisional Manager, CCS), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services Manager), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mr P Jobson (Taxation Manager), Mrs V McKay (Divisional Manager for Growth), Mr J Mildred (Divisional Manager for Corporate Services), Mr P E Over (Executive Director & Deputy Chief Executive), Mrs E Reed (Environmental Housing Manager), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

71 **Chairman's Announcements**

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

The emergency evacuation procedure for Chichester City Council was read out.

There were no apologies for absence.

72 **Approval of Minutes**

The Cabinet received the minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 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 5 November 2019 be approved.

73 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

74 Public Question Time

The following public questions were received. The responses are indicated in italics below.

Mr Dicker asked the following questions:

1. Under issues raised no comment is made about the quality of the consultation document and in particular the different standards for assessing land suitability for the development including proximity to SDNP and Harbour boundaries how many comments were made and what are the council doing to address these valid concerns.

2. In light of the changes to national planning and policy how will the changes be reflected in the plan prior to the next round of consultation and specifically:

“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.”

3. Can the council please explain why the housing numbers have increased in line with this comment?

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).

4. Why is there no identifiable option that looks at land around Goodwood for both employment and residential space? Yet later in the document it states that further investigation is required around employment space near Goodwood.

5. When will this council make a decision on the unmet housing need from the SDNP?

6. The Peter Brett Report is very detailed. From a scanned reading prior to the submission of questions I can see no mention of the modelling and policy excluding the link road that Councillor Taylor stated would be undertaken. Where is this in the PB report or when will it be conducted if it is not in the report.

Mrs Taylor provided the following responses:

Thank you for your questions. Answering each in turn –

- 1. The list in section 8 of the report, of significant issues is not intended to be exhaustive and members are asked to consider the full range of responses. Section 5 of the report outlines the consultation process, and section 6 of the report reflects on the consultation process and how it may be improved. With regards to the assessment of the suitability of land for development, the covering report highlights that further consideration will be given to landscape capacity and proximity to the sensitive environment of the AONB and confirms that the availability of suitable sites will be reviewed in an update of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.*
- 2. Any changes in government policy will be reflected upon and where necessary the plan updated. The government has stated that the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England will be published in 2020 and members will be updated accordingly.*
- 3. In line with national planning policy, the plan should be informed by the consideration of options and alternatives through the sustainability appraisal process. The outcomes of that testing is set out in Appendix 4 to the Local Plan way forward report. However the total number of dwellings referred to is the sum of all the potential locations for development which are included in that option – it does not represent the target for development in the emerging plan. Ultimately the next iteration of the plan will set out a new housing target justified with reference to the evidence of need, infrastructure and environmental constraints and ensuring the certainty of delivery.*
- 4. The refresh of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, which is referred to in sections 11 and 12 of the report will be considering all available land including that around Goodwood.*
- 5. The unmet need from the South Downs National Park will be considered next year as this council finalises its proposed submission draft plan. That consideration will need to be based on factors including - confirmation of the position of the national park authority; the availability of sites within the Chichester Plan area; environmental and infrastructure constraints; and sustainability and habitats regulations assessment.*
- 6. Further work to consider the transport implications of a mitigation strategy which excludes the Stockbridge Link Road is underway and the initial results are being discussed with West Sussex County Council as Highway Authority and Highways England. The outcomes of this work will inform the Plan and the results reported back to Members and interested parties in due course.*

Mr Dicker was permitted to ask a supplementary question:

How many comments have been made and what is the council doing to address the concerns on the quality of consultation documents.

I was assured that the council would be making a decision on the unmet housing need from the South Downs National Park this month.

Mrs Taylor replied as follows:

I recall explaining that the South Downs National Park decision would be made next year.

Mr Frost replied as follows:

The number of responses is set out in the tables in the report. Further details on the specific point raised will be sent to Mr Dicker outside of the meeting.

Cllr Charlotte Pexton (Bosham Parish Council) asked the following question:

The Initial Council Response in respect of AL10 Chidham and Hambrook states (p112):

“In March 2019 the Revised Landscape Capacity Study was produced which confirmed the assessment in the November 2018 study regarding the capacity for landscape change in the east-west corridor. The Preferred Approach Plan notes the potential landscape sensitivities, including protecting views to the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and their settings.

Therefore further consideration will need to be given to the capacity of this service village area to accommodate development, particularly with regards to landscape capacity and proximity to the sensitive environment of the AONB.”

Bosham Parish Council considers that the same consideration must be given to AL7 Highgrove Farm, Bosham. Bosham Parish Council is concerned that the wording of the Councils “Initial Response” implies a more stringent assessment and appraisal of the landscape setting relating to the AL10 allocation than is the case with Policy AL7.

Bosham Parish Council therefore requests Chichester District Council to confirm that there will be no less stringent assessment and appraisal of AL7 than of any other potential allocation along the A259 corridor?

Mrs Taylor provided the following response:

Thank you for the question. I can confirm that all sites are and will be subject to the same stringent assessment and appraisal. The proposed allocation of 500 homes at AL10 - Chidham and Hambrook – is considered to be a significant number for a service village and that is why it is recognised in the report – however, these considerations are acknowledged to affect other parishes and will be taken into account.

Cllr Pexton was permitted a supplementary question as follows:

The council's landscape study demonstrated that the area around Bosham has the same landscape sensitivity as Chidham so needs to be taken into account.

The comment was noted.

Mr Marson asked the following question:

QUESTION ON S12 INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION (p39 of Agenda Pack)

The narrative of the officer statement as documented is not a true reflection of either the Strategic Transport Meeting 15/11/17, nor the CDC Transport Consultancy Brief (sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5).

Is it not about time our Cabinet took a position that the Local Plan stated a dependency on adequate A27 funding from Government. In taking that stance, push back the onus on the CDC Director of the Environment and Planning to demonstrate that he, and his officers, deliver balanced narratives that enable our elected councillors to make informed decisions.

A balanced narrative for Infrastructure that would assist our councillors, and one which the public could readily accept, should contain integrated statements that take account of impact to Air Quality/Public Health from housing/transport numbers. The implications from the Court of Appeal judgement 12th Sept in Kent, where the refusal to grant planning approval for housing on the grounds of impact to Air Quality should not be underestimated given the current, and likely future AQMAs in Chichester.

My question is therefore...(a) Is this Cabinet prepared to declare a red line dependency for A27 Highways England funding to support our Local Plan? (b) will this Cabinet reject the S12 narrative as written and request Officers to provide a balanced narrative for our elected councillors to consider.

Mrs Taylor provided the following response:

Thank you for your question. In terms of part (a), a scheme of junction improvements for the A27 Chichester bypass is not at this stage funded via the Government's Roads Investment Strategy (either RIS1 or RIS2) and whilst the Council will continue to press for government funding and support, this cannot be relied upon. In order to be able to submit a sound Local Plan for independent examination next year, the Council has no option therefore but to proceed with work (in conjunction with Highways England) on the Local Plan A27 mitigation scheme, which is likely to comprise smaller-scale, at-grade improvements to ensure the junctions will continue to operate effectively and to mitigate the impacts of new development. However the work to date does suggest that public funding support will be necessary as part of that strategy.

In terms of part (b) of your question, the representations received to Policy S12 which concerns infrastructure provision cover a wide range of infrastructure matters and so are not focused solely on transport issues. Appendix 1 to the Local Plan Review report on the Cabinet agenda explains that the Council has provided a summary of the comments received and an initial response to the matters raised; unfortunately, it is not possible for the Council to provide a unique or detailed response to every representation. Nevertheless, I would wish to reassure you that matters such as the impacts on air quality and human health are key issues for the District Council, West Sussex County Council and Highways England in assessing the effects of new housing and associated traffic arising from development in both the adopted and emerging Local Plans. Ultimately, the answer to this part of your question will of course be a matter for members of the Cabinet to determine when they consider the Local Plan agenda item.

Ms Towers asked the following question:

In the Responses to the Preferred Approach Consultation and Way Forward document Policy S30 Strategic Wild life corridors there were 18 responses in support and one against. Those in support represented large organisations and councils , the one objection was a developer representing land owners.

The first line of the Council's response states "while there is a level of support, a number of objections and suggestions to amending the policy have been received". This does not reflect the fact that there is a significant level of support and only one objection. The suggestions to amend the policy are to improve the corridors. The objection seems to be because the wild life corridor proposed in Fishbourne is on land that could be developed.

Can the Council assure me that there will not be equal weighting between the many supporting submissions and the one objection and that the objection will not be on an equal footing with the many organisations who are putting the crucial conservation of wild life and bio diversity in Chichester Harbour and the National Park before development?

Mrs Taylor provided the following response:

As a matter of clarification, the report refers to the number of objections not objectors. However, I can confirm that the responses received will be considered on an equal footing with reference to the issues raised within them.

Ms Towers was permitted a supplementary question as follows:

Will you treat the objections on an equal footing with the supporters

Mr Frost replied as follows:

There were a number of issues raised which would be treated with equal weighting.

Ms Towers then asked:

What assurances can the council make that once in place wildlife corridors will be protected in perpetuity?

Mrs Lintill requested the supplementary question be submitted in writing for a written response as it did not directly link to the initial question.

Mrs Lintill then concluded public question time.

75 Extending Ultrafast Public Connectivity

Mr Wilding introduced the item. He explained that in 2017 the council signed up to a countywide Gigabit project. Part of the project was an award to West Sussex County Council (WSCC) of a government grant funded contract to create a fibre network connection for public sector sites across the county. Cityfibre won the contract and the project is now in the final stages. He explained that the council now has an opportunity to use the cool off arrangement to connect a further 50 council assets in Chichester city such as Westward House, Westgate centre and offices. The project requires new fibre infrastructure installation across the city but in turn will provide ultrafast connectivity to the council's assets and increase fibre and digital infrastructure across the city, benefitting the local community and the local economy. The cost of the project is estimated at £743,000 over seven years and is likely to be met from the West Sussex Business Rates Retention Pool.

Mr Wilding confirmed that there is also a project relating to better connectivity in the rural areas.

Mr Mildred added that the project is part of the programme of countywide projects which tie in to the national agenda for digital infrastructure. He explained that it puts the council at the forefront of the benefits on offer. A member briefing will be arranged next year.

Mrs Sharp was invited to ask her pre-submitted question as follows:

I understand that the Extending Ultrafast Public Connectivity report Item 5 on the agenda that this item doesn't involve 5G. However could I ask the Cabinet Members (Martyn Bell – Place and Penny Plant - Environment)

- A) If you could, if possible work with Peter Wilding (Corporate Services) to link in the digging up the road issue with the Vision project to revamp our city pavements and possibly with tree planting works
We don't yet as a County have a "Dig Once" policy but if we could work together to bring some co-benefits to Chichester residents this might make residents happier about the inconvenience of the digging works although we probably all agree on the society benefits that better connectivity can bring
- B) Could I ask Cabinet Members to share your personal views on the precautionary principle and 5G and trees

I know that you might say 5G doesn't need to be discussed under this Agenda item but this project doesn't preclude the coming of 5 G and residents' concerns are very real especially for those who have health issues linked to Wi-Fi etc so some reassurance from Cabinet members that they are looking into these issues would be a comfort.

Mr Wilding provided the following response:

With regards to the first part of your question the Council is represented on a Countywide group that is coordinating the approach to Digital Infrastructure, one key work stream of that group is developing a 'Dig Once' approach. Whilst the County Council will need to lead this as they grant the licences for digging roads we will ensure that Chichester District Council strongly encourage this approach to be developed and implemented as a matter of urgency.

Mrs Lintill then provided the following response:

With regards to the second part of your question it is not appropriate at this time to seek the personal views of members however the WSCC position on this and shared lines for communication are that the County does not have a programme to deliver 5G which is still in development by national commercial suppliers and we would expect that any future deployment of 5G in the county would be in line with the relevant government policies.

Mrs Sharp asked if the issue could be discussed by all members at a future date. Mrs Lintill confirmed that this would be the case.

Mr Potter was invited to ask a question as follows:

With reference to the last sentence of page 13 of the Cabinet papers relating to minimising disruption, how much disruption is anticipated?

Mr Mildred then provided the following response:

Wherever possible existing infrastructure will be used to minimise disruption however, it is likely to take a few years to complete in total.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions and recommendation below.

RESOLVED

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.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

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.

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

Mrs Taylor introduced the item. She explained that a consultation of the Local Plan Review took place over an eight week period from 30 December 2018 until 2 February 2019. A total of 3200 representations were received from 729 respondents. The report sets out a summary of the representations received for Part I of the Local Plan Review Preferred Approach which relates to Strategic Policies and Allocations. A separate report to Cabinet and Council will address representations on Part II of the Plan relating to Development Management Policies. Mrs Taylor drew attention to appendix 1 to the report which contains the initial council response and paragraph 8 of the report. She explained that paragraph 9 sets out a number of new issues which require consideration including the declaration of a Climate Emergency and the discharge of nitrates into Solent and impact this has on future development. Mrs Taylor confirmed that A27 discussions remain ongoing with Highways England and WSCC regarding the nature and finance of improvement works and this uncertainty will need to be addressed within the Local Plan. She then drew attention to the Schedule as set out in appendix 3 to the report and the Sustainability Appraisal detailed in paragraph 4 of the report. She confirmed that further technical work is required.

Mrs Taylor outlined an amendment to recommendation 1c to add the words *and supplementary material* prior to its publication.

Mrs Lintill clarified that the report is considering progress only at this stage.

Mr Wilding addressed concerns relating to options in the north of the district and the implications given the current lack of infrastructure. Mr Ayling explained that the council must test all the options and consider the benefits and issues of each.

Mrs Plant commented that less than 1% of residents had made representations on the review. She explained that a Local Plan is essential in order to prevent unplanned development in the district. She referred to the need for the examiner to find the Plan sound.

Members thanked officers for their hard work to date.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the recommendations below.

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 and supplementary material prior to its publication.
 - d. That the issues raised in the Summary of Representations document and the other relevant issues summarised in section 9 of the report are noted as key considerations for the ongoing production of the Local Plan.
2. That the programme of further technical work set out in section 11 of this report is endorsed.
3. 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.

77 **Resurfacing, Improved Drainage and additional site enhancements at Westhampnett Depot**

Mrs Plant introduced the item. She drew attention to the details of the proposal as set out on pages 29 to 37 of the report. The project seeks to overhaul the foul drainage system at the Depot and will create a pumped connection to Stane Street. The project will also overhaul the storm water drainage storage system creating new gullies, soakaways and a fuel interceptor. The HGV parking area will be levelled and fully resurfaced and a new enclosed vehicle washdown facility installed. Mrs Plant explained that the addition of several environmental and operational improvements would result in significant additional costs if carried out separate to the main project. She outlined the additional enhancements which include:

- A new one way system for vehicles entering and exiting the site
- LED Flood lighting
- Electric vehicle charging including installation of cable stays under the surface
- A rainwater storage system
- Increased CCTV cameras
- Number plate recognition at the entrance gate

Mrs Plant confirmed that the additional enhancements total £195,000 resulting in an overall total cost of £850,000. In addition WSCC have agreed in principle to connect the gypsy and traveller transit site to the main sewer system, funded by WSCC.

Mrs Plant advised that officers had secured a window of 14 weeks to store vehicles offsite during the works. Mr Ward added that due to the critical timescale outlined in section 4.9 of the report the Chairman of the Council had agreed to take the

decision as urgent and as such the decision is not subject to call-in (please see urgent notice attached to the final minutes).

Mr Carter outlined a minor amendment to page 33 of the report which should refer to the existing budget as being £592,000 rather than £595,000.

Members noted their support to the project.

Mrs Plant requested the addition of the words *of which* to follow £850,000 in the recommendation to Council.

Mrs Lintill requested clarification on the use of storm water. Mr Carter confirmed that the size, cost, capture and use all have to be considered. He explained that a suitable volume had been agreed and the water would be used to fill road sweepers which are currently filled by hose pipe, thereby reducing mains water usage. In addition it is anticipated that the time saved filling the sweepers would be up to an hour a day.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions and recommendation below.

RESOLVED

1. That Cabinet approves the inclusion of environmental and operational enhancements to the scheme set out in 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

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

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

78 Determination of the Council Tax Base 2020-2021

Mr Wilding introduced the item. He explained that the determination of the Council Tax Base 2020-2021 is an estimate of the taxable capacity of the district. The figure is adjusted based on the assumed collection rate of 99%. He drew attention to Appendix 1 which details the chargeable properties by band which totals 54,133 and Appendix 2 which details the determined tax base for each parish.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions below.

RESOLVED

In order to comply with section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

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 (1 above) 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.

79 Disabled Facilities Grants - Staff Resources

Mrs Graves introduced the item. She explained that the report relates to the Disabled Facilities grants which seek to enable independent living for people with disabilities. The grants are funded from the Better Care Fund and can be used for a number of projects including changes required to a property to enable earlier discharge from hospital. In 2018/19 a total of 180 grant related cases were facilitated compared to 126 in 2017/18. The facilitation of this increase in cases has only been possible via the use of contractors. Mrs Graves explained that the volume of cases is set to increase further and therefore additional staffing is required to ensure that the council has a robust system in place to provide the level of support needed. She confirmed that the staffing costs would be funded by the Better Care Fund.

Mrs Reed added that the complexity of the cases had increased significantly.

Mrs Taylor requested clarification on whether current vacancies were an indication that recruiting to the new posts would be difficult. Mrs Reed explained that although there had been vacancies the new posts would be more specialist.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolution below.

RESOLVED

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.

80 **Late Items**

There were no late items.

81 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

Mrs Lintill read the part II resolution in relation to agenda items 12 and 13 which was seconded by Mrs Taylor.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to go into part II.

RESOLVED

That with regard to agenda items 12 and 13 the public including the press should be excluded from the meeting 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.

The Cabinet then took a five minute break.

82 **Southern Gateway**

Mr Bell introduced the item.

Mr Over then provided additional information. He also drew member's attention to amendments to the recommendation:

- Resolution 4 to delete the word authorised from the first line.
- Resolution 5 to delete the words and county officers from the first line.

The Cabinet then discussed the report.

Mr Moss requested that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) recommendations be referred to in making recommendations to the Council. Mrs Lintill clarified that the recommendations from OSC and the Chichester District Growth Board had been noted.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions and recommendation below.

RESOLVED

On the assumption that Council approve the selection of Developer A that Cabinet:

1. Delegates 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. Approves 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.
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.
4. Notes that officers will investigate a “Land equalisation” proposal and bring forward options to a future Cabinet.
5. That the District Council requests WSCC to 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.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

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.

83 St James Industrial Estate Chichester

Mr Bell introduced the item.

Mr Oakley and Mrs Sharp were invited to the table as they had requested to speak.

Mrs McKay and Mrs Hotchkiss responded to the points raised.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolution below.

RESOLVED

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 space at St James Industrial Estate in accordance with the proposal set out in section 5 of the report.

The meeting ended at 11.28 am

CHAIRMAN

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

CABINET

7 January 2020

Climate Emergency Initial Action Plan

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Tom Day/Stephanie Evans – Environmental Coordinator (job share)

Telephone: 01243 534854

E-mail: tday@chichester.gov.uk / sevans@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Penny Plant - Cabinet Member for Environment and Chichester Contract Services

Telephone: 01243 575031 E-mail: pplant@chichester.gov.uk

2. Executive Summary

The Environment Panel were tasked by Cabinet with “evaluating priority actions for a Climate Emergency Action Plan” and to “identify and evaluate the resources needed to achieve delivery of the action plan, including the proposal for a Climate Emergency Officer funded from reserves and the potential for the use of the Zero Carbon Graylingwell payment for implementing carbon reduction initiatives”.

This report represents the culmination of the work undertaken by the Environment Panel and presents the Climate Emergency Initial Action Plan for approval by Cabinet. It also presents for approval the preferred option for the resourcing of the Action Plan as recommended by Environment Panel.

3. Recommendation

3.1 That the Climate Emergency Initial Action Plan, as presented in Appendix 1, is approved.

3.2 That Cabinet recommend to Council that a Climate Emergency officer post at a total cost of £120,000, plus an operational budget of £30,000, is funded from reserves for 2 years (full time) to support delivery of the Action Plan.

4. Background

4.1 Cabinet declared a Climate Emergency at its meeting on 9 July 2019. As part of that report Cabinet tasked the Environment Panel with “evaluating priority actions for a Climate Emergency Action plan” and also asked the panel “to identify and evaluate the resources needed to achieve delivery of the action plan, including the proposal for a Climate Emergency Officer funded from reserves and the potential for the use of the Zero Carbon Graylingwell payment for implementing carbon reduction initiatives”.

4.2 Since the meeting of Cabinet in July, the Environment Panel has met a number of times to determine the scope of the actions to tackle climate change that are deliverable (by a local authority) and then developed a list of action areas in order of priority. At its meeting in November, the Panel commented on a draft Initial Action Plan. This was developed further and the plan finalised at the December Panel. It is this Plan which is presented for Cabinet's approval and is included in Appendix 1 to this report. Options for resources to support the action plan delivery were also assessed at the November meeting, with the preferred option forming the basis of the recommendation to Cabinet in paragraph 3.2 above.

5. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 5.1 The main outcome to be achieved is the reduction in carbon emissions from Chichester District in response to the declaration of a Climate Emergency. A District wide area target of a 10% year-on-year reduction is proposed in action 3 of the Initial Action Plan (Appendix 1). National, local and individual actions beyond those in the CDC action plan would be needed to achieve this. The target is set to reflect a step up from the current level of reductions which are between 3 and 5% year on year. However, it is less than the 13% year-on-year to 2050 figure that the UK's 2050 net zero target would require, reflecting that the carbon reduction trajectory will not be linear over time.
- 5.2 The Environment Panel evaluated the potential of Low Carbon Chichester funding from the Graylingwell redevelopment via Homes England. The action plan seeks to utilise this funding (approx. £250,000) in combination with match funding to deliver practical carbon reduction projects across the District, rather than limiting funding to a specified geographical area. Securing this funding and putting in place the resources to support its utilisation, is a key outcome of the Plan. The recommendation for a new post is based, in large part, on being able to deliver the work on Low Carbon Chichester without affecting other work areas.
- 5.3 The action plan will also deliver reductions in carbon from new developments, from the Council's own operations and via an increase in tree planting.

6. Proposal

- 6.1 The Initial Action Plan in Appendix 1 contains high level actions with outcomes and overall timescales. This will form the basis for a more detailed action plan, to be developed by the new post-holder (if funding is approved), which will break down each of the numbered actions into stages and determine project milestones and dates for performance management.
- 6.2 The scope of potential actions considered by the Environment Panel was initially very broad. In developing the plan, the Panel have considered the main areas that a district council can influence. The main focus of the plan is on carbon reduction, so as to demonstrate the district's contribution towards national targets in addressing the climate emergency. The plan does not evaluate climate adaptation measures specifically, although many services within the Council are already contributing to this agenda. The actions on tree planting and wetland creation will have additional benefits for adaptation, biodiversity and health and wellbeing in general.

- 6.3 The benefits of the plan are aimed at all residents of and visitors to the district. Further work in drawing up the criteria for the Local Carbon Chichester fund will affect where the benefits of that funding fall depending on whether domestic and/or non-domestic buildings are eligible.
- 6.4 The main timescales are set out in the Initial Action Plan. Project milestones will be developed as part of the detailed action plan. The new post will sit within the existing Environment Strategy team in the Environmental Management division.

7. Alternatives Considered

- 7.1 The plan has been developed from a longer list of options, which were considered by the Environment Panel. Examples of other local authorities' action plans have been considered. For the resources required to support the plan, a range of options were also considered by the Panel. These included a full time post, a part time post and an option for a mixture of additional staff time from existing part-time posts and external consultancy support.
- 7.2 In order to make full use of the Low Carbon Chichester funds, and to implement a full range of actions, including carbon savings within our own estates, tree planting schemes, securing carbon reductions from new development and wider publicity and community-based campaigns, the Panel has recommended to Cabinet, an option for a full time post for 2 years. The options considered by the Panel are set out in Appendix 2.

8. Resource and Legal Implications

- 8.1 Financial implications are that £150k will be expended from reserves on a fixed term post including a supporting operational budget. However, in making its recommendation, Environment Panel considered this to outweigh the wider cost of not investing in a detailed action plan now. There is no certainty at the moment that alternative sources of funding from central government will be forthcoming and delaying a full action plan until such funding may become available would not achieve the objectives of the climate emergency declaration.
- 8.2 The Climate Change Act 2008 is the primary piece of legislation driving action nationally. The UK government has recently changed its target to making the country net carbon neutral by 2050. Carbon budget setting is not yet devolved down to local authority areas. In order to meet community expectation of local action, it is recommended that we take action now, rather than wait for a future binding target to be imposed.
- 8.3 Staffing implications. The proposal is for a two year fixed-term post. The post will require a high level of technical knowledge on energy management, carbon reduction technologies, as well as the ability to deliver projects over a relatively short space of time. The proposed budget has been assessed using an estimated staff grade that reflects this skills set.
- 8.4 The recommended option also includes a supporting operational budget. This is proposed because the Low Carbon Chichester funds can only be used towards supporting that project's own carbon reduction targets. Other projects in the action

plan can be publicised using this allocation, which will also support training and equipment for the Project Officer.

8.5 Property implications. The wider property implications from recommended Action 12 in the Action Plan cannot be assessed yet and each will depend on its own business case being developed. However cost effective investment in reducing carbon emission will also reduce running costs.

9. Consultation

9.1 Environment Panel members have been consulted through the development of the priority areas for action, the initial action plan and on the options for resourcing.

10. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

10.1 The main community impacts will be to reduce carbon emissions, demonstrate leadership in addressing the Climate Emergency, and encouraging actions by communities and individuals. Secondary impacts will be increased tree planting and increased partnership working within the district.

10.2 Risks that could affect delivery include:

- Changes in government policy, particularly on planning policy.
- Changes to funding available for projects on our own estate and /or projects being identified, but only with a long payback period.
- Lack of identifiable sites with land owner agreements for tree planting projects.

10.3 The proposed Initial Action Plan is based on current policy and funding opportunities. Other funding opportunities may come forward nationally during the two years of the new officer post. The action plan will be subject to annual review by the Panel in order to ensure that it remains focussed on the opportunities available and is not adversely affected by changes in the national policy and funding contexts.

11. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		X
Climate Change and Biodiversity Yes positive impacts for addressing climate change locally and for biodiversity	X	
Human Rights and Equality Impact In developing the Low Carbon Chichester funding criteria an equalities impact assessment will be carried out.	X	
Safeguarding and Early Help		
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)		X
Health and Wellbeing By supporting sustainable lifestyles and transport choices, there should be minor but positive impacts on health and wellbeing	X	

12. Appendices

12.1 Appendix 1 - Chichester District's Climate Emergency Initial Action Plan 2020 – 2025

12.2 Appendix 2 - Options for the Resourcing and Scope of Chichester District's Climate Emergency Action Plan

13. Background Papers

13.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1 - Chichester District's Climate Emergency Initial Action Plan 2020 – 2025

A) Cross-cutting themes:

**Putting our climate at the heart of decision making,
Ensuring all decision-making and investments are sustainable.**

	Action	Target	Timescale
1	Complete recruitment to Climate Emergency officer post	Suitable qualified and experienced person in post	May 2020
2	Develop the Climate Emergency Full Action Plan, containing detailed targets and project milestones, from this Initial action plan. The full plan is to be reported to the Environment Panel and approved by Cabinet	Plan adopted by Cabinet and Council	September 2020
3	Set a Local Authority Area-wide target for District CO2 reductions of 10% year on year until 2025. Work with partner organisations across the District to co-ordinate actions towards meeting this target (see also action 22)	10% year on year reduction in emissions	Target in place by 2020, target to run to 2025
4	Quantify current carbon emissions from CDC operations. Set a CO2 reduction target for CDC operations (development of existing target)	Target to be set based on the outcome of further assessment work	Target in place by 2020, target to run to 2025
5	Put in place a system for identifying those CDC decisions with impacts on carbon emissions, air quality and biodiversity and ensure that negative impacts are avoided or mitigated.	That key decisions are identified in good time, impacts are assessed and any negative impacts are avoided.	Systems in place by June 2020
6	To report annually on the progress of this action plan	Report to Environment Panel, identifying progress, successes, any new funding opportunities for evaluation and any changes to national policy context that will affect delivery	Annually from the adoption of the detailed action plan

	Action	Target	Timescale
7	To align our council statutory and non-statutory plans, policies and guidance with respective carbon reduction pathways and biodiversity restoration plans, including procurement.	Review of plans and policies together with recommendations for changes, to be reported back to Environment Panel and Cabinet	By September 2021

B) High Level Action Plan

Ref	Action	Target	Timescale	Services involved in Delivery
Low Carbon Chichester Funding				
8	Secure Low Carbon Chichester Funding from Homes England: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decide on areas of focus - energy efficiency/renewables within public sector / community buildings; Establish joint agreement with HE and Linden on criteria for funding applications; Carbon savings in Kg/year, Locations anywhere District-wide, Public ownership and/or public access, value for money £/kg CO2, Deliverability, Publicity; Establish match funding requirements from applicants. 	Legal agreement signed and funds transferred. Funding criteria agreed	May 2020 July 2020	ESU -project officer to lead. Legal and PR to support the project
9	Report on the feasibility of establishing an ongoing District-wide fund for delivery of carbon reduction projects and biodiversity restoration projects. This will include: (1) a review of the opportunity to raise money from the UK Municipal Bonds Agency for low carbon infrastructure, and (2) the potential to use legal and planning mechanisms for offsetting residual carbon from new developments.	Report finished Implementation of funding (continuation of LCC)	Sept 2020 End 2020	ESU – project officer to lead. Planning Policy Team
Minimise emissions from new housing				
10	Require new development to achieve high levels of energy efficiency and minimise carbon emissions through policies within the Local Plan Review. (subject to the outcomes of the Future Homes Standard consultation and implementation of any changes to the Building Regulations)	Highest viable level of carbon minimisation included in Local Plan review	2020 (submission)	ESU, Planning Policy

Ref	Action	Target	Timescale	Services involved in Delivery
Minimise Corporate Carbon Emissions				
11	Investigate opportunities to move to a Green Energy supplier within the existing LASER procurement framework	New supply contract in place	October 2020	Building Services
12	Report back on previous review of existing and identify new opportunities for carbon saving within the Council's estate including options for external funding through BEIS's Salix interest free loans.	Report on 5 major buildings Report on other CDC properties	2021 2022	Building Services, Estates
Reduction in food waste				
13	Develop local plans for reducing food waste within national policy frameworks and targets.	Dependant on national policy and funding developments	End of 2020	Chichester Contract Services (CCS)
14	Investigate opportunities for diverting food waste to anaerobic digestion.	Target to be set in terms of CO2 saved / year	End of 2020	CCS, WSCC
Increase tree planting				
15	Increased tree planting on CDC land through carbon offset funding, Woodland Trust funding, or other national policy initiatives.	Parks Vision to include target for tree planting	2021	ESU, CCS
16	Increased tree planting on non-CDC land through carbon offset funding, Woodland Trust funding and net biodiversity gain or other national funding streams	Dependent on announcements on national policy and funding schemes	End of 2020	ESU, Development Management
17	Investigate opportunities for multi-function use of any land acquired for the mitigation of nutrient inputs into on Chichester / Pagham Harbours. Wetland creation and tree planting would both act as carbon sinks and ensure that the land can't revert to high input agricultural use	Joint scheme of mitigation to be agreed with Partnership for South Hampshire and Natural England	End of 2020	ESU, Planning Policy, Development Management

Ref	Action	Target	Timescale	Services involved in Delivery
18	Identify land with opportunities for tree planting within the Strategic Wildlife Corridors.	Heritage Lottery Fund bid to be submitted	March 2020	ESU; implementation depends on outcome of funding for wildlife corridor enhancement project
Sustainable Transport				
19	Achieve enhancements to walking and cycle networks through partnership working.	Contribute to County's target of increasing the length of the cycle network by 15% per annum compared to a 5km base (across the County)	Spring 2022	Environment Protection (EP), WSCC
20	Enable the continued expansion of the electric vehicle charging networks.	Will be developed based on the demand metrics from the recent installations and developments in the EV market	Ongoing	EP
Communication and Promotion of Lifestyle Changes				
21	Promote, through various means climate change actions and lifestyle changes in the wider community including publicity campaigns such as the West Sussex Climate Change Pledge.	Produce details of a costed campaign on key environmental issues (Climate Change, Biodiversity, Plastics)	End of 2020	Public Relations/ESU

Ref	Action	Target	Timescale	Services involved in Delivery
22	<p>Evaluate benefits and costs of setting up a Climate Commission. A commission would bring together major public and private sector organisations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-ordinate and monitor actions that contribute to District-wide carbon reductions. • Share best practice and innovatory project ideas • Work together to improve sustainable transport networks, (including bus services , park and ride, car-share schemes and car clubs) 	Investigate opportunities for building on existing networks and partnerships	2022	Communities/ Corporate Improvement/ESU

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2 - Options for the Resourcing and Scope of Chichester District's Climate Emergency Action Plan

Options	Budget Implications for CDC	Skills and Support required	Actions to be Delivered	Pros/Cons/Risks/Opportunities
<p>Option A Recruit a Climate Emergency Officer for up to 3 years</p> <p>Option A1) 1 FTE for 2 years</p> <p>Option A2) 1 FTE for c.2.5 years</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>Option A1) £150,000 (£120,000 salary costs¹ plus £30,000 operational budget and Low Carbon Chichester Fund)</p> <p>Option A2) £150,000 (£150,000 salary costs with minimal operational budget except Low Carbon Chichester Fund)</p>	<p>Skills and experience required indicate an F Grade post (subject to job profile evaluation).</p> <p>Key skills Project management, recent experience of developing and delivering energy projects.</p> <p>Line management and support from Environmental co-ordinator</p>	<p>Deliver the full scope of actions on carbon reduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gain approval for the detailed Climate Change Action Plan, to be developed from the high level Strategy, including setting a local carbon budget framework within the context of a long term trajectory to a Zero Carbon Chichester. The detailed action plan will set out deliverables in the first five year action plan period ; 2. Secure the Low Carbon Chichester funding from Homes England. This includes deciding on an area of focus – energy efficiency or renewable energy; joint agreement on criteria for funding applications; determining the extent of match funding from applicants needed to make most efficient use of the funds available in delivering the carbon savings required 3. Investigate opportunities for a local carbon offset fund. This would require a revised Local Plan Review policy to require new development to offset residual carbon (in addition to fabric efficiency reductions). The management of the funds could be based on a continuation of the Low Carbon Chichester funds, revised in the light of the successes and difficulties of that fund. 4. Consider opportunities to move to a Green Energy supplier (depending on existing contractual commitments). 5. Revisit existing and identify new opportunities for energy saving within the Council's estate; this should include options for external funding through BEIS's Salix interest free loans. Where projects have 	<p><u>Advantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for the delivery of the most comprehensive range of actions for reducing carbon in Chichester District of all the options and clearly demonstrates a substantial local contribution towards achieving zero carbon Chichester • Allows for the development and delivery of the Low Carbon Chichester Fund. • 2 or 2.5 year post allows for the recruitment of a suitably experienced officer. • Allows for responding to anticipated UK Government policy responses and funding opportunities <p><u>Disadvantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger cost implications for the Council • Operational implications of the post are less clear, as they are more dependent on Local Plan progress and projects coming forward within CDC estate. <p><u>Resource level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff resourcing on climate change across Environmental Strategy would increase from 0.05 FTE to 1.05 FTE for 2 or 2 ½ years. • Under option A2 there would be minimal supporting budget for non-LCC funded action areas, but more officer time to

¹ Includes on costs

Options	Budget Implications for CDC	Skills and Support required	Actions to be Delivered	Pros/Cons/Risks/Opportunities
			<p>a payback period of less than 5 years they can fully funded though Salix. Where payback is more than five years they can co-funded by CDC and Salix. Some external resource is likely to be needed to identify potential projects (for example consultancy and/or WSCC estates energy team).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Develop local plans for reducing food waste within national policy framework and targets, and investigate opportunities for diverting food waste to anaerobic digestion; 7. Investigate opportunities for increased tree planting, including on non-CDC land through carbon offset funding; multi-functional use of any land acquired for nutrient mitigation and potential for external funding (e.g. Woodland Trust). 8. Delivering sustainable transport measures through partnership working, including opportunities for achieving enhancements to cycle networks and electric vehicle charging networks. 9. Promotion of lifestyle changes (e.g. West Sussex Climate Pledge) and supporting publicity campaigns. 10. Evaluate benefits and costs of setting up a Climate Commission. 	implement changes
<p>Option B Recruit a Climate Emergency Officer for 1 – 1.5 years</p> <p>Option B1) 1 FTE for 1 year</p> <p>Option B2) 1 FTE for 1.5 years</p>	<p>Option B1) £70,000 (£60,000 salary costs plus £10,000 operational budget</p> <p>Option B2) £100,000 (£90,000 salary</p>	<p>Skills and experience required indicate an F Grade post (subject to job profile evaluation).</p> <p>Key skills Project management,</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gain approval for the detailed Climate Change Action Plan, to be developed from the high level action plan, including setting a local carbon budget framework within the context of a long term trajectory to a Zero Carbon Chichester. The detailed plan will set out deliverables in the first five year action plan period ; 2. Secure the Low Carbon Chichester funding from Homes England. This includes deciding on an area of focus – energy efficiency or renewable energy; joint agreement on criteria for funding applications; 	<p><u>Advantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would focus on the achievement of first two objectives of option A within year one and other objectives as time and funds allow. • Would allow the necessary staff time for the development of the Low Carbon Chichester Fund and enable delivery of the fund in year 1. • Would not allow for the delivery of as wide a range of actions as option A, as post would

Options	Budget Implications for CDC	Skills and Support required	Actions to be Delivered	Pros/Cons/Risks/Opportunities
	costs plus £10,000 operational budget	<p>recent experience of developing and delivering energy projects.</p> <p>Line management and support from Environmental co-ordinator</p> <p>An alternative is a secondment from an existing member of CDC staff however they may not have extensive experience in the energy / low-carbon sector. No attempt has yet been made to identify a suitable secondment.</p>	<p>determining the extent of match funding form applicants needed to make most efficient use of the funds available in delivering the carbon savings required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Investigate opportunities for a local carbon offset fund. This would require a revised Local Plan Review policy to require new development to offset residual carbon (in addition to fabric efficiency reductions). The management of the funds could be based on a continuation of the Low Carbon Chichester funds, revised in the light of the successes and difficulties of that fund. 4. Consider opportunities to move to a Green Energy supplier (depending on existing contractual commitments) 5. Revisit existing and identify new opportunities for energy saving within the Council's estate; this should include options for external funding through BEIS's Salix interest free loans. Where projects have a payback period of less than 5 years they can fully funded though Salix. Where payback is more than five years they can co-funded by CDC and Salix. Some external resource is likely to be needed to identify potential projects (for example consultancy and/or WSCC estates energy team) and may also be required for implementation of projects where they fall beyond the initial period. 6. Investigate opportunities for increased tree planting, including on non-CDC land through carbon offset funding; multi-functional use of any land acquired for nutrient mitigation and potential for external funding (e.g. Woodland Trust) 	<p>cease after 12-18 months.</p> <p><u>Disadvantages / Risks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the 12-18 month period, it is likely that the action plan would focus on the delivery of one action (Low Carbon Chichester Fund) without ongoing increases in resources within the team. Continuation of a local carbon offset fund and energy project within CDC estate will need some continuing resource support from Environmental Strategy and Estates / Building Services team beyond the 12/18 month period • Short-term nature of the post means there is a risk that an officer with suitable skills and experience to deliver in a short time scale cannot be recruited; <p><u>Resource level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff resourcing on climate change across Environmental Strategy would increase from 0.05 FTE to 1.05 FTE during year 1/18 months. However it is likely to revert to 0.1-0.25 FTE after 1 year/18 months depending on the ongoing requirements of LCC / carbon offsetting projects. This will have knock-on implications for delivery of support to planning policy and also for the Single-use Plastics Action Plan

Options	Budget Implications for CDC	Skills and Support required	Actions to be Delivered	Pros/Cons/Risks/Opportunities
<p>Option C Combination of outsourcing of technical work to identify best value opportunities for achieving carbon savings plus additional staff time for setting up the Low Carbon Chichester Fund</p> <p>Option C) 1 FTE for 1 year</p>	<p>Existing staff are part time and therefore there is potential to increase above 1.0 FTE using the existing post holders</p> <p>Option C) £30,000 (£15,000 estimate from reserves for consultancy fees. £15,000 for additional staff time).</p>	<p>Existing CDC Officers would require the support of external expertise to enable opportunities for leveraging in funding for future energy projects to be fully realised.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review and update of the existing Climate Change Action Plan 2. Secure the Low Carbon Chichester funding from Homes England. This includes deciding on an area of focus – energy efficiency or renewable energy; joint agreement on criteria for funding applications; determining the extent of match funding form applicants needed to make most efficient use of the funds available in delivering the carbon savings required. 3. Investigate opportunities for a local carbon offset fund. This would require a revised Local Plan Review policy to require new development to offset residual carbon (in addition to fabric efficiency reductions). The management of the funds could be based on a continuation of the Low Carbon Chichester funds, revised in the light of the successes and difficulties of that fund. 	<p><u>Advantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable an expert on energy project finance to identify opportunities for funding; • Resourcing additional staff time means that existing work programmes could continue, including the delivery of the Single Use Plastics Action Plan and Local Biodiversity Action Plan and support for development of the Local Plan would continue. <p><u>Disadvantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not allow for the delivery of as wide a range of actions as options A or B, as option would have to focus on a limited range of activities which would achieve the greatest carbon saving; • On-going resources likely to only be sufficient to focus on the set up and initial delivery of the Low Carbon Chichester Fund <p><u>Resource Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff resourcing on climate change would increase from 0.05 FTE to 0.25 FTE and initially there would be additional resources, in terms of the consultants’ time. However the resourcing is likely to return to current levels in the second year and the action plan will need to reflect this

Options	Budget Implications for CDC	Skills and Support required	Actions to be Delivered	Pros/Cons/Risks/Opportunities
---------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------

Note on the Low Carbon Chichester Fund

Homes England has offered the Council the opportunity to use funds from the Graylingwell development to be spent on quantifiable carbon reduction projects District-wide. The amount of this funding will be around £250,000. Funding is not available for the setting up of the fund, however once in place, up to 10% of the zero carbon payment can be used for the day to day management/promotional costs of the implementation phase. However this 10% will also need to fund the Building Standards Hub who will be assessing the Carbon Savings of particular projects or measures put forward to be funded. This is a requirement of the agreement with Homes England.

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

CABINET

7 January 2020

Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst Air Quality Management Area

1. Contacts

Report Author

Simon Ballard – Environmental Protection Manager
Telephone: 01243 534694 E-mail: sballard@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member

Penny Plant - Cabinet Member for Environment and Chichester Contract Services
Telephone: 01243 575031 E-mail: pplant@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That Cabinet note the responses to the proposed Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst, Air Quality Management Area public consultation exercise.**
- 2.2 That Cabinet note the authority delegated to the Director of Planning and the Environment in consultation with the Director of Housing and Communities to make and seal an Air Quality Management Area Order at Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst as shown at Appendix 1 of this report and to commence preparation of an Air Quality Action Plan.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Local authorities have a statutory duty to designate those parts of their areas, where any of the nationally prescribed Air Quality Objectives (AQO) are not being achieved or likely to be achieved, as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA). This applies only to those locations where members of the public might reasonably be exposed. Under Section 83(1) of the Environment Act 1995, local authorities have to designate these AQMA's 'by means of an order'.
- 3.2 Members will recall that at the Cabinet meeting of 1 October 2019 it was resolved to approve a consultation on the proposed AQMA at Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst. This report presents the consultation responses received (Appendix 2) and the draft Order for the AQMA declaration (Appendix 1).
- 3.3 Once an AQMA is declared then the authority must produce an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) within 12 months. The AQAP for Rumbolds Hill will form part of the revised AQAP for Chichester District.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 The outcome will be a new Air Quality Management Area at Rumbolds Hill and a revised Air Quality Action Plan for Chichester District with various options and actions

aimed at improving air quality in the area. The revised AQAP is due for adoption in the summer of 2020.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 That members consider the consultation responses in Appendix 2 and endorse the proposal to declare an AQMA in Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst.
- 5.3 Officers will work with West Sussex County Council, South Downs National Park Authority, Midhurst Town Council and Midhurst Vision Steering Group to co-write the draft revised AQAP in relation to Rumbolds Hill.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 Where authorities have evidence that air quality fails an AQO then declaration of an AQMA is a statutory duty. The monitoring data at Rumbolds Hill is unequivocal in suggesting that the declaration of an AQMA is necessary for non-compliance with the air quality objective for nitrogen dioxide stated as an annual mean value. As such no alternatives are considered appropriate.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 The AQMA declaration and delivery of the revised AQAP are deliverable within existing staff and financial resources.
- 7.2 Under Section 83(1) of the Environment Act 1995, local authorities have to designate AQMA's 'by means of an Order' where any of the prescribed AQOs are not likely to be met.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 A full list of those consulted is at Appendix 3. The consultation responses are at Appendix 2.

Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.2 The proposed declaration of the Rumbolds Hill AQMA is a statutory duty for the District Council. Nevertheless the matter relates to local traffic emissions where WSCC are the relevant Highway Authority. Options for improving air quality in this location will be the subject of future discussion with WSCC. In drafting the revised AQAP, consideration will be given to the consultation responses and suggestions made within.

9. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		✓
Climate Change and Biodiversity Once the AQMA is declared then the related AQAP will propose measures to improve air quality in the AQMA. Measures that tackle air pollution generally have a positive impact in tackling climate change.	✓	
Human Rights and Equality Impact		✓

Safeguarding and Early Help		✓
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)		✓
Health and Wellbeing Actions proposed to tackle air pollution and emissions have a positive impact on health and wellbeing. Non-car modes of travel such as cycling and walking are well documented to be beneficial in relation to a wide range of physical and mental health issues. Reduced emissions are directly linked to lower exposure to pollution and a wide range of beneficial health and environmental effects.	✓	
Other		✓

10. Appendices

Appendix 1: Draft Rumbolds Hill AQMA Order for declaration.
Appendix 2: Consultation responses.
Appendix 3: List of consultees.

11. Background Papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1: Draft Order for the Declaration of the Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst AQMA:

Chichester District Council

Section 83 (1) Part IV Environment Act 1995

The Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000

**The Chichester District Council
Air Quality Management Area
(Rumbolds Hill Midhurst West Sussex)
Order No 1 2020**

ORDER DESIGNATING AN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT AREA

WHEREAS

- (a) Chichester District Council ('the Council') is satisfied that, as a result of an air quality review and an assessment of whether air quality standards and objectives were being or were likely to be achieved having been conducted in June 2019 under section 82 of the Environment Act 1995 ('the Act'), the air quality objective level for nitrogen dioxide of 40 micrograms per cubic metre or less expressed as an annual mean is not being achieved in the area of Rumbolds Hill Midhurst West Sussex (which area is more fully described in the Schedule below) within the meaning of the Act and The Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000 (as amended).
- (b) In consequence thereof the Council has exercised the powers conferred upon it by section 83 (1) of the Act.

THE FOLLOWING ORDER IS HEREBY MADE

- (1) The area described in greater detail particularity in the Schedule below and outlined in red on the attached map in red is to be designated as an Air Quality Management Area ('the designated area').
- (2) The Air Quality Management Area is designated in respect of nitrogen dioxide only.
- (3) The designated area shall come into force on 17 January 2020 and shall remain in force unless and until it is varied or revoked pursuant to section 83 (2) of the Act.
- (4) This Order for the designated area is to be known as The Chichester District Council Air Quality Management Area (Rumbolds Hill Midhurst West Sussex) Order No 1 2020.

SCHEDULE

The area of land bounded by the front elevations of the buildings on the East side and West side of Rumbolds Hill (A272) between the junction with West Street and Petersfield Road (A272) and the junction with North Street (A286) and Duck Lane Midhurst West Sussex identified by and including the red outlined and hatched area on the attached plan which is marked The Chichester District Council Air Quality Management Area (Rumbolds Hill Midhurst West Sussex) Order No 1 2020.

This Order and the attached map may be viewed at the Council’s offices during opening hours namely East Pallant House East Pallant Chichester West Sussex PO19 1TY and on the Council’s website at <https://www.chichester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=32679>

The Common Seal of

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

was hereto affixed on

the day of 2020

in the presence of

.....

AUTHORISED SIGNATORY

Plan of the Chichester District Council Air Quality Management Area (Rumbolds Hill Midhurst West Sussex) Order No 1 2020.
Environment Act 1995 Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000 (as amended).



		CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL			
Location Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst					
The Chichester District Council Air Quality Management Area (Rumbolds Hill Midhurst West Sussex) Order No 1 2020					
Scale: 1:1,250	 AQMA Boundary	Date: 02/12/19	Author: mjennings		
© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018803					

Appendix 2: Consultee responses received.

Response 1:

Philippa McCullough response (By email 22 October 2019):

Hi Simon

Good to meet you last week. Thank you for your email re the consultation asking for comments.

I think the only way to improve or possibly resolve this serious issue properly is by a thorough consultation/work with a traffic consultant.

However even as a lay person there seem some obvious things that could most likely reduce the traffic congestion and as a result the build up of pollution at Rumbolds Hill.

In keeping with the ethos of the Vision process it would be good to look at the issues in a holistic and innovative way - having a can-do attitude to finding resolutions.

Review deliveries with businesses on North Street - days, times, size of vehicles etc - how much if any flexibility

Consider retractable bollards for one loading bay on each side of North Street - a physical obstruction is the only way to guarantee these spaces will be kept free for deliveries & prevent double parking which occurs now

Check sequencing of pedestrian crossings to make sure optimising crossing time etc

Consider preventing right turns into roads intersecting North Street

Serious consideration of widening pinch point on Rumbolds Hill - Nat West Bank currently vacant - make the most of this opportunity

Re-routing of large HGV's away from A272

Look forward to hearing the results of the consultation in a few weeks.

Kind regards

Response 2:

Midhurst Town Council (By email: 4 November 2019):

Dear Simon,

Consultation on the declaration of an Air Quality Management Area at Rumbolds Hill, Midhurst.

Thank you for your invitation to comment on the above matter and we note with regret that the five years of ongoing Air Quality monitoring has still not achieved the UK AQ objectives. We support your department's work and will continue to do so as and when CDC declares an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP). We trust that all local authorities will engage in the AQAP to address the AQ issues at Rumbolds Hill. I note that it was suggested by The National Society for Clean Air & Environmental Protection's report in response to the publishing of The Environment Act 1995 that in the section headed;

The AQMA : "Turning Reviews into Action"

It is written on page 25 by The Society;

It is considered best practice that:

All local authorities consider the need for co-operation and collaboration in their air quality management work and particularly with respect to the potential designation of AQMAs.

Once a body of the various interested parties has been formed, Midhurst Town Council would like to be represented at future AQAP meetings. Our offices at The Old Library, Knockhundred Row are less than 100 meters from Rumbolds Hill and we offer them as a meeting point for any future site visits and discussions by the assembled local authorities.

We look forward to hearing more once the consultation period has ended and thank you once again for your department's work so far.

Yours sincerely,

Melanie Kite,
Town Clerk
For and behalf of Cllr Steve Morley.

Response 3

SDNPA (By letter 20 November 2019):

Dear Mr Ballard

Subject: SDNPA response to the consultation on the declaration of an Air Quality Management Area at Rumbold's Hill, Midhurst.

Thank you for consulting the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) on the declaration of an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at Rumbold's Hill, Midhurst, within the South Downs National Park. We support the designation of this AQMA and look forward to working with Chichester District Council (CDC) going forward on this, including on showing the AQMA on the Policies Map for the South Downs Local Plan. We would also welcome the opportunity to work with CDC in the preparation of the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP). The SDNPA, through the Partnership Management Plan and the South Downs Local Plan, has identified outcomes and policies related to sustainable travel, and is engaged in a number of current and forthcoming projects which might helpfully contribute to the AQAP.

Yours sincerely

Lucy Howard
Planning Policy Manager

Response 4

WSCC (by email 02-12-2019):

Dear Simon,

Thank you for your letter of 21 October 2019 concerning consultation on an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at Rumbold's Hill, Midhurst. I apologise for the delay in responding to your letter.

West Sussex County Council notes the results of air quality monitoring data collected at Rumbold's Hill and the requirement to declare an AQMA in this area. The proposed geographic extent of Rumbold's Hill AQMA is believed to be appropriate to the scale of the air quality objective exceedances measured at Rumbold's Hill.

We recognise the challenges of finding solutions to the air quality exceedances in this location given the nature of the historical street pattern, the location within the South Downs National Park and the volumes of traffic using the A286 and A272 through the centre of Midhurst. We will be happy to work with Chichester District Council (CDC) and other partners to identify and implement appropriate measures for the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) which we understand that CDC will now lead the preparation of. This will include linking measures to our combined West Sussex authorities "[Breathing Better: a partnership approach to improving air quality in West Sussex](#)" action plan.

We look forward to continuing to work with CDC on this matter.

Kind regards,

Jamie Dallen
Transport Planning and Policy Senior Planner
Transport Planning and Policy Team
Planning Services;
[West Sussex County Council](#)

Response 5

Midhurst Town Vision Steering Group (by email 03-12-2019):

Midhurst Town Centre Highways: a review by Midhurst Town Centre Highways: a review by Midhurst Town Council and the Midhurst Vision Group. November 2019.

Mission Statement:

"Midhurst Town Council's priority is to improve road and pavement safety while enabling traffic to pass through and park more easily in our town, to improve air quality and to encourage residents and visitors alike to enjoy all that our town has to offer."

Highway Issues and Air Quality Problems;

Background: Over the last three years we have been researching the various ways of addressing the Parking and Air Quality issues in North Street and Rumbolds Hill. Midhurst Town Council conducted a questionnaire in 2018 followed by an opinion poll and then subsequently in 2019 The Vision programme received many comments and ideas on this same subject.

There have been meetings with traders, shoppers, car, van and lorry drivers, environmental officers and parking officers at CDC and Highway officers and councillors at WSCC. Observation has been conducted for many hours at various times of the day and night. These results are now offered for further discussion.

The two concerns of Highway Issues and Air Quality problems are inextricably linked. The poor air quality experienced on Rumbolds Hill is caused by stationary vehicles waiting to continue north along North Street. They are prevented from doing so by lorries and vans who have double parked in North Street due to the selfish and lazy habits of car drivers

who park in loading and delivery bays. A further problem is the manner in which the new pedestrian crossings operate; they also cause delays to vehicle progress.

On both the east and west side of North Street it is inevitable that due to the cars parked in the delivery bays, lorries and vans will be forced to draw alongside and wait for a delivery space to become available. A large lorry may wait until the bay is clear but small and large vans will start unloading from the highway. Within minutes a tail back can be created in Rumbolds Hill and at busy times this will continue along both Petersfield Road and Bepton Road. These delays also cause tailbacks in the other direction, over North Mill Bridge and up the A272 and A286. The frustration that this creates can cause visiting drivers to abandon any plans to explore the town and continue on through Midhurst and then speed on out from the other end of town.

So what to do? How can we solve these issues? When is the Air Quality problem going to be addressed? How do we motivate drivers to stop in our town and enjoy all that it has to offer?

Firstly it should be acknowledged that we are blessed with two large car parks at each end of town and two smaller ones in the centre. Encouraging more efficient use of these facilities would certainly help alleviate the problem. The southern car park is rarely filled to capacity and one of the central car parks is sadly inefficient. A primary initiative should be to enable large lorries to park in the delivery bays of North Street. The more effortless the delivery process is then the sooner these trucks can move on. In achieving this we would also facilitate parking for the many vans now plying our town due to the rise in internet deliveries. For whatever reason (and our CEOs have heard them all) people continue to park in delivery bays. For the sake of our health and the town's wellbeing this practice should be prevented. We therefore offer an outline solution that has recently been gaining popularity.

Possible solution: To create an area for **delivery and collection only** on both the east and west side of North Street running south from the southern pedestrian crossing to the start of Rumbolds Hill. From that same crossing but in the northerly direction there could be **car parking** on the west side and possibly also the east side. Additionally, more appropriate street furniture could be placed around the crossing to discourage the selfish and often dangerous practice of parking on the cobbles.

To recompense for the loss of some car parking spaces at the southern end of North Street, a TRO could be applied for to revert the parking in Church Hill to a shorter turn-around time. If one hour parking could be reinstated this would help the traders in Church Hill, North Street and West Street. It would also better enable the necessary traffic clearances for markets, Christmas Street parties and Armistice Day Parades. The Post Office car park could also benefit from a few alterations to encourage higher vehicle turn-over too. Blue badge holders would also have parking spaces in North Street.

There are many different permutations of how to better address the confusion caused by half-day and full-day parking restrictions. The solution above would work alongside the Town Vision's desire for a more open and green town while creating a more welcoming town centre.

If these ideas are not acceptable then alternatively consultees also suggested:

The creation of a town by-pass.

*To completely remove **all** car parking in North Street and only allow deliveries.*

A cycle lane to run down North Street

*More efficient timing sequences for the two pedestrian crossings in North St.
The widening of Hollist Lane from Easebourne to Woolbeding.
Placement of trees in tubs to dissuade pavement parking.
To expand North Street car park behind North Street.
Use traffic lights at both ends of Rumbolds Hill to enable a better traffic flow.*

Currently Chichester District Council is in the process of commissioning a consultancy to review parking efficiency across the district and MTC have requested that they approach Midhurst's parking issues holistically. Both on-street and off-street parking should be reviewed in tandem and we trust that both CDC and their consultants are made aware of the comments and suggestions represented herein.

Speeding Issues and Highway sound pollution;

These two subjects only bear any joint correlation when the vehicle is a motorbike. With reference to motorbike noise, especially early on Sunday mornings, there is virtually nothing that can be done. There was a suggestion of introducing *sleeping policemen* throughout the town but this is not popular due to the noise that would be created by large trucks. The only obvious remedy is for West Sussex police to increase their patrols on the A272 on Sundays.

The issue of other speeding vehicles has started to be addressed and Midhurst Town Council has initiated a Community Speedwatch programme under the auspices of West Sussex Police. Currently there are three volunteer operatives and a co-ordinator who are about to receive final training on December 2nd. They will be seen on our roads this winter and if more volunteers come forward then it is hoped that their presence will become more of a deterrent to anti-social driving habits.

Maintenance of Pavements and Kerbs;

The constant breaking up of the paving slabs and kerbs by drivers who park on them is another much noted frustration. This is especially so for those who rely on mobility scooters, transport their children in buggies or have impaired vision. They have reported the dangers of rocking slabs and the lack of dropped kerbs. The erection of more bollards around town was suggested but most would prefer to put a stop to this practice without resorting to such measures. The Town Council will review this subject separately and research further how other towns (eg; East Grinstead) have dealt with the problem.

Councillor Steve Morley

Midhurst Town Council Highway Review Group
and Midhurst Town Vision Steering Group.

Appendix 3:

List of consultees:

Internal

Development Management and Building Control

External

DEFRA

West Sussex County Council

South Downs National Park Authority

Midhurst Town Council

Midhurst Vision Group

Members of the public living in, or close to the declared AQMA

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

7 January 2020

Off-Street Parking Proposals Response to Consultation

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Tania Murphy – Divisional Manager - Place

Telephone: 01243 534701 E-mail: tmurphy@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Martyn Bell – Cabinet Member for Growth, Place and Regeneration

Telephone: 01243 539806 E-mail: mbell@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. Cabinet approves the increase in car parking charges as set out in sections 5.1 to 5.3 of this report.**
- 2.2. Cabinet approves the consolidation to the Parking Order as set out in section 5.4 of this report.**
- 2.3. 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 the Road Traffic Act 1984.**

3. Background

- 3.1. At its meeting on 5th November 2019, Cabinet resolved to consult on increasing parking charges by 3% in line with inflation and the additional amendment of a £2 per hour rate for both Little London and Baffins Lane car parks. Cabinet also resolved to consult on the rural season ticket prices increase from £17.50 and £15.00 per month (Bosham and rural /coastal car parks respectively) to £20.00 and £17.50 per month.
- 3.2. Cabinet also resolved, subject to consultation, to the consolidation of all variations to the Parking Order since 2012 into one document to provide further clarification of the provision for electric payments and the exemption from daily charges for Blue Badge holders (with the exception of Pay on Foot parking).
- 3.3. It was approved that any amendments would come into effect from 1st April 2020 subject to the consultation response.
- 3.2. Consultation has now taken place with the general public and stakeholder organisations (see Appendix 1). The closing date for receipt of responses was Monday 16 December 2019.

- 3.3 Twenty-two responses have been received. Full responses are included in Appendix 2. In summary there was a number of responses concerning the potential impact of raising parking charges on the retail offer in the high street, although some responders stated that there was merit in increasing the charges further to assist with mitigating the environmental impact of the use of vehicles. The number of comments received is higher than the level generally received for parking consultation but it is considered that this may be due to the concern over the fast changing nature of the high street.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1. To ensure Chichester District parking charges remain competitive with neighbouring centres leaving our business centres in a strong position and do not cause unacceptable parking deflection into residential areas.
- 4.2. The proposed charges assist with delivering the objectives of both; assisting with capacity issues in the higher demand car parks and helping to cover administration and maintenance costs of each car park.
- 4.3. An updated Parking Order will continue to ensure that the legal basis for issuing Penalty Charge Notices is correct.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. Having considered the consultation responses it is proposed that all parking charges in car parks are increased by Council's proposed budgeted rate of inflation – i.e. 3%. However due to the current changing nature of the high street it is recommended that this is only implemented for one year (2020-21) and a full review is undertaken prior to any proposed increases for the following year (2021-22), followed by further consultation.
- 5.2. In addition to this there would be a further small increase in Little London and Baffins Lane car parks of a flat rate of £2 per hour to assist with turnover and reducing the congestion caused in this area which would assist in improving air quality in the area and making the area more attractive by removing queuing cars.
- 5.3. Season tickets in the city car parks will remain as currently priced, as it is recognised that these are largely purchased by employees working within the city, although there will be an increase in the price of rural car park season tickets from £17.50 and £15.00 per month (Bosham and rural / coastal car parks respectively) to £20.00 and £17.50 per month.
- 5.4. In addition the Parking Order will be consolidated into one document to include all the variations since 2012 and provide further clarification relating to the application of electronic payment for parking and evidencing payment, along with further clarification concerning Blue Badge holders.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 A series of options were considered by the Chichester District Parking Forum and the consultation on the proposed charges was undertaken and has been reviewed and considered as part of this report.
- 6.2 If any alternative option is recommended by Cabinet, members need to consider the financial impact and the potential need to find savings from other service areas.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1. To implement changes to charges and car parks there will be minor costs associated with the provision of new signs and necessary adjustments to the machine tariffs as well as changes to back office software; these costs are contained within the service's revenue budget.
- 7.2. The five year financial strategy assumes that all income from fees and charges are increased in line with inflation. Failure to achieve that overall anticipated increase would have an impact on the financial strategy.
- 7.3. The Parking Order will require amendment once the charges and amendments are agreed and will be advertised.

8. Consultation

- 8.1. The proposed changes to parking charges were discussed by the Parking Forum meeting of 9 September 2019.
- 8.2. The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) requested that the proposals relating to parking charges should be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 26th November.
- 8.3. OSC resolved to uphold the Cabinet decision on 5 November 2019 and that the OSC produce a report to cabinet with its response to the proposed car parking charges increases consultation before the closing date of 16 December 2019. An extract of the draft minute is included in Appendix 3.
- 8.4. The report from the Chairman of OSC is included at Appendix 4. (The Chairman sent the report to all Members of OSC to determine whether they were in agreement with the report and some have responded, whilst others have not). As this report was written outside of a formal meeting it is therefore not the recommendation from OSC and members need to consider the formal draft minutes in Appendix 3. Comments in square brackets have been added to Appendix 4 to highlight any differences.
- 8.4. Consultation has been undertaken with the stakeholder organisations listed in Appendix 1. Notices were also placed in all car parks, on CDC's website and in the local press. They were also placed at three locations in the district to be viewed by the public. All responses received are shown within Appendix 2. Please note **all comments have not been redacted or amended in any way except to remove personal data or offensive material.**

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1. The impact of the amended charges will be closely monitored. Any increase in charges could cause people to park within neighbouring residential areas and reduce the economic effectiveness of the localities they serve. The modest nature of the increases and other mitigation proposed is designed to minimise this risk.

10. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		X
Climate Change and Biodiversity Congestion due to drivers queuing to locate a parking space can have an impact on air quality. When parking charges are set at the correct level this can assist with encouraging alternative forms of transport or parking in less congested areas.	X	
Human Rights and Equality Impact		X
Safeguarding and Early Help		X
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)		X
Health and Wellbeing		X
Other		

11. Appendices

- 11.1 Appendix 1 - List of organisations contacted as part of consultation
- 11.2 Appendix 2 – Responses from consultation
- 11.3 Appendix 3 – Extract of the draft minute from OSC 26th November 2019
- 11.3 Appendix 4 – Report from Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee

12. Background Papers

None

Off-Street Parking Proposals – List of Stakeholders

Stakeholders

- Chichester Chamber of Commerce
- Chichester City Council
- East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council
- Midhurst Parish Council
- Petworth Parish Council
- The Road Haulage Association
- Selsey Chamber of Commerce
- West Wittering Parish Council
- West Sussex County Council
- Freight Transport Association, London & South East Region
- Petworth Business Association
- Selsey Business Partnership
- Sussex Police

This page is intentionally left blank

Off-Street Parking Proposals – Response to Consultation

Consultation has been undertaken on the proposals relating to Parking Charges as discussed at Cabinet in November. A number of stakeholders were contacted and feedback was requested on the proposals, along with advertisements being placed in local press and in all affected car parks.

Consultation closed on 16th December and the results were as follows:

There were 22 responses to the consultation.

Of the responses received, 18 responses objected to the proposal, 3 questioned whether the proposal went far enough to change people's behaviour in helping to address air quality issues and one expressed no concerns. Comments received are as detailed below.

Please Note: All comments have not been redacted or amended in any way except to remove personal data or offensive material.

1. Business in Chichester: As a business owner for XXXXX shop chichester I formally object to the parking charges increase. In fact there should be free parking on Sundays like it used to be. Since the parking charges increase and Sunday parking charges came into being I have experienced a decline in customer footfall. We should trial a measured parking scheme to provide visitors incentive designed to increase dwell times. As with other townships Midhurst, Petworth, East Wittering they have 2 hours free parking. Our City centre needs to be supported by fair rates and parking charges.
2. Representative from a political party in Chichester: By raising car park charges this just encourages out of town shopping. It reduces additional footfall as people will just come into town for specific activities to minimise the cost of parking – for example they will just come for the theatre when parking charges have ended rather than come early and have a drink or meal or shop before the theatre.
More shops will close. Shoppers will go to other towns where parking is cheaper. I totally disagree with raising parking charges
3. Business in Chichester: Being a store on the High street is incredibly challenging at the moment – we have lost approximately 10 stores this year in Chichester, or ones that made an impact on the High street with their footprint, which to be fair, have been replaced by not so exciting businesses

that will not really direct specific footfall to the High Street. Winchester City some years ago had the same problem as Chichester, they now offer FREE parking on a Sunday – and to be honest at various times of the year you can visit the High Street and it is absolutely heaving with people.

We need to make Chichester a destination area, to save what we have, and allow people to come and park and enjoy, not put them off with high charges, the number of times I hear people outside our window, saying how the town has changed with so many vacant premises. The Landlords are asking for too high rents, and if we couple that with parking charges we will see even more stores closing. BACK THE HIGH STREET – SAVE CHICHESTER this beautiful City.

4. Business in Chichester: I am writing to express my strong concerns about the opposed car parking rises across Chichester. Is there anything more that Chichester council can do to deter customers away from the town centre is to raise the car parking charges! Why don't someone with an ounce of common sense look around the town centre and see that this high street along with others around the country are struggling to keep their doors open. I have been working as a store manager in Chichester for about 10 years now and have seen the decline in customers staying for the long day out, more and more likely I am hearing from customers that they must hurry up as their car parking is running out and they won't pay any more as the car parking is too expensive! The greedy counselors are proposing to raise the charges which is "disgusting" just to make a bit more money which in my opinion will have the opposite effect as customers would probably decide to go to other places that are encouraging customers into their town centres not the opposite. I hope by my concerns someone from the council will take notice!
5. Business in Chichester: I hope this email finds you well, I just want to let you know as a retailer on Chichester High Street I object to the increase of parking charges in the car park. Chichester has a high number of elderly clientele who live predominantly off of their pensions, I have found that many customers complain already about the cost and don't have the money to spend on the items they want to purchase as there is a high cost in parking. Due to these comments I feel this will prevent high footfall into Chichester as your pricing people who drive out of the town, also people will avoid public transport as trains are rarely on time and have huge delays. Please take this into consideration when making final decisions on costs.
6. Business in Chichester: We are a small business owner in the heart of Chichester and are pleased to say we have reached our first birthday at our shop down XXXXX.
That being said, it's not been an easy ride with the state of the high street gradually declining since we first moved to the area in 2017. Shops are

closing, many have been empty for years and the general feel when strolling through town isn't pleasant, with an increase in homeless men and women congregating around town in a drunken or drugged state. To top it all off we have Brexit making many consumers nervous. To now hear that the council plans to increase parking charges in Chichester adds insult to injury for many of the business owners trying to get through what can only be described as a difficult time in retail. From my understanding, the council has argued that it is their policy to increase parking charges on an annual basis however policies should surely be revisited as times change. Car parks in Midhurst, Petworth and East Wittering offer 2 hours free parking so I would hope that the Chichester District Council would consider helping out local businesses by trialing something similar and disregard the "annual increase policy" while they're at it. Can we not try to give businesses a fighting chance to make it through these tough times?!

7. Business in Chichester: Please be advised that I have read all the latest proposals with regards to the parking order and wish to express my absolute dismay. I can not, for one moment support a council who offer very little support (or initiatives) for our local high street traders, who are currently loosing precious ground to the on line retailers. Any increase in parking will effectivly hand over what little footfall we have left to neighbouring cities and towns. increasing the parking WILL then factor highly in the amount of time shoppers will want to spend in Chichester. many shoppers want to pop in and pop out. but being charged around £2.00 just to buy a card and some wrap will result in said shopper opting to park fro free in any of the larger establishments outside of the city. Parking increases will further demoralize independent store owners, and will leave us little choice but to protest, both vocally, via the ballot box and with a blanket cessastion of funds that the council collects. Please be under no doubt that I will find away to mobilise every independant retailer in Chichester in order to make sure our voices are heard.

As a suggestion, you may need to consider the following:

- Any increase in parking should only ever be used to subsidise free parking within the city on Sundays, as well as Wednesdays. Chichester shoppers should not be penalised in order for Chichester to offer free parking in Midhurst, Selsey and Petworth. This is an unacceptable situation.
- Any retailer will tell you that the current parking charges in Chichester are already too expensive, and as such doesnt afford shoppers the opportunity to explore the city fully.
- There will be a drastic downturn in footfall the moment your parking charge increases come into effect. As such, you should also consider the ramifactions that this will cause. As a tennant, I can quite clearly see many more empty retail units as we move forward.

- Many of my customers refer to my shop as a "destination shop", meaning that my shop is the sole reason for coming to Chichester. And there are a growing number of destination shops within the city walls. Once these have closed-up, you will find that all that's left to occupy the empty retail units are low rent pop-ups, vape stores, head shops and worse. By increasing the parking, you will sadly, find history as being left with no choice but to refer to the council as the architects of Chichester's demise.

Would it not be easier to find a way to incentivise Chichester's shoppers with a far better deal, to encourage (not dissuade) commerce?

I cannot endorse your proposed changes, and will challenge this order every step of the way. Not just for the survival of my own shop, but also for every indie shop within Chichester. We work long hours, for little reward (I have not drawn salary in two years in order to keep my shop open). So, it is safe to assume that I consider your proposals as a total stab in the back.

Chichester's councillors NEED to start working with a progressive attitude towards commerce and development, and encourage the entrepreneurial spirit that is currently busting a gut to keep Chichester viable.

Chichester's mantle is fading fast. Your parking order could extinguish the indie spark. There is far more to Chichester than Festivals of Speed, Revivalist days and race events. Instead of going for yet another "Cash Grab", perhaps you should listen to what is being foretold, and work towards cheaper parking across the district, so that retailers can work unencumbered by haphazard, amateurish local policy. Failing to do so, will stoke the fires of a rebellion, and herald the start of what Chichester District Council and its councillors will one day regard as the beginning of Chichester's continued spiral downwards towards "Ghost Town" status. A mere shadow of its former self. And for the avoidance of doubt, please do not misinterpret this email as hyperthetical follie. The challenges facing indie retailers in Chichester are extreme. Your new parking proposition WILL tip the scales and commence an irreversible process once it gets started.

8. Resident: I find it quite remarkable that Chichester council are even considering increased parking charges throughout the city. As the city sinks even deeper into a ghost town, with shops closing every week, what can possibly be achieved by these increases. Nobody will want to visit Chichester at all. Surely every effort should be being made to encourage visitors and shoppers to visit.
9. Business in Chichester: I own XXXXXX, I am most concerned that you propose an increase to parking charges. I believe every effort should be made to keep charges to a minimum in these difficult times. I do, however have a proposal that would help us all. We often have customers who say they cannot buy anything at the moment as their parking ticket is due to expire, so I propose you replace these with a pay on departure machine instead. Whilst I

realise there would be heavy costs initially for you ,in the long term, you will profit from this as customers would remain in the town longer. Therefore it is a win- win situation for us all as we would all make more money I also note your concerns about traffic queues I have a shop in XXXX Horsham and it is run by the council land it recognises the car on entry and you pay at machines when you leave . I think you are given plenty of time to depart . I know it has been very successful . Please consider this as a positive solution to this issue.

10. Chichester City Councillor: I note that CDC are proposing increases in parking charges for the district. Under our Declaration of a Climate Emergency but within the framework of business viability we must encourage more travel on public transport and an increase in walking/cycling. Needing to drive to town centres, equally, should not be seen as a 'cash cow' for revenue purposes for local authorities. A balance must be struck.

11. Business in Chichester: I'm a business owner in Chichester and right opposite me there is a car park it is full everyday there's not a problem with the parking it's the people like us who have to pay such a high rent price and rates and also pay a High permit price. Please consider this.

12. Business in Chichester: We would like to bring to your attention our concerns as a Chichester business, with you increasing the car parking charges yet again.

Recently, we have had lots of complaints from customers with the specific increase in the County Hall car park. The increase from £3 all day on a Saturday to £8 is absolutely ludicrous and quite frankly, business crippling. A lot of people relied on that car park for being the 'only reasonably priced, off street car park in Chichester' to use at the weekends. This is especially helped on a Sunday; as it is a slow day for Chichester's retail anyway, let alone the busiest car park going from being free to park all day, to now £3. We know for a fact with our customers, that the parking in Chichester is something that puts people off visiting, and the above issue mentioned is not helping with driving footfall into the city; especially so close to the busiest trading season. The average age of people in Chichester is 65 years old, and they do not want to use the Park and Ride system, however the only alternative is to pay extortionate pay-per-hour car parks. When places local to us (eg. Portfield Retail Park, Ocean Retail Park, Port Solent etc) offer free parking whilst using the facilities, this inevitably makes people shop elsewhere. With the retail market as it is, big high street stores are constantly closing around us in Chichester, it seems to be that you want Chichester to have no retail?

More nearby to us, Midhurst, Petworth and East Wittering all offer 2 hours free parking as STANDARD when you shop there. This should indefinitely be something you should be looking into to help grow Chichester as a 'great

place to shop' rather than deterring people away. It seems to be that the shoppers of Chichester are at an unfair disadvantage and it is increasingly causing a negative impact on the footfall who travel further afield to shop with us here. We totally object to any increases in parking charges in which you are looking to put in place, and we speak for all our customers who have raised their concerns with us too. We look forward to hearing from you.

13. Business in Chichester: My name is XXXX and I am the Store Manager of the XXXX in Chichester XXXXX. I am writing to formally object to the proposed parking charge increases in Chichester Town Centre. In a period of economic uncertainty and a struggling high street, I deem it vital that there are no actions to potentially deter visitors to the city centre in order to preserve and maintain the High Street which is a vital part of the community.

14. Business in Chichester: I wish to give my opinion on parking in Chichester. I run and own the XXXXX, which is over 7 and half years old, I also own and run the new XXXXX. We rely on visitors staying a sensible amount of time in the city for our trade and feel that this is not supported by the District in Chichester. Knowing towns close by have free parking schemes and low parking rates while you continue to raise charges in the city makes residents uncared for and taken for a fool.

I am disgusted at the parking charge change at County Hall. A lot of my traders chose to park here as it was an excellent rate of £2.50 a day, now with the change to over £11 for the day they are struggling to find places to park, making the decision to trade with us a difficult and potentially curtailing an attraction in the city. Visitors are also saying the same thing. I would urge you to take a sensible view of the situation, raising parking fees and not providing free parking may give your coffers a boost in the short term, but a long term view for your reputation and for the city you serve, who rely on visitors being able to put money into the local economy.

15. Business in Chichester: We would like to email our objection to the council thinking of increasing the parking charges in Chichester. With car parks in Midhurst, Petworth and East Wittering allowing 2 hours free parking we find it ludicrous that Chichester council are considering increasing parking prices when maybe we should be following these other areas. Chichester in the last year has suffered with foot fall and the amount of shops disappearing we need to find a way to bring the public back into the town not deter them. We need to pull together to bring our town back to life.

16. Business in Chichester: I wish to object to the potential raise in parking charges.

As a small business manager in central Chichester I urge you to certainly not raise any parking charges. As a retail and leisure centre we struggle enough

with the empty shops and other buildings without giving people less reason to come here. We independents are competing on a daily basis with the big chains and online shopping. We shouldn't have to compete against our council as well. Independent business is the way to move our city forward and if you continue to oppose us with higher charges imposed on our potential customers we will all be forced to bow out of the high street. Many people Who visit Chichester will be unhappy with even higher charges to park. There are so many towns and villages around and about us that offer free or nominal parking charges. You should be trying to lower charges. The car parks seem well enough maintained with the current prices paid. You could offer an incentive to use the multi-storey carpark and lower charges for long stays in all carparks. Lastly you should certainly be looking to the future to create park & rides, electric busses and a fully pedestrianised centre. To make our city more inviting. I am very hopeful that you will consider the detrimental affect this will have on our high street.

17. Resident: Chichester city council need to wake up. All the high street shops are struggling to make ends meet. The rents & business rates must be some of the highest in the south & now they are proposing to increase parking charges yet again. Also the proposed on street parking charges they plan to introduce will also impact on the shops. People have to travel to work & as the bus & train service is diabolical where are these vital workers supposed to park? Maybe the council should consider making the whole of chichester a car park after all the shops will disappear so it could be used as a park & ride for the small towns around us. Wake up please you are slowly draining the life blood out of what was once a beautiful place.
18. Sussex Police: Sussex Police would generally not get involved in your changes to parking as we do not have any enforcement in that area, so we do not need to have a say on it, but what you have proposed seems fair and reasonable
19. East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council: The proposed car parking increases of up to 30% in some of the city centre car parks will not meet the aims of reducing air pollution, but will adversely affect city businesses, and we would like to see CDC working to develop more viable solutions to air pollution issues which do not punish city centre businesses.
20. Business in Chichester: At a time when bricks and mortar retailers are struggling, and where those same retailers in city locations struggle more than some others, it seems absolute madness to do anything that may negatively impact the health of those businesses. These same businesses employ local people and pay local taxes.

We then face an increase to the already high parking charges in the city, at a time when shopping centres are either reducing or in some cases stopping parking charges to make it more attractive as a shopping destination. It is easy to dress this up in some other way, but the reality is nothing more than short term revenue driving over the medium term health of the city. It is a quite desperate move when the council appear to do nothing which positively impacts their city retailers.

Comments from Councillors

21. Councillor Adrian Moss: It is my view that Chichester District Council is missing a significant opportunity to look at how CAR PARKING Charges could be revised to take into account changing visitor behaviour and the threat to the High Street.

First of all I believe that any Car Parking charge should have been fixed for 12 months not 2 years, whilst a full strategic review was undertaken into how our District can appraise the pressures on the High Street. Ideally all charges should have been frozen at current rates for 12 months whilst this review was undertaken and to encourage visitors.

Here in summary are my objections to the revised charges

Evening Car Parking charges should be abolished to safe guard night life, The Theatre and New Park Centre

Significant incentive car park charges should be applied to Avenue de Chartres Car park. This car park often has many free spaces. We need to fill this with enthusiastic visitors. We also need to improve the access into the city centre and ambience of the car park

Any increases in parking charges should be in City Centre Car Parks where pollution is an issue

Little London and Baffins Lane should focus on increased Blue Badge and electric vehicle parking. Charges in these car parks could be increased significantly for other vehicles

Without affecting revenue "Incentive parking" should be applied. Car parks are often almost empty by 4.30pm and rarely very full at 9.30am.

A scheme should be introduced that incentives people to return to Chichester on a regular basis

Charges in the coastal and rural area are acceptable.

Additional comments:

Workplace parking levy should be investigated

Parking is free at out of town shopping centres. We need to find a way to get these people into town using electric busses.

CDC needs to look at new ways to incentivise visitors and residents. Putting parking charges by xx% is neither innovative or encouraging visitors.

People need to be given a reason to come to Chichester, It is as the BID say about psychology. Give them an incentive and they will come.

We do need to offer more events and make specific car parks free for a period of time.

Car Parking Strategy need to include a full review across the District to make our policy ready for the changing markets.

Chichester does not need to be revolutionary but does need to be progressive.

22. Councillor Sarah Sharpe: I would like to object to changes to car parking charges in that they are **not high enough**. You should be charging **more** for people to park in the City Centre especially. I think you should also park for evenings in **all** car parks. The polluter pays. Your prices for parking are ridiculously low compared to the buses to pay over 8 hours to park in Midhurst is £2.30 whereas the bus return to Chichester costs £8.20. This is not a good ratio. Any extra money you make from car parking could be put into sustainable travel and supporting buses. I think you should have lower prices for smaller cars and electric cars to prioritize and encourage people not to have large SUVs and to nudge people into less polluting vehicles.

I think that Little London especially should be more for blue badges and more space should be put towards the market (the picture from the Chichester Vision needs to become a reality please). I would encourage you to look into the **Workplace Parking Levy** as this is an excellent revenue source to plough back into the City and public transport eg building bus lanes, putting towards bike hire scheme etc as Nottingham have done – they financed their tram system with this: <https://www.centreforcities.org/reader/funding-financing-inclusive-growth-cities/reviewing-funding-finance-options-available-city-combined-authorities/1-nottingham-workplace-parking-levy/>
<https://bettertransport.org.uk/blog/better-transport/winning-policy-nottinghams-workplace-parking-levy>

Reasons why I object to these inadequate price rises: My objections are based on the need to improve air quality, encourage more sustainable lifestyles, reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, act in response to our declared Climate Emergency, reduce occurrences of asthma and other breathing-related illnesses and reduce obesity. I.E. car parking charges should support public health agenda and help to reduce NHS costs.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix Three

Special Overview and Scrutiny Committee
26 November 2019

Minute 323: Parking Proposals and Off-Street Parking Charges

The Committee considered the Parking Proposals and Off-Street Parking Charges report considered by Cabinet on 5 November 2019 and the draft resolution circulated with the agenda.

The Chairman welcomed the speakers who had been invited to today's meeting to provide their views and those of the organisations they represented on the parking proposals. He explained that the Committee was responding to the consultation on the car parking proposals.

Mrs Murphy reported that the public consultation was currently underway and ran from 21 November 2019 until 16 December 2019. Notices had been displayed in the Council's car parks and in a local newspaper. Key stakeholders were currently being consulted and all feedback would be collated and presented to Cabinet on 7 January 2020. Once the final decision was made on the proposals, notification would take place advising the public of the changes to come into effect on 1 April 2019.

The Chairman invited the following representatives to present their views:

Mr Hicks, Chairman, Chichester BID: Mr Hicks commented on the concessions made in the rural towns concerning free 1 hour parking in Petworth, the 7% drop in footfall drop last year and the 13% drop this year and advised that the Christmas footfall increase was not guaranteed. The BID had been working with the District Council on schemes designed to improve "dwell time". The BID was aware that although there were less visitors to Chichester, retail sales were rising. Businesses felt parking should be free with 70% blaming parking charges for fewer visitors. Mr Hicks stated that 20% of car park users raise parking as an issue. The District's charges compared with some other council compared favourably.

Incentives proposed:

- Car Less: Discourage car use by increasing charges to reduce car use in Chichester City Centre. Consider effect on rural car parks as lack of public transport.
- Bike, foot, bus and train: Lack of inner city transport doesn't assist.
- Blue badge scheme extended.
- Promotion of the City: Working with visit Chichester to promote the City. Suggested ring fencing parking fee income.
- Free 1 hour parking at end of parking pay and display ticket period – suggested that no penalty parking charges would be issued during this time.
- Avenue de Chartres car park should be promoted more as it was underutilised.

- Season ticket scheme: Good scheme but should be promoted more efficiently. MiPermit was more popular with the younger generation.
- One off events: Free parking should be considered.

Mrs Murphy provided details of the incentives that the Council continued to promote to encourage the use of its car parks. The Council worked with Mipermit to promote the District Council's scheme nationally. The Council wanted visitors to arrive in the District with the Mipermit app already installed on their mobile phones, which would enable them to extend their stay if necessary. The Council ran a Park and Ride scheme during the Christmas period which visitors attending free events could use.

With regard to the suggestion of an extra hour granted after a parking ticket had expired without enforcement she was not aware that other councils offered such an incentive. This incentive may add confusion to users of the car parks and would need to be looked into carefully if there was a wish to take this forward. Mr Bennett added that his immediate concern if a free one hour parking was allowed was ensuring fairness. Legal advice would be sought if this incentive was taken forward. If the Council under enforced it had to be done under a particular policy.

Mrs Hotchkiss informed members that a number of the incentives Mr Hicks had spoken about were welcomed and had been discussed with Chichester BID. Important aspects highlighted by Mr Hicks included increasing the 'dwell time' and the importance of events happening in the City to encourage visitors. Chichester BID and Chichester City Council had been approached to see if they would like to support the proposed parking incentives including financially. Cabinet had proposed to increase the parking charges in Little London and Baffins Lane car parks so that they could be performance managed and encourage visitors not to bring their vehicles into the city centre. As part of the Chichester Vision process and the Car Parking Strategy, the use of these car parks was being looked into and with the introduction of the Blue Badge scheme, one proposal that would be looked into was providing additional car parking spaces for blue badge holders and electric vehicles.

Mr Hicks felt that the Council should look at introducing incentives that would not affect its finances. There was a perception that parking charge prices were putting off visitors from coming into the City.

Mrs Meddows-Smith, Chief Executive, Chichester Chamber of Commerce and Industry: Mrs Meddows-Smith advised that as there had been a number of board member changes at the Chamber and a loss of continuity she was not in a position to present the views of the Chamber. However, she would report back to the Chamber the discussion on this item at today's meeting and would respond to the consultation currently taking place.

Mr Sutton, Chichester District Parking Forum Member and Petworth Ward Member: Mr Sutton referred to the extensive debate that had taken place at the Chichester District Parking Forum concerning the rationale for providing a free parking period for the rural areas, which was broadly accepted by the

Forum. He referred to the absentees, but in his view he did not think that it had stifled debate as there were arguments for both sides.

He read out the comments of Mr McAra (Ward member for Midhurst) and his view over the particular issues concerning the revenue loss to the City if a free parking time was introduced. In particular the importance of the rural towns retaining the free parking periods was stressed, which were essential to the continued efforts to keep these shops solvent during increasingly hard times.

Mrs Fowler, representing her views and those of Mr S Morley (Midhurst Town Councillor): Parking needs for the rural car parks were different to the City and free parking in Midhurst had increased the number of visitors. If free parking was removed visitors would travel to the nearby larger towns outside of the District instead.

In response to a question from a member, Mrs Hotchkiss explained that the provision of free parking periods by other council's was dependent on the size of their parish, town and cities. The two hour free parking period incentive provided in some Bognor Regis car parks was funded by Bognor BID and Arun District Council.

Mrs Lintill, Leader of Chichester District Council: Mrs Lintill referred to the negative impact of removing the free hour parking in Petworth, as it may encourage visitors to park on the narrow streets. The provision of more free parking would impact on the Council's finances and may result in other services being reduced. Public transport in the rural areas was less adequate than routes to the City. She visited Chichester to buy products she was unable to buy in Petworth.

Mrs Plant, Acting Chairman of Chichester District Car Parking Forum: The Council's policy stated that Chichester District Council's parking charges were reasonable and adequate, and allowed a turnover of spaces. The user paid for the service and was not subsidised. It was a discretionary activity and the income raised was used to fund discretionary activities provided by the Council. Officers were aware of the different issues affecting the car parks, hence different proposals for the car parks in each locality to nudge behaviour and improve parking usage. The Parking Forum, when considering the proposals worked through all the alternatives, but ultimately did not want any increase in charges. Free periods of parking were discussed but she considered that the Parking Forum was not convinced the arguments would increase the use of the car parks. In order to protect the Council's funding streams, it was necessary to increase parking charge by the rate of inflation over a period of two years. The proposals intended to encourage visitors not to park in the central car parks so as to not to end up with queues and engines running, leading to poor air quality. She welcomed incentive schemes concerning electric charging and the blue badge scheme.

Mr Bell, Cabinet Member for Growth, Place and Regeneration: Mr Bell advised that he was a Director of Chichester BID. He referred to Mr Hicks' comments that the schemes Chichester BID wanted the Council to look into

would not impact the Council's revenues. He welcomed the BID's suggestion that Avenue de Chartres, being underutilised, was ideal for free event parking days. He welcomed some experimentation, providing the financial impact was understood and the implementation of the charges on 1 April 2020.

During the discussion the following comments were made by members. A comment was made about the Council's reliance of the funding stream from car parking income. A point was made with regard to climate change, that a climate emergency had been declared by the Council but vehicles continued to park in the City centre. The Council should do more to promote walking, cycling and the use of public transport. This would require better public transport infrastructure to ensure it was fit for purpose. A request was made that the Council should investigate the feasibility, as well as preparing costings, for a year round park and ride scheme. The majority of Members on the whole supported a free parking period in the rural areas should remain, as they were less well served by public transport.

The Chairman commented that at the Overview and Scrutiny meeting held on 19 November 2019, Mrs Bourne, Chief Executive of Chichester Festival Theatre had advised that restaurant takings were down due to the impact of evening charges. He referred to the correspondence he had received from independent retailers in the District who were of the view that the car parking charges were seriously affecting their businesses. He believed the Council could affect behaviour, in particular the number of cars that used Little London car park. He felt that there were opportunities that would not affect the Council's budget, for example only allowing electric vehicles and blue badge holders to park in Little London and Baffins Lane to help reduce air pollution in the City. With regard to the new Parking Strategy he suggested changing to one year parking charge increases with a review at the end of the year to look into ways of attracting visitors into the City.

Mrs Hotchkiss advised that at a meeting she and Mrs D Shepherd, Chief Executive, had attended with Mrs Bourne, they were advised that evening charges had not had an effect on ticket sales. The views of retailers were a perception. Officers were aware of the impact that rents, business rates and online shopping had on retailers and advised that work was taking place with Chichester Vision and the BID on this matter. People are increasingly spending more leisure time on the high street. The parking strategy was an audit of need and was not focused on the charges. She undertook to look again at the park and ride to see if it was feasible to provide the services outside of the Christmas period, but finding the right location an issue.

Mrs Murphy and Mrs Hotchkiss outlined the timescales relating to the upcoming review of the Parking Strategy, which will set the strategic direction for parking in the Council's car parks over the coming years and that whilst any changes to charges would be closely monitored it may be difficult to introduce any proposals from the Parking Strategy review relating to charges for April 2021 given the timescales involved.

The Chairman explained that he would produce a report, to take into account today's discussion on the proposals, to feed into the council's parking charges consultation. A draft would be circulated to members of the Committee who would be given the opportunity to comment.

RESOLVED

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee uphold the decision made by Cabinet, which was as follows:

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.

RECOMMENDED

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee produce a report to Cabinet with its response to the proposed car parking charges increase consultation before the closing date of 16 December 2019.

This page is intentionally left blank

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORT TO CABINET ON CAR PARKING CHARGES

Recommendation passed at Overview and Scrutiny Committee Tuesday 26th November

“That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee produce a report to Cabinet with its response to the proposed car parking charges increase consultation before the closing date of 16 December 2019.”

[OSC resolved to uphold the Cabinet decision on 5 November 2019 and that the OSC produce a report to cabinet with its response to the proposed car parking charges increases consultation before the closing date of 16 December 2019].

At the Chairman’s request the proposed Car Parking Charges 2020 to 2022 were brought to Overview and Scrutiny Committee to enable a wider view of Car Parking charges to be debated by Councillors and invited outside bodies.

The outcome of the meeting was that no specific recommendations were made but the Committee wished to make a range of observations.

The committee welcomed a number of elected members and invited speakers.

- Vicki Meddows-Smith - CEO Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- Colin Hicks - BID
- Cllr Alan Sutton (Member of Chichester District Parking Forum) also read out a statement from Cllr Gordon McAra.
- Cllr Judy Fowler (Midhurst Ward Member) read out statement from her and Stephen Morley (Midhurst Town Councillor)
- Cllr Eileen Lintill, Leader
- Cllr Penny Plant (Chaired the Chichester District Parking Forum meeting)
- Cllr Martyn Bell (Director of Chichester BID)

Colin Hicks from the BID

Colin Hicks presented a strong case for changing the psychology of parking so that it was not seen as a cost but was incentivised to encourage visitors to stay longer.

He also proposed that we should continue to work across the BID and the Council to offer events and other special promotions to encourage visitors to come to the City.

In addition BID expressed concern over any increase in parking charges.

Festival Theatre

Whilst not present for the car parking debate, representatives from the Festival Theatre had specifically reported during the *Overview and Scrutiny Committee 19th November Agenda Item 9 Chichester Festival Theatre Monitoring Report* that evening car parking charges made at the Northgate Car Park had affected the number of covers at the Brasserie at the Theatre.

Representation from Midhurst and Petworth

There was strong representation from Midhurst and Petworth that no changes should be made to the free parking element of car parking charges as this was seen as crucial to retaining visitors to Midhurst and Petworth.

Comments from the Committee [Comments from individual members not a reflection of the whole of the committee]

Chichester Councillors were concerned that Chichester was paying too much of the Car Parking costs whilst a level of free parking was retained elsewhere. This needs to be taken into account in the future.

There was a major concern that evening parking charges discourages visitors to use local restaurants prior to attending the Festival Theatre and using the New Park Centre.

Concerns were expressed that the new Car Parking charges were being proposed for the next two years, whilst the new Council had not had a more open debate. It was suggested that charges should be fixed for one year. Officers explained why this was not advisable.

Some members felt that charges needed to increasingly reflect the Councils aim to reduce traffic in the city and to encourage public transport.

Support was expressed for increasing parking for Blue Badge holders and the provision of electric charging points in Little London and Baffins Lane car Parks.

Other members of the committee felt the new charges were a realistic increase and would not be detrimental to visitor numbers.

Some members did wish to see a more innovative approach to charging as a way to manage the strategy.

There were no formal proposals to make changes to the recommended new charges.

Key observations from the Committee

- The committee supported the increase in charges to Little London to reduce the affect of idling cars at Little London Car Parks.
- Consideration should be given to increasing the provision of “Blue Badge” parking spaces in Baffins Lane and Little London.
- The Committee[some members of the committee] is concerned about the evening parking charges is affecting the night time economy.
- The provision of Electric Charging points could be increasingly focused on Little London and Baffins Lane to reduce the affects of idling petrol and diesel vehicles.
- BID introduced a range of progressive and innovative options for car parking charges in Chichester. In the forthcoming review of Parking Strategy these should be investigated further.
- The current Car Parking charges reflect a charging policy that may need to be reviewed in light of changing visitor behaviour.

- The forthcoming District wide Car Parking Strategy Review needs to consider how we can mitigate the challenges of.....
 - increased congestion in the city
 - Air quality caused by idling vehicles
 - Changes to the visitor economy in Chichester and elsewhere in the District
 - Improving the use of specific car parks
- The Council needs to carefully consider the balance of charges in the City and in the rural and coastal car parks.
- The Car Parking Strategy needs to take an innovative approach to parking, taking into account the pressures on our towns and cities to find the best ways to encourage visitor to stay longer.

December 16 2019
Adrian Moss
V1.3

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

CABINET

7 January 2020

**Revised Fees and Charges 2020 for the
Animal Welfare Licensing Regime**

1. Contacts

Report Author

Timothy Horne – Principal Environmental Health Officer

Telephone: 01243 534598 E-mail: thorne@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member

Penny Plant, Cabinet Member for Environment and Chichester Contract Services

Tel: 01243 575031 E-mail: pplant@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That Cabinet recommends the revised Animal Licensing fees and charges for 2020 as set out in the appendix to this report, for consideration by the General Licensing Committee.**

3. Background

- 3.1 The Council is responsible for the grant of licences under 1) the Animal Welfare (Licensing of Activities Involving Animals) (England) Regulations 2018 which regulate; animal boarding, dog breeding, pet shops, performing animals and riding stables and 2) the Dangerous Wild Animals Act 1976 (DWA). The Council has currently issued 69 Animal Welfare Licences and three under DWA.
- 3.2 The new licensing regime, which aims to provide benefits for animal welfare came into force on 1 October 2018. Despite being accompanied by the introduction of a new fee system, the regulatory regime was generally well received by operators as there has been a general view that it has levelled the playing field between operators.
- 3.3 The legislation allows licensing authorities to charge a reasonable amount to recover the cost of considering the grant, renewal or variation of a licence.
- 3.4 The fee levels presented to Cabinet in November 2018 were based on an estimate of how long the licensing process would take under the new regulatory regime. It is now proposed to adjust fees to take account of actual time taken based on the experience gained from the first year of implementation.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 That proposed fees are deemed to be fair and reasonable, based on the “Open for Business: LGA guidance” on locally set licence fees and which achieve recovery of

the Council's costs in administering the licensing system. The proposed fees have regard to the reasonable anticipated costs for:

- Consideration of an application, including any related inspection;
- Consideration of a licence holder's compliance with the Regulations and their licence conditions. This includes the cost of any further inspections related to compliance;
- The reasonable anticipated costs of enforcement in relation to any licensable activity of an unlicensed operator;
- The cost of the new requirement for officer training
- The costs of the local authority compiling and submitting the data required by regulation 29 to the Secretary of State.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 That a revised fee structure is introduced on 1 April 2020 (as set out in the Appendix) which ensures the animal licensing system achieves cost recovery, including for enforcement.
- 5.2 The fees and charges proposed are based on the statutory guidance for the new regime, issued by DEFRA.
- 5.3 In addition to the Council's fees, businesses may also be required to pay for an inspection and report from the Council's authorised vet. This cost will be in addition and is recharged to the licensee at the cost to the Council. Vet inspections are required for riding establishments, the first inspection of a dog breeder, dangerous wild animal inspections and for any premises where an officer has concerns about animal welfare and a vet's opinion is required.
- 5.4 Whilst the cost of administering this licensing regime has resulted in some significant increases in fees for operators, some licences now run for two or three years, instead of being renewed annually, so the cost to fully compliant businesses may be relatively modest over the life of the licence.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 That fees are retained at the current levels. This will not however comply with the legislation because the full cost of administering the regulations would not be recovered and this deficit will be borne by the Council.
- 6.2 There is a time lag for renewing licences that have been issued for two or three years so any delay in introducing revised regulatory costs may compound the Council's costs in the animal licensing regime and not incentivise higher risk rated licencees from making changes necessary to extend their licences.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 The animal licensing system is administered from the existing staff resources of the Environmental Protection team. There are no further legal implications.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 When the new animal welfare licensing regime was introduced on 1 October 2018 all the existing licence holders were written to, explaining the changes to animal licences and the new application process. The Council's website was updated to provide further guidance.
- 8.2 There has been no further consultation about these proposals. On approval of the proposed fees, current licencees will be advised at the time of licence renewal.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1 The changes in legislation and increased licence fees are a challenge for a regulated business although the thrust of the legislation is to improve animal welfare standards, which should be seen as a positive move. Any increase in licensing of premises that currently operate unlicensed, will assist in achieving an even playing field for all businesses.
- 9.2 Failure to approve suitable fee levels for licensable activities will result in the Council's costs in administering the regime not being recovered.

10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder The legislation will result in more businesses now coming under the licensing regime which have previously been unregulated e.g. hobby breeders, dog day care franchises. The legislation also requires LA to look for businesses that continue to operate animal activities without a licence.	x	
Climate Change and Biodiversity		X
Human Rights and Equality Impact		X
Safeguarding and Early Help		X
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)		X
Other		X

11. Appendices

- 11.1 Table of proposed Animal Licence Fees for 2020

12. Background Papers

- 12.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix

Table of Proposed Animal Licence Fees (£) 1 April 2020

Licence Type	Numbers	Existing Licence Fee	Proposed Licence Fee
Pet shop		304.00	375.00
Home boarding of dogs	1-6	253.00	270.00
Franchise Animal Boarding	Home placements	new	425.00
Dog day care	1-6 (home)	new	270.00
	1-6	289.00	375.00
	7-25	304.00	395.00
	26-75	319.00	410.00
	76+	334.00	430.00
Boarding – dogs or cats	1-6	304.00	375.00
	7-25	319.00	390.00
	26-75	334.00	410.00
	76+	349.00	425.00
Hire of horses/donkeys	1	418.00	380.00
	2-10	445.00	460.00
	11-20	522.00	520.00
	21+	599.00	565.00
New dog breeding establishment	1-6	349.00	435.00
	7-12	364.00	500.00
	12+	394.00	560.00
Renewal dog breeding establishment	1-6	304.00	405.00
	7-12	319.00	465.00
	12+	349.00	525.00
Animals for exhibition [3 year licence]	1-6	304.00	375.00
	6+ or >3 species	334.00	405.00
More than one licensable activity at inspection		-100.00	-100.00
Appeals requests		140.00	175.00
Re-inspection for re-rating requests		140.00	165.00
Variation to licence		new	45.00
Processing Dangerous Wild Animal (DWA) application (Vets fees charged separately)		new	50.00
Add horse to Licence		25.00	25.00
Annual Horse Inspection Admin Fee		new	25.00
Vets fees (where required)	Recharge the licensee of the cost to Authority		

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

CABINET

7 January 2020

South Downs National Park Authority

Extension to Development Management Agency Agreement

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Tony Whitty – Divisional Manager Development Management
Tel: 01243 534875 Email: twhitty@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Planning Services
Tel: 01243 514034 E-mail: staylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Executive Summary

This report outlines the background to the delivery of a Development Management service by the Council on behalf of the South Downs National Park Authority over the previous eight and a half years, which, without any agreed extension of the existing legal agreement or negotiation of a new agreement, would come to an end on 30 September 2020. The report considers the merits of extending the agreement by a further two years (to 30 September 2022), as envisaged as a possible outcome in the agreement itself, subject to approval by the Council and the SDNPA.

3. Recommendation

3.1 That Cabinet approves an extension of the current Agreement with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) under section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 to enable the Council to continue to provide a development management service to the SDNPA for a further two years to 30 September 2022 on the basis of the previously agreed terms of the Section 101 Agreement including the Service Level Agreement and related Protocols.

4. Background

4.1 The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) originally entered into a legal agreement under S101 of the Local Government Act 1972 with 15 host authorities that have parts of their administrative areas within the national park to enable the delivery of development management services from 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2014. Individual agreements were supplemented with a number of other provisions including protocols relating to enforcement and the management of Section 106 agreements and a Service Level Agreement (SLA). Following the end of the initial 3

year period, the agency agreement with the SDNPA was extended for a further 3.5 years (to 30 September 2017). By this time ten of the original host authorities had opted out, with the administration of the development management service within those areas transferring back to the SDNPA. With the exception of the relevant County Councils, this was where the SDNP designation covered a comparatively small proportion of the application workload of those authorities.

- 4.2 During the first half of 2017 the Council renegotiated the terms of the agreement with the SDNPA, the most substantive of which was the way in which the Council is paid for the work undertaken. Rather than a fixed annual settlement, the Council is now paid by the number of cases it deals with for applications and appeals, and a fixed amount in relation to the provision of enforcement services within the South Downs National Park (SDNP) area. A breakdown of agreed payments per case is provided as Appendix 1.
- 4.3 The current S101 agreement, under which the Council provides a development management service for the area of the National Park that falls within Chichester District, was entered into on 1 October 2017. The agreement was drafted on the basis of a 3 year term, including a 12 month notice period in the event of termination by either the Council or the SDNPA, with the potential to extend to 5 years, subject to agreement by both parties. The agreement sets out the terms under which the Council undertakes all development management planning work pursuant to Parts III, VII, VIII and X of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and also the operation of the SDNPA pre-application advice service, within those parts of the SDNP in the Council's administrative area. The work also includes general planning enquiries, the making of tree preservation orders, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening/scoping and the administration and determination of planning related applications, appeals and enforcement matters. The SDNPA retains the ability to call in those applications, orders or consents which it considers may have a significant effect on the purposes for which the SDNP has been designated.
- 4.4 The above arrangements allow for a greater level of direct involvement by the Council into development proposals within that part of the SDNP which falls within Chichester District than would be afforded if the Development Management Service was provided by the SDNPA itself. This has previously been identified as a valued benefit of the arrangements by the Council. In addition to the added involvement in the SDNP planning process that the arrangement affords, the Council operates the service provided on behalf of the SDNPA to a high standard, which has been recognised by SDNPA officers and is a benefit to the local communities.
- 4.5 The Council and the SDNPA work in partnership in delivering the Development Management Service. In addition to the weekly presence of the SDNPA Link Officer at the Council Offices, Development Management Officers are part of administrative and professional working groups that

meet on a monthly basis, in addition to a quarterly 'relationship' meeting at a more senior level. The arrangements put in place in October 2017 continue to work well for both Authorities.

- 4.6 The Council recovers the direct costs in providing the Development Management Service on behalf of the SDNPA. In addition, the payment arrangement contributes toward shared overhead costs across the Development Management Service. Appendix 2 provides a comparison with the anticipated workload/income and the actual workload and resultant payment by the SDNPA over the past 2 years. Whilst income has been 2.9% lower than that envisaged prior to entering the agreement the arrangement remains financially beneficial in contributing towards shared overhead costs.
- 4.7 Officers of the SDNPA have advised that they are pleased with the way that the arrangement with the Council has operated in the previous 2 years and are satisfied with the level of service that the Council provides on behalf of the SDNPA. The SDNPA is currently separately considering the advice of its officers to extend the current arrangements for a further two years to 30 September 2022.

5. Outcomes to be achieved

- 5.1 To ensure that the proposed agency agreement continues to provide for recovery of all costs incurred by the Council in delivering a development management service for the SDNPA.
- 5.2 Continued arrangements should ensure a high quality service continues to be provided and that the character and qualities of the area of the South Downs National Park within Chichester District are protected.
- 5.3 There is also considered to be significant benefit for the Council in maintaining a larger core of experienced planning officers and being involved in planning decision making across the whole District.

6. Proposal

- 6.1 That the Council requests an extension of the existing agency agreement with the SDNPA for a further two years from the end of the initial 3 year period on 30 September 2020. All terms under which the Council currently provide the service on behalf of the SDNPA will remain as previously agreed including the Service Terms, the Service Level Agreement, the Financial Provisions and the Protocols.

7. Alternatives Considered

- 7.1 The case for the Council continuing to provide a development management service on behalf of the SDNPA has been considered carefully by officers. The current arrangements allow for greater involvement by Members in development proposals within the area of the SDNP within Chichester District and, in addition to recouping the direct

costs associated with providing the Development Management function on behalf of the SDNPA, allows for a contribution toward the shared cost of some of the indirect overheads of providing a Development Management Service across the whole of Chichester District.

- 7.2 The alternative option, not to enter into a new agency agreement for a further period would mean that the Council would no longer handle planning and associated applications on behalf of the SDNPA. The financial implications to the Council would also need to be reassessed.

8. Resource and Legal Implications

- 8.1 Recognising the importance of this work, the Planning Service operates a dedicated SDNP Applications Team and shares the resources of the Enforcement Team across both the CDC plan area and the SDNP. Both teams are supported by an administrative support team and specialist advisors in areas such as heritage, ecology, housing and environmental health. Given the staff resources already employed in undertaking this work, the continuation of the provision of a development management service on behalf of the SDNPA would not result in significant resource implications beyond those already identified. Maintaining a larger DM service to support work both in and out of the SDNP also provides greater resilience to the Council in service delivery as a whole and efficiencies of scale in relation to overheads.
- 8.2 An extension of the existing 3 year agreement for a further 2 years will provide for a continuation of service delivery and staff resourcing whilst allowing for the arrangements to be reviewed at an appropriate point prior to September 2022.
- 8.3 There are no further legal implications beyond those set out in the body of the report.

9. Consultation

- 9.1 The existing agency arrangement was reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Cabinet and Council in June/July 2017. Consultation was also undertaken with the then Head of Finance and Governance and the Legal and Democratic Services Manager in respect of the proposals for determining future payments and the content of the new S101 agency agreement.
- 9.2 As the extension to the existing agreement does not propose any changes to the current system of payment for the services provided by the Council or the expected service level provisions no further consultation has been identified as necessary.

10. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 10.1 Important considerations are that the extended arrangement continues to deliver a service that is respected by the community, meets the

requirements of the SDNPA and ensures the Council is compensated for the agency work undertaken. It is noted that SDNPA have recently expressed their satisfaction with the service that the Council continues to provide on its behalf.

11. Other Implications

11.1 None.

12. Appendices

12.1 Appendix 1 – Agreed costs per case to be used in calculating quarterly payment amounts [Part II – confidential exempt from publication]

12.2 Appendix 2 – Comparison between expected income generated by agreement and actual income over previous 2 years [Part II – confidential and exempt from publication]

13. Background Papers

13.1 Current agreement under s 101 of the *Local Government Act 1972*, related Protocols and SLA.

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

Chichester District Council

CABINET

7 January 2020

Strategic Wildlife Corridors Project

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Stephanie Evans – Environmental Coordinator
Telephone: 01243 5343523 Email: sevans@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Penny Plant - Cabinet Member for Environment and Chichester Contract Services
Telephone: 01243 575031 E-mail: pplant@chichester.gov.uk

2. Executive Summary

The Environmental Strategy Unit has identified the need for a wildlife project aimed at safeguarding Strategic Wildlife Corridors across the District, connecting Chichester and Pagham Harbours with the South Downs National Park. The National Heritage Lottery fund is considered a suitable source of funding for the project which would also allow for the continued funding of the Community Wildlife Officer post.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 That Cabinet approve the submission of an application to the National Heritage Lottery Fund for the funding of a 5-year Strategic Wildlife Corridors Project.**
- 3.2 That Cabinet approve the annual contribution of £10,000 from reserves for 5-years as match funding towards the project and to allow the continued funding of the Council's Community Wildlife Officer Post.**

4. Background

- 4.1 The Environmental Strategy Unit (ESU) has developed a policy within the draft Local Plan Review on Strategic Wildlife Corridors. Strategic Wildlife Corridors have been identified based on existing wildlife value and run north-south connecting the South Downs National Park to Chichester and Pagham Harbours. The aim of the draft policy is to direct development to areas outside of these corridors to ensure that the corridors are safeguarded and maintained. This will allow species to move for food and to breed, ensuring the sustainability of their populations for the future.
- 4.2 The corridors have been identified as part of the Local Plan Review work and the proposed Local Plan policy offers protection through the planning system. The existing work of the Council's Community Wildlife Officer in the Bournes has identified the need for enhancing the strategic corridors as well as preserving them

through planning protection. This is vital to ensure that they are resilient to environmental changes. This need is the basis of a new Strategic Wildlife Corridors Project.

- 4.3 ESU has investigated the National Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) for the funding of a 5-year wildlife corridors project. The project provides an opportunity for the future development and funding of the Community Wildlife Officer post as the s106 funding for the current post is due to cease at the end of July 2020.

5. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 5.1 Chichester District's wildlife is safeguarded through enhancing the Strategic Wildlife Corridors which allow species to move and their populations to thrive;
- 5.2 The District's wildlife is more resilient to change, including climate change;
- 5.3 The funding of the Council's Community Wildlife Officer post is continued for 5 years, ensuring the post holders skills, experience and community links are retained;
- 5.4 Local residents are better engaged with their natural heritage.

6. Proposal

- 6.1 In developing the Local Plan Review, ESU identified Strategic Wildlife Corridors of existing wildlife value to be safeguarded to ensure that species can continue to migrate, in light of the development proposed up to 2036. These corridors run north-south connecting the South Downs National Park to Chichester and Pagham Harbours. A policy has been drafted for the Local Plan Review which directs development to areas outside of these corridors over the long term, safeguarding these corridors to enable species to move. In addition to safeguarding the corridors, existing work has identified the need for these corridors to be enhanced independently of the planning system and hence has identified a potential project to ensure this need is met.
- 6.2 The Council's Community Wildlife Officer has for many years undertaken recreational disturbance mitigation projects at Chichester Harbour. This post is currently funded from Graylingwell, Roussillon and Hambrook strategic development Section 106 monies and so is outside the base budget. The original s106 funding is due to cease at the end of July 2020 and future s106 funding and the on-going work will pass to Bird Aware Solent and the Pagham Harbour Mitigation Scheme (RSPB).
- 5.1 The Community Wildlife Officer post has been instrumental in enabling the Council to demonstrate compliance with its statutory biodiversity duty. The post holder has developed exceptional links with many local resident groups and has acquired an in-depth knowledge of the area's habitats and species. The timing of the Heritage Lottery Fund application has been driven by the desire to avoid losing the ecological skills, experience and community links that the post holder has developed and would be difficult to replace or would take considerable time to re-acquire.
- 5.2 ESU has identified National Heritage Lottery Funding (HLF) as a suitable option for the funding of a 5-year Strategic Wildlife Corridors project, including the future funding of the Community Wildlife Officer post. For a project of this size, there are

two phases: a Development Stage (2 years) and a Delivery Stage (3 years).

5.3 The total project costs for the two phases have been estimated as:

Development Stage Costs/ £	
Professional Fees	6000
New Staff Costs	105300
Surveys	6000
Other costs (training, travel, equipment, printing)	22800
Contingency	7500
Non-case contributions	6200
Volunteer time	3000
Total	168800
Grant Requested	149600

Delivery Stage Costs/ £	
Capital works – practical enhancement measures	513000
New Staff Costs – 2 Full-time Equivalent	344500
Other activity costs	45600
Contingency	5000
Non-case contributions	10800
Volunteer time	30000
Other costs (inflation, evaluation, publicity,	38700
Total	988500
Grant Requested	871700

5.4 The total project costs for the 5-year project, including the costs of implementing the enhancement works is just over £1.15 million. To secure HLF, partnership funding is required which can consist of cash, non-cash contributions (in-kind funding such as room hire) and volunteer time. The partnership funding cash commitment from CDC would be £10k per annum, or £50k over 5 years. However this contribution would unlock over £1 million in funding.

5.5 An Expression of Interest for the proposed project was submitted to the HLF last summer and confirmation has been received that CDC has been invited to submit an application for development stage funding. To enable an application to be completed, confirmation is needed that CDC is committed to the partnership funding and is willing to host the project officer post.

5.6 If approval to submit an application is given by Cabinet, it is ESU's intention to submit an application for development funding for the March 2020 deadline. Confirmation of funding will be received by the end of June 2020, with the possibility of the project commencing on 1 August 2020. The proposed timeline for the project is as follows:

Grant Application Submission Deadline	2 March 2020
Funding Confirmed (Assumed)	End of June 2020
Development Phase Commenced	1 August 2020
Development Phase Completed	31 May 2022
Delivery Grant Application Submission Deadline	1 June 2022
Funding Confirmed (Assumed)	End of September 2022
Delivery Phase Commenced	1 November 2022
Delivery Phase Completed	31 October 2025

7. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 An alternative option is for the funding of the Community Wildlife Officer to work on the Strategic Wildlife Corridors Project to be secured from reserves. The total cost for the funding of the post for a further 3 years, including on-costs, is £163,000. This option does not include an operating budget for enhancement projects, making the success of the project dependent on volunteer time and project specific small grant applications. The cost benefit analysis makes this option less viable and it is not at this stage being put forward. Without HLF or CDC funding for an enhancement project, the future of the corridors would rely on protection from major development through the planning system and any ad-hoc improvements that may be secured by local voluntary groups.

8. Resource and Legal Implications

- 8.1 To secure the HLF grant, CDC needs to commit to partnership cash funding of at least £10,000 per annum or £50,000 for the 5-year duration of the project.
- 8.2 The development phase of the project will provide funding for the Community Wildlife Officer post which will be overseen by the Environmental Coordinators. During the delivery phase, funding will be provided for the Community Wildlife Officer post and another full-time equivalent post.

9. Consultation

- 9.1 In developing the project, advice and support has been secured from the Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group, the Sussex Wildlife Trust, Chichester College, West Sussex County Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. Support is also being sought from Chichester Harbour Conservancy. A number of landowners have been engaged during the development of the project and have already given their in-principle support to enhancement works taking place on their land.

10. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 10.1 The HLF will require two applications for the two different phases of the project, development and delivery phase. Should the development phase be unsuccessful in securing delivery funding, the project would cease after the development stage. In

this unlikely situation, CDC’s commitment would also be reduced to the 2 years of the development stage.

10.2 The staff costs during the interval between the development phase funding and delivery phase funding (approximately 5 months) is intended to be met by retaining the final part of the s106 funding, related to the current post, in order to give continuity of employment.

11. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
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
Crime and Disorder		x
Climate Change and Biodiversity Yes, positive impacts for biodiversity and mitigating and adapting to climate change	x	
Human Rights and Equality Impact		x
Safeguarding and Early Help		x
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)		x
Health and Wellbeing Yes, by engaging local people with their natural heritage, will have additional benefits for their health and well being	x	
Other (please specify)		

12. Appendices

12.1 A copy of the Expression of Interest (EOI) submitted to the National Heritage Lottery Fund, is included in the Appendix. Please note that the project, including the timescales, has evolved since the EOI was submitted.

13. Background Papers

13.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank



Expression of Interest

Notes

The Expression of Interest form (EOI) is mandatory for anyone thinking of applying for a grant above £250,000. We will use the information you provide in the EOI to decide whether or not to invite you to submit a development phase application. An invitation to apply does not guarantee a grant from us in the future but does indicate that we see potential in your initial proposals.

We aim to respond to your EOI within 20 working days of receipt. If we decide to invite you to apply, we will contact you to discuss next steps.

You must read the application guidance before submitting this form. This can be found on our website.

You will be able to save this document as you work on it.

If you decide to copy and paste text directly into your application, please review your application before submission and make changes where necessary to ensure you do not exceed the stated word count limit.

Summary

Name of your organisation

Chichester District Council

Project reference number

OL-19-02414

Project Title

Please choose a title which you think best describes your project.

'Connexions' for Wildlife and People

Date submitted

22/08/2019

Section One - Your Organisation

1a. Name and address of your organisation

Name of your organisation	Chichester District Council
Address line 1	East Pallant House
Address line 2	1 East Pallant
Address line 3	
Town / city	CHICHESTER
County	West Sussex
Postcode	PO19 1TY

1b. Is the address of your project the same as the address of your organisation?

Yes

1c. Details of main contact person

Name

Stephanie Evans

Position

Environmental Coordinator

Is the address of the main contact person the same as the address in 1a?

Yes

Daytime phone number, including area code

01243 534523

Alternative phone number

Email address

sevans@chichester.gov.uk

Tell us about any particular communication needs this contact has.

Please note that there is a limit of 50 words for this question.

N/A

For projects based in Wales, which language should we use to communicate with the main contact?

- English
- Welsh
- Both (Bilingual)

1d. Legal status of your organisation

Please select one of the following:

Local authority

1e. Do you consider your organisation's mission and objectives to be:

Please select the options that apply

- Black or minority ethnic-led
- Disability-led
- LGBT+-led
- Female-led
- Young people-led

And in Northern Ireland only:

(none selected)

1f. Where did you hear about us? Please pick from list or specify below.

Other

Please specify

The Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group

Section Two - Project Proposal

2a. Please tell us about your project. In particular, please try to cover:

- **Heritage focus**
- **What will the project do (capital work and activities)**
- **What programme outcomes you are hoping to achieve. Please note that we expect all projects to achieve the outcome 'A wider range of people will be involved in heritage.'**
- **Why you want to do this project (what is the need and demand)**
- **Feasibility or options work done so far**
- **Timescales**
- **Overall cost including a short breakdown of key items of expenditure**

This section of the form has a total word count of 800 words. Please note that dashes in the text count as whole words.

Heritage Area – Nature and Landscapes and the Countryside

The Natural Environment White Paper (2011) indicates Government's ambition to halt the decline in the UK's biodiversity by creating a "resilient and coherent ecological network at a national and local level" and "achieving this will require a fundamental shift in approaches to conservation and land management."

Chichester District is home to a wide variety of wildlife across a rich diversity of habitats, including 10 internationally designated sites, 38 Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and 130 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). Although the vast majority of these sites lie within either the South Downs National Park (SDNP) or the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), they cannot exist in isolation and require a living landscape around them and connections between them. Species use these connections or corridors to travel between sites, allowing them to forage, feed and breed in a wider landscape. This is essential for the long-term survival of the species and to ensure a resilient and coherent ecological network.

In 2012, the Council worked with Forest Research UK and the South Downs National Park Authority on mapping the ecological networks within the District. Based on these networks, the Council has identified six strategic corridors of existing wildlife value that run north-south connecting the South Downs National Park to Chichester and Pagham Harbours. These are listed below:

- Hermitage to Westbourne
- Chidham/East of Nutbourne
- Broadbridge to East Ashling
- West of Chichester to Fishbourne
- Westhampnett to Pagham Harbour
- Aldingbourne and Elbridge Rife

What will the project do?

The purpose of the project is to restore and enhance these strategic wildlife corridors through the following methods:

- Survey the strategic corridors to establish their condition, the presence of priority habitats and species, and to identify key opportunities/sites for enhancements;
- Engage local communities to raise awareness of the historic post glacial landscape, and the importance of strategic wildlife corridors linking the chalk downs to the sea;
- Engage landowners to encourage them to undertake land management to help enhance these wildlife corridors;
- Educate and train a wide range of volunteers to help enhance sites within the corridors by undertaking activities, such as planting and hedge laying;
- Engaging with Chichester College on the building of wildlife towers;
- Undertake woodland planting to ensure connectivity and mitigate against climate change;
- Train volunteers on health and safety;
- Use specialist contractors to undertake more substantial work such as greening bridges;
- Engage with Developers in and adjacent to Wildlife Corridors to encourage sustainable development;
- Engage with partner organisations to share information and data on the strategic wildlife corridors.

The main project outcomes will be as follows: **Page 100**

- * A wider range of people will be involved in heritage - Through audience development work to inspire local communities about natural heritage, and attract volunteers. Regular workshops and training show how different groups become included in the project;
- * Heritage will be in better condition - Through improvements created by conservation work by volunteers and contractors;
- * Heritage will be identified and better explained - Heritage walks and talks to local groups and schools will explain the historic importance and contemporary relevance of natural heritage sites and wildlife corridors;
- * People will have developed skills - Local residents and conservation volunteers will be offered training in planting, and other activities to enable them to undertake small scale conservation work;
- * People will have learnt about heritage, leading to change in ideas and actions - By promoting the value of the corridors and the wildlife they support, local people will have developed their understanding and the intrinsic value of natural heritage, encouraging them to protect and enhance the wildlife;
- * People will have greater wellbeing - By providing opportunities to get involved with improving natural heritage, people will have better links with their local environment bringing benefits to physical and mental health;
- * The local area will be a better place to live, work or visit - Making direct improvements to the local environment will enhance the perception of the area, and create a better sense of place for local people and visitors;
- * The local economy will be boosted - Restoration of the natural environment will provide direct opportunities for businesses involved in ecotourism, and indirect opportunities for support businesses.

Total Project Duration: 5 years

April 2020 – Mar 2021 – Development Phase – undertake a pilot project on one of the Strategic Wildlife Corridors.

Summer 2021 – Summer 2026 – Delivery Phase – undertake the delivery phase on the remaining five Strategic Wildlife Corridors

Proposed Project Costs

Staff costs (2 full-time equivalent project officers, 0.1 full-time equivalent project overseer, all housed at CDC) 537000

Staff Training 10000

Volunteer training, travel and expenses 25000

Staff Travel 15000

Equipment costs 20000

Professional Fees (external mentoring and evaluation) 15000

Printing 10000

Other costs including contingency 10000

Conservation works – including planting, wildlife towers, greening bridges 650000

Total Costs 1,328,000

2b. How much are you likely to ask for from us?

£1,328,000

2c. When are you likely to submit a development phase application if invited to do so?

Please note that there is a limit of 200 words for this question.

We are aiming to submit a development phase application for November 2019.

Section Three - Submission

Your local team may wish to use your email to send you invitations to workshops or events they are running for potential applicants, or other useful information about our grant programmes. Please tick this box if you would like to receive this information by email. You can unsubscribe at any time.

✕