



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in Committee Rooms - East Pallant House on Tuesday 23 July 2019 at 2.00 pm

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

Members not present: Mrs J Fowler, Mrs N Graves, Mrs E Lintill, Mr R Plowman and Mr H Potter

Officers present all items: Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services Manager), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

21 Minutes

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

The Chairman explained that there was one amendment to minute 13 of the minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 21 May 2019 relating to Public Question Time:

Mr Lloyd-Williams asked the following supplementary question, what does the council intend to do about the members who haven't attended training sessions which are paid for by the tax payer. Will they be prevented from speaking at Council and/or sitting on Committees until they have completed training?

Mrs Shepherd responded:

It is not possible to stop a councillor from attending Council or any Committee which they have been appointed to. Following today's appointments the Planning and Licensing Committee members will be reminded that they need to attend the relevant training sessions. The council acknowledges the number of working members and will be considering ways to best address their needs going forwards.

In a show of hands the Council voted to approve the minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 21 May 2019 subject to the above amendment.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 21 May 2019 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record of the meeting subject to the above amendment.

22 Urgent Items

The Chairman explained that there was one urgent item relating to the Appointments to External Organisations made at the Annual Council meeting on 21 May 2019 which would be dealt with under agenda item 11.

23 Declarations of Interests

Mr Over declared an interest in agenda item 14 and withdrew from the room when the item was discussed.

24 Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman announced the following apologies for absence from Cllr Judy Fowler, Norma Graves, Cllr Richard Plowman, Cllr Eileen Lintill and Cllr Henry Potter.

The Chairman explained that she had attended the Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (VAAC) AGM and was pleased to report that the council amongst other authorities had received thanks for its support in offering a three year funding agreement.

The Chairman then took the opportunity to congratulate a previous district councillor Tony French on receiving the Freedom of the City.

25 Public Question Time

The following public questions were asked:

Question from Mr Lloyd-Williams:

How much Council Tax Payers money has been spent supporting the Novium Museum since it has opened (including site purchase, design and build costs, running costs), and how much further Council Tax Payers money must be spent in the next 5 years to continue this support, please?

Response to question read by Mr Briscoe:

I'd like to thank you for giving me this opportunity to bring to everyone's attention the fantastic resource we have in the Novium Museum, yes there are costs associated with it as with many of the other District Council facilities and services. I would have expected you however to have been familiar with the costs you are asking about having been a Dist. Cllr who sat on the Overview and Scrutiny Cttee. However, I'm sure you're aware the Novium Museum opened in July 2012 and has progressed steadily in its achievements and fantastic Exhibitions including the ones on our own Tim Peake and Lego. The visitor numbers are steadily rising and with that the revenue from the shop, grants and sponsorship are increasing, and that's without even considering the boost to the local economy of the City and wider District as a result. So, initially, the museum cost just over

£6 million. This included the build, the fit and transference of artefacts from the site at the Little London Museum. However, that site was sold on along with the adjoining Tower Street site for a combined figure of nearly (2.5m) £2.465m in order to reduce the capital expenditure for the new premises. The Tourist Information Centre also moved into the new museum, which meant that we the council could lease the former TIC building, this is now generating an additional £49.5k pa for the council, this additional income is not attributed against the Novium's budget even though it is because of the Novium that this has been made possible. Since the construction of the new museum, the museum service has cost the council £4,290,000 to run which equates to an average of £536,250 per annum. The Novium Museum budget for 2019/20 is £610,900 but we're currently carrying out a feasibility study into the running and facilities at the Novium and the results from this will inform the new Museum business plan, that will go to cabinet next year. As part of this work we are continuing to look for opportunities that will help us to reduce costs and increase income from the service. A good example of this is the work currently being carried out for the exciting forthcoming 'Mystery Warrior' exhibition. This exhibition is of International Interest, we have been chosen to host this exhibition due to our location and superb facilities in the Novium, we hope it will attract more visitors than both the Tim Peak and Lego Exhibitions. It is very hard to quantify the educational and economic benefits the Novium provides to schools and businesses of Chichester, but it certainly gives us the benefit of Media coverage and enables us to sell Chichester as a destination. The new Exhibition has already brought a £50k grant from the National Lottery Heritage Fund and sponsorship from Irwin Mitchell, money which would otherwise have gone to other Council areas. The cost of running the old museum in Little London and the TIC in South Street has been reviewed, when this is compared to the current budget for the Novium Museum taking the inflationary rate into account it showed that The Novium Museum actually costs £32,777 less than the Little London Museum and Chichester TIC. So, you can clearly see significant savings have been made through diligent management. Chichester prides itself on its diverse heritage and cultural offer, The Novium Museum plays a key role within this. Along with other attractions it encourages people to visit our city, spend in our shops, use our cafes and restaurants; and stay in our hotels. This can only be good for local businesses. What's even better, is that the museum is free, accessible to all and offers something for all ages. We should be proud our District has such a world class facility and encourage its use. There is a public consultation currently in progress which I'd encourage you to complete as it looks at ways of improving our service, it runs till 1st Sept. Thank-you

Question 1 from Deborah May:

Could you as a District Council pledge to support these WASPI women and families in Chichester?

Question 2 from Deborah May:

Would Chichester DC also be prepared to write to West Sussex County Council to also ask them to pledge *their* support to the WASPI women?

Response to questions read by Mrs Taylor:

Thank you for your question and I would confirm your statement that the Council does not decide national pension policy, however, we do have a role to support all members of our community. The Council feel it is for WSCC to make their own decision in this regard and so it is not our intention to write to them, however, the Council will write to the Minister offering our support to the WASPI campaign.

Question from Guy Knight:

At last weeks Chichester food festival the noise levels were set at a maximum of 65 decibels the equivalent of a domestic vacuum cleaner. The music was played for 27 hours and whilst the recorded music appeared to meet the agreed levels the live music was intrusive was heard inside properties at the far end of North Close and in North street as well as causing a considerable nuisance to properties closer to the park. In addition conditions regarding the event start time and dismantling of the site were disregarded by the operator. This was also the case with the Ice rink and Oktoberfest How will Chichester District Council ensure that future events are run in accordance with the agreed conditions and thus protect the well being of residents living near the park and will they refuse to allow operators who breach these conditions to run future events in Chichester?

Response to question read by Penny Plant:

The Environmental Protection Team at the Council refer to a national standard, the Noise Council's Code of Practice on Environmental Noise Control at Concerts (1995) when setting Music Noise Levels ((MNLs) and other noise control measures for outdoor music events.

The Council seeks a balance between a music event enjoyed by many and the potential for disturbance and annoyance to those living in the vicinity. Compliance with the code may not eliminate complaints as other local factors affect the acceptability and likelihood of complaints from concerts.

For Rhythm and Blues Festival 2019, music was restricted so residents did have quiet times and all music ceased before 9pm on Friday and Saturday and 6pm on Sunday. Noise levels were set at the boundary of noise sensitive properties for the music and for the more disturbing bass frequencies

Noise monitoring undertaken by the Environmental Protection team and the event organiser demonstrated compliance with the noise level requirements throughout the event. The one exception was when the event sound engineer conducted a low level sound test on Saturday morning and this was addressed by the Council at the time of the event.

In terms of ensuring events are run in accordance with the agreed conditions, Hire of Land conditions include a clause where the hirer shall ensure no noise nuisance is caused and any violation may result in closure of the event. No nuisance was witnessed during this event.

The Council agreed breakdown of the event with the organiser between 9am and 12.30pm however the fencing contractors were on site at 7am. As soon as the Council were notified, the event organiser was contacted and ceased the activity. The event organiser has apologised and we are liaising with them over the incident under the terms and conditions of hire of the land.

Question 1 from Mr Dicker:

In 2018 the Council stated that a consultation had to be conducted on the local Plan over Christmas and New year to ensure that tight deadlines could be met for ensuring that the

local plan is in place for the examiner. The initial plan was for this information to be presented to the examiner for the summer of 2019 having been represented to a public consultation.

I like circa 800 people responded to what I felt was the worst consultation paper I have ever read. I now gather that the full council are to make a key decision in November 2019. Can the council please confirm:

When will the public see the revised plan and comment on it prior to the November decision at full council?

Response to question read by Susan Taylor:

As stated in the Cabinet Forward Plan, it is currently expected that November's meeting of Cabinet and Council will consider responses to representations and the proposed distribution of development to be included in the Publication Plan. There is no expectation that the full revised plan will be considered in November. Papers for November meetings of Cabinet and Council will be publicly available at least five working days before the relevant meeting.

Question 2 from Mr Dicker:

When will the council decide on whether to adopt the unmet housing need from the SDNP [1] as it does not appear in the key decision log before the local plan comes back in November?

Response to question read by Susan Taylor:

Such matters will need to be considered in conjunction with a number of other matters, including the updated evidence base for the Local Plan. It is currently expected that this will be discussed at the November meetings of Cabinet and Council but this position will be kept under review. Nevertheless, whilst it is for this Council to confirm its position in this regard, it is ultimately for the Secretary of State to conclude on the soundness of the approach through the examination of the Local Plan Review.

Question 3 from Mr Dicker:

I heard recently that an officer of the council stated "there is NO PLAN to build in Flood Zone 3" can the council please explain why land at AL6 has been accepted into the current draft plan?

Response to question read by Susan Taylor:

The Local Plan Review proposes to allocate a number of sites across the Plan Area, with proposed boundaries identified to cover the extent of an allocation. The proposed boundaries of an allocation should not be inferred to identify the area of the site which is considered to be suitable for development. With specific regard to AL6, the proposed allocation also expects delivery of significant open space and green infrastructure, to include a county park. Such uses may well be acceptable within areas identified as being particularly prone to flooding.

Question 4 from Mr Dicker:

Can the council now confirm how many responses to the consultation were received, How many comments or observations made and what was the area which received the most comments ie AL area?

Response to question read by Susan Taylor:

Just over 3,200 representations were received from 729 respondents. Details of the issues raised and recommended responses to them are expected to be considered by Cabinet and Council in November.

Question 5 from Mr Dicker:

Has the council asked the MP to challenge the assessed housing need numbers with Government. If so when, If not why not?

Response to question read by Susan Taylor:

The Government has prescribed a standard methodology which local authorities are expected to use in identifying the starting position for calculating local housing needs. This standard methodology has been prepared to enable the central Government objective of significantly boosting housing supply to be provided for across the country. The Council will continue to prepare its Local Plan in accordance with national planning policy. Whilst the Chichester Plan Area is recognised to have a number of constraints to address in meeting this need, insufficient evidence has yet to be identified which would suggest that the anticipated development needs could not be reasonably accommodated.

Question 6 from Mr Dicker:

How is the Peter Brett report without a link road progressing and when will this amended transport study be available for public consultation?

Response to question read by Susan Taylor:

The evidence base supporting the Local Plan Review is continuing to be updated. Updates to the transport study are expected later this year and will be carefully considered by this Council.

Question from Mr Andrew Bain on behalf of the Chichester Society read by Mr Wiggins:

Given the overall desire for removal of the level crossings expressed over many decades and confirmed in a recent survey in the Observer with 85% in favour, can we expect this removal to be included in the Master Plan for the Regeneration of the Southern Gateway?

We have proposed a height limited underpass on Basin Road as a feasible solution.

Response to question read by Tony Dignum:

Thank you for your question.

The masterplan has been adopted by the full Council on a free, unwhipped vote and does not include proposals for an overpass or underpass. The masterplan forms the basis of the development brief upon which developers will make their detailed proposals. Given a choice most people would obviously prefer there were no level crossings. That is why the Consultants who produced the masterplan were asked to look at the possibility of closing the level crossings and providing access via a bridge or tunnel. I note that like the Gateway Plus group you are advocating only a tunnel and not a flyover.

The consultants also rejected a flyover because of:

- *The length of the ramps. The southern ramp would have stretched from the northern boundary of the Royal Mail depot to the railway and the northern ramp would have been a similar length*
- *The adverse impacts on the look of the city and the views of Chichester Cathedral.*
- *The adverse impact on the environment in terms of the presence of a flyover within the Conservation Area.*

The consultants also rejected your proposed solution of tunnel.

They concluded that a tunnel would not be feasible, deliverable or desirable for the following seven reasons:

1. significant cost – in the order of £10 million so adding to the abnormal costs of the Southern gateway scheme;
2. substantial land-take to accommodate the tunnel approaches (approximately 125 metres either side of the line), similar to that required by a bridge;
3. issues of flood risk for a tunnel;
4. relocation of underground services including the River Lavant Culvert;
5. localised air quality issues around tunnel entrances; and within the tunnel
6. maintaining rail services during construction;
7. Easing access would tend to bring more traffic into the city centre, contrary to the aims of the Chichester Vision.

While we sympathise with the wish to scrap the level crossings, we all should also recognize that the issues have already been carefully studied.

26 Resurfacing and Improved Drainage at Westhampnett Depot

The Chairman invited Mrs Plant to introduce the report and referred members to the recommendations made by the Cabinet at its meeting on 4 June 2019 which are detailed on the Council agenda front sheet.

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

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

1. That the Council releases £392,000 from reserves and £200,000 from the Asset Replacement Programme to fund the resurfacing and improved drainage at Westhampnett Depot.

2. That the Council uses Brexit funding of £31,000 to purchase a new fuel storage facility.

27 Vehicle Wash-Down Facility at Westhampnett Depot

The Chairman invited Mrs Plant to introduce the report and referred members to the recommendation made by the Cabinet at its meeting on 4 June 2019 which is detailed on the Council agenda front sheet.

Mr Oakley requested reassurance that the downstream environment impact would be minimised. Mrs Plant explained that this would be the case.

Rev Bowden requested that vehicles using the facility be supervised by council staff to minimise damage.

Mrs Plant proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Mrs Taylor.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

That the Council releases £199,400 from reserves to fund the provision of a vehicle wash-down facility at Westhampnett Depot.

28 Chichester District Council Annual Report 2018-2019

The Chairman invited Mrs Taylor to introduce the report and referred members to the recommendation made by the Cabinet at its meeting on 9 July 2019 which is detailed on the Council agenda front sheet.

Dr O'Kelly with reference to page 20 of the agenda pack expressed concern regarding the 10.9% increase in crime and suggested it be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) in the coming year. She also requested the introduction of indicators to monitor the homelessness in relation to numbers in temporary accommodation and to monitor the response times of the Planning Enforcement team. In response to the crime increase Mr Briscoe explained that he would be addressing the concerns with the Police Crime Commissioner. With regard to the OSC referral Mr Moss as Chairman of OSC agreed to address the item in the upcoming OSC work programme. With regard to the introduction of new indicators Mrs Shepherd explained that the practicality would need to be discussed with the relevant officers outside of the meeting.

Mr Brown with reference to page 38 of the agenda pack requested a more satisfactory response to the reason for the exclusion of a fifth wildlife corridor from the draft Local Plan. Mr Frost explained that there had been strong evidence for four of the corridors and if further evidence came forward for the fifth corridor it would be taken into consideration.

Mrs Johnson wished to note a correction to the report relating to the Seas the Day Project. She explained that the project is part of the Selsey Haven Feasibility Study not the Selsey Vision.

Mr Moss with reference to page 21 of the agenda pack explained that he felt it important to expand the thinking of the parking strategy and look at parking charges more dynamically

with regard to its effect on visitors to Chichester. Mr Dignum explained that a report would be taken to the Chichester District Parking Forum shortly where this could be considered.

Mr Bell requested confirmation whether there would be changes made to the car parking charges prior to April 2020. Mr Dignum explained that the car parking charges had been fixed by the Cabinet in April 2018 for a two year period.

Mrs Plant proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Mr Briscoe.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

That the Council receives the Annual Report 2018-2019.

29 Overview and Scrutiny Committee Annual Report

The Chairman referred members to OSC Annual Report 2018-2019 and OSC Work Programme 2019-2020 on pages 19 to 28 of the agenda pack and explained that the recommendation from the OSC had been amended to read '*that the 2018-2019 Overview and Scrutiny Committee Annual Report be noted*'. The Chairman then invited Mrs Apel as the OSC Chairman during the period discussed in the OSC Annual Report to introduce the item.

Mrs Apel explained that a great deal of work had taken place during 2018-2019 and she wished to take the opportunity to thank all the officers involved.

Mr Bell with reference to page 23 of the agenda pack asked whether a breakdown of costs for the Ice Rink had been received. Mrs Apel confirmed that she had not seen any figures to date. Mrs Hotchkiss explained that a report would be taken to the next OSC which would cover Mr Bell's request and detail the reinstatement of the grass which had been signed off.

Mrs Apel proposed the recommendation as amended which was seconded by Mr Moss.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

That the 2018-2019 Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report be noted.

30 Questions to the Executive

The Chairman invited questions to the Executive.

Mrs Apel asked whether following the Cabinet's declaration of a Climate Emergency could green measures such as solar panels in new buildings such as the new Lidl's be a requirement of a planning permission. Mr Over explained that a planning application for solar panel roofing at the site would be submitted shortly.

Mr Oakley explained that during the recent unauthorised occupation of Tangmere Airfield a number of illegal and antisocial activities took place including:

- Fly tipping
- Human fouling
- Intimidation of allotment holders
- Verbal abuse of a CDC officer

He asked what approaches has CDC taken or will undertake to Sussex Police to ensure the Police take a more robust approach to the use of their S61 powers to remove travelling groups and minimise the impact on residents and the environment. Mr Briscoe agreed that the Police should take their more powers more seriously in this case. He agreed to come back to Mr Oakley with a response.

Mr Johnson asked what the process is for asking supplementary questions as some supplementary questions were allowed at the Annual Council meeting but not others. The Chairman explained that supplementary questions are allowed at the Chairman's discretion and time is a consideration. Mrs Shepherd added that a Public Question Time leaflet is available on the website and public questions are limited to 15 minutes per meeting.

Mr Hughes with reference to the council's website asked whether reference to starter homes as an affordable housing option could be removed if the option is not being pursued. Mrs Rudziak responded and explained that the Government initiative had never taken off so it would be removed from the website.

Mrs Bangert with reference to library closures asked to what extent could the Local Plan mitigate West Sussex County Council (WSCC) cuts to ensure community facilities such as the Southbourne Library are maintained. Mrs Taylor responded and explained that the cuts were not foreseen when the Local Plan process began three years ago however the needs of local communities would need to be addressed as part of the Local Plan Review process. She explained that Mrs Bangert could make representation to WSCC with regard to the effects of the closure on the local community.

Mr Brown with reference to Southern Water Waste Water Treatment Works what representations have been made by the council to Ofwat and could representation be made to Southern Water and/or Ofwat under the duty to cooperate. Mr Frost explained that representations to Southern Water and/or Ofwat would be appropriate once assurance has been given that the infrastructure in the district area is unaffected.

Mr Evans asked with reference to Government targets for 0 emission cars by 2022 what provision has the council made to meet the target and will the Local Plan take the requirement into account. Mr Dignum responded and explained that a grant had been received for electric car points in district car parks. He added that there is a new Air Quality Action Plan and consideration was also being given to air pollution from tailbacks into car parks such as Little London. Mr Frost added that a number of council projects would be addressing the requirement in the coming year.

Mrs Sharp asked whether the Council could do more to make a more level playing field between out of town and inner city shopping to revitalise the city centre and suggested considering an impact assessment to determine the effect on city centre vitality by continuing to develop Barnfield Drive and the Southern Gateway with more shops and considering putting pressure on Central Government to reduce business rates on

increasingly struggling in-town shops and increase rates on increasingly valuable out of town sheds and internet companies.

As Mrs Sharp had submitted the question in advance Mrs Taylor read the following response:

The policies of the adopted Local Plan seek to ensure that the city centre retains its role as the focus for retail activity. Consequently, Policy 28 of the Plan restricts edge and out of town proposals primarily to bulky goods which require larger units and which will not harm the vitality and viability of the city centre.

The District Council has been focusing additional support to the inner shopping city area with the following activities:

- Appointment of Events & Promotions Officer
- Retail Mentoring Programme to support **independent** high street retailers in Chichester City and our rural towns / retail centres.
- New Shop Front Grant Scheme to improve external improvements to the retail premises of **independent** businesses – eligibility via Retail Mentoring Programme and funds still available
- Investment in Visit Chichester
- Enabling Grant programme
- Economic Development -Business Contact Programme

Firstly, the development at Barnfield Drive has planning permission. The planning applications were not required under Government policy in the NPPF to be accompanied by an impact assessment but assessments were nevertheless submitted and independently tested by consultants on behalf of the Council. These showed that by imposing restrictions on the uses and size of units permitted, the development would not have an adverse impact on the city centre.

Secondly, when planning applications are submitted for the development of Southern Gateway these will be subject to the 'Sequential Test' and 'Retail Impact Test' (as appropriate) as set out in the NPPF and to the retail policies of the Local Plan to ensure that proposals that come forward are complementary to and do not have a significant adverse impact on the city centre.

As members will be aware the Business rates paid by businesses are a combination of the Rateable Value set by the Valuation Office and the Business Rate multiplier set centrally by the Government. The Government have recognised the current pressures on the high street and has recently announced a number of measures to assist the High Street including changes to business rates which allows retail businesses occupying premises with a rateable value of less than £51k to apply for rate relief of a third for two years. This 30% discount applies to shops, cafes, restaurants, bars and pubs and within the Bid area of the city 177 businesses have qualified for this discount including 145 shops.

With regard to increases rates on out of town and internet companies, this is a national issue and the Local Government Association lobbies the Government on behalf of all Councils.

Mrs Sharp asked a supplementary question regarding whether support would be given to start-ups and community groups using empty shops. Mr Dignum responded and explained

that a proposal for a pop-up shop in a property owned by the council would be coming forward shortly.

Mr Moss asked whether following the Council's agreement to support the WASPI proposal during public question time could the letter to Government be copied to the Leader of WSCC and the local MP. Mrs Taylor agreed to take up the suggestion.

Rev Bowden requested a timetable of when decisions would be made regarding the cities pavements. Mr Dignum explained that a discussion had taken place at a recent Steering Group involving the council, WSCC, Chichester City Council and the BID and the options available would be reported back to the Group shortly. Rev Bowden requested a copy of Mr Dignum's full written response.

Miss Barrie asked whether CDC would consider mounting a challenge to the Minister on the District's housing allocation under NPPF Footnote 9 and taking into account the extenuating circumstances given:

- The UN report on Climate change and sea level rise
- The Natural England position on nitrate vulnerable zones
- Pending the outcome of Glover Review

As Miss Barrie had submitted the question in advance the following response was read by Mrs Taylor:

NPPF Footnote 9 which was replaced by Footnote 6 within the latest iteration of the NPPF refers to specific policies that protect areas or assets of particular importance that could represent a reason for restricting development within the context of the general presumption in favour of sustainable development.

In this context and responding to the 3 points raised in the question:

- **'The UN report on Climate change and sea level rise'** - Is taken into account through the Local Plan Review evidence base, including Habitat Regulations Assessment and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
- **'The Natural England position on nitrate vulnerable zones'** - Will need to be addressed by the Council as part of the development of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, working with Natural England and the Environment Agency.
- **'Pending the outcome of Glover Review'** – This review relates to National Parks and we will need to take account of any policy implications arising from its findings.

At this time, there are not considered to be extenuating circumstances which suggest that the housing requirement for the Local Plan Area cannot be met. However this position will need to be kept under review over the next months as our evidence base is updated and discussions with bodies including Natural England and Highways England continue.

Mr Bell asked whether the use of the word Chichester could be included or excluded from events licensed by the Council in order to make sure the word is used for events with the Chichester Vision in mind. Mr Briscoe agreed that Chichester should be a brand and agreed to look into the possibility with officers.

Mrs Hume explained that the council is currently in the process of reviewing the Local Plan and in the DPIP meeting last week urgent concerns were heard from members. Although

the details of the Local Plan discussions are strictly confidential at this stage what is not secret is that there are severe concerns about sustainability and infrastructure, as a direct result of historic planning policy. Mrs Hume then asked if over the coming months, the council would be working with expert consultants to produce a robust evidence base for the revised Local Plan so that it passes the necessary tests. She suggested that during this process, it would be incumbent on the council to scrutinise and challenge the dysfunctional parts of our existing policies. She asked if council staff and consultants could therefore be asked to produce a special report, using the evidence that they encounter in the course of their research, which can then be shared with the public, the building inspectorate and central government.

As Mrs Hume submitted her question in advance the following response was read by Susan Taylor:

The Authority's Monitoring Report (AMR) is prepared on an annual basis by this Council and provides information and data relating to the performance, implementation and effects of the adopted Local Plan policies. The monitoring of these policies is also informing the preparation of the policies in the Local Plan Review. It is important to note that the planning policies of this Council have to also be prepared in accordance with national planning policies. For instance, recent Governments have sought to reduce the obligations/costs imposed on developers in construction and therefore they have limited councils abilities to prescribe certain standards for construction. This Council will continue to actively explore opportunities to pursue the highest standards of construction and sustainable forms of development.

31 **Late Items**

The Chairman referred to the previously mentioned urgent item relating to the Appointments to External Organisations made at the Annual Council meeting on 21 May 2019. She explained that with regard to the Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee two appointments had been made where only one is required. She proposed that Cllr Plowman remain appointed and Cllr Taylor be removed.

Mrs Plant moved the recommendation which was seconded by Mr Wilding.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

That Cllr Taylor be removed from the Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

32 **Exclusion of the press and public**

The Chairman explained that there are two exempt items for consideration which are recommendations made by the Cabinet at its meeting on 9 July 2019.

The Chairman read the resolution to exclude the press and public as detailed below.

Mrs Taylor proposed the recommendation to exclude the press and public which was seconded by Mr Dignum.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

That in accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (the Act) the public and the press be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of agenda items 13 and 14 for the reason that it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted that there would be disclosure to the public of 'exempt information' being information of the nature described in Paragraphs 1 (information relating to any individual) and 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act and 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.

33 **Increased Commercialisation of the Council's Business and Waste and Recycling Service**

The Chairman invited Mrs Plant to introduce the exempt report and referred members to the recommendation made by the Cabinet at its meeting on 9 July 2019 which is detailed on the Council agenda front sheet.

Mrs Plant proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Mrs Taylor.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

That the Council releases £134,000 from reserves for the provision of a new vehicle for the Business Waste and Recycling Service as set out in the Project Initiation Document with an estimated payback period of 4 ½ years.

34 **Staffing Matter**

The Chairman requested that all officers leave the room except Mrs Shepherd, Mr Ward, Mr Bennett and Miss Higenbottam. She then invited Mrs Shepherd to introduce the item which had been circulated as a separate report pack to members. Mrs Shepherd outlined the exempt report and responded to questions from Mr Brown, Mr Hobbs and Dr O'Kelly.

Mrs Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Mr Wilding.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

RESOLVED

That the Council agrees the proposal as set out in paragraph 5 of the report.

The meeting ended at 4.13 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date: