



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in Committee Rooms - East Pallant House on Tuesday 24 September 2019 at 2.00 pm

**Members Present:** Mrs E Hamilton (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, Mrs J Fowler, Mrs N Graves, Mr F Hobbs, Mr K Hughes, Mrs N Hume, Mrs D Johnson, Mr T Johnson, Mrs E Lintill, Mrs S Lishman, Mr G McAra, Mr A Moss, Mr S Oakley, Dr K O'Kelly, Mr C Page, Mr D Palmer, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mr H Potter, Mrs C Purnell, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp, Mr A Sutton, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

**Members not present:** Mrs C Apel and Mr G Evans

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

### 35 **Minutes**

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

There were no amendments to the minutes.

In a show of hands the Council voted to approve the minutes of the Council meeting held on 23 July 2019 without amendment.

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 23 July 2019 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record of the meeting.

### 36 **Urgent Items**

The Chairman confirmed that there were no late items.

### 37 **Declarations of Interests**

Dr O'Kelly declared a personal interest in relation to agenda items 19 and 20 as a member of West Sussex County Council.

### 38 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- Item 25 relating to Southern Gateway had been withdrawn from the agenda.
- Apologies for absence had been received from Mrs Apel and Mr Evans.
- Members should return their Independent Remuneration Panel members' allowances questionnaires to the Democratic Services team.

The Chairman then explained that she had been invited to a High Sheriff Service and had also visited the new St Wilfrid's Hospice site. She added that the Vice-Chairman attended a presentation of the Queens Award Voluntary Service at St Richard's Hospital.

### 39 **Public Question Time**

**The Chairman invited Atholl Forbes to the table to read his public question:**

*Gatwick Airport recently announced its Master Plan which includes:*

- (1) Increasing the capacity of its main runway*
- (2) Turning its standby runway into a second runway and*
- (3) Safeguarding land for a potential third runway.*

*Should Gatwick's plans proceed, they have confirmed that flight numbers would increase by almost 40%, passenger numbers by over 50%. The result will be devastating for the long-suffering communities of West Sussex already adversely impacted by Gatwick's operations. Such growth would result in:*

- *Even more intolerable noise for communities*
- *More adverse health impacts for ourselves and our children*
- *A reduction in the value of our homes*
- *Additional strain on already fragile road and rail infrastructure*
- *Permanent environmental damage to our beautiful countryside and*
- *An extra million tonnes of CO2 emissions pa, risking our planet's future*

*With the above in mind, can the Council please confirm what action it intends to take in order to ensure the protection of its residents from Gatwick Airport's opportunistic growth plans.*

**Mrs Taylor gave the following response:**

*Thank you for your question. The Council responded to the Government's consultation on the Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan in January 2019. An analysis of potential impacts on Chichester District was provided (full details are available within Appendix 1 to the Cabinet report of Tuesday 8 January 2019 - Item 636) and the Council will make necessary representation through response to any further consultation on Gatwick expansion proposals.*

**The Chairman invited Katy Blunden to read her public question:**

*I recently became a resident (rental) of Russell street and noticing all the 'zone O' signs around the area dutifully went down to the council to purchase a permit. But No! I was informed that I was not eligible to apply for one as Russell street is not a permitted street, despite being slap bang in the middle of zone O and surrounded by permitted streets (Oving Road, Green Lane, Armadale road) this means that I have no option but to try and get a space down Russell street. This is becoming almost impossible due to a constant lack of spaces, partly obviously due to other residents with the same issue, but also from commuters who have worked out that it's not permitted and are parking there all day whilst at work. Russell Street is a tiny little road which doesn't even have room for very many residents cars let alone any others and we have no option to park elsewhere due to being surrounded by permitted roads. This seems very unfair and is becoming dangerous as people are parking in all sorts of wild ways just to squeeze in. I would like to see Russell Street included in the Zone O banding for two reasons:*

- 1. It will discourage non-residents using it for "free parking"*
- 2. It will enable the residents to have the option of parking in the surrounding areas of zone O if there is none available in Russell Street.*

*Having spoken with other residents we all agree we would happily buy permits if it meant our options for parking increased.*

*Please could you consider recommending the inclusion of Russell Street in the Zone O permit banding?*

**Mr Bell gave the following response:**

*Thank you for your question. West Sussex County Council determine where the controlled parking zones should be allocated within the city centre, although Chichester District Council administer the provision of permits on WSCC's behalf. When the extension to Zone O was made a few years ago WSCC decided not to include Russell Street. Chichester District Council cannot therefore sell a permit for this area as it is not included in the agreed zone from WSCC. Please contact WSCC if you wish to seek additional information relating to the reason that Russell Street was not included or to suggest that this is included. However, residents of Russell Street are able to purchase a non-resident permit for nearby Green Lane, Pound Farm Road and Bridge Road, should this be required.*

**The Chairman invited Mr Weavis, the Chair of Chidham and Hambrook and Nutbourne East Housing Action Group to read his question:**

*With regard to the Chichester District Council Local Plan Review and the Governments imposed housing need for the District. The 'National Planning Policy Framework' Clause 60 states that an alternative approach to the Standard Method of housing needs assessment can be used under exceptional circumstances. This is further confirmed in the 'Housing and economic needs assessment' Guidance document page 2. Chichester District and other Local Councils on the South Coast have a number of considerable constraints to development including the South Downs National Park to the north and the AONB to the south which could justifiably be included in 'exceptional circumstances'. My question is, given the NPPF also encourages cross Council dialogue on this matter, did*

*Chichester District Council ever discuss with other Local Councils the possibility of a joint application to Government to reduce imposed housing numbers and, if not, why was this action not considered.*

**Mrs Taylor provided the following response:**

*Thank you for your question. The Council is a member of the West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board, which includes all authorities in the West Sussex and Greater Brighton area. The Board did submit a combined response to the most recent government consultation on this matter (December 2018) which included the following points –*

- Collectively, it is already acutely challenging for the West Sussex and Greater Brighton authorities to currently meet their unmet housing need, given the significant areas of nationally protected landscapes including the South Downs National Park.*
- The proposed change would increase the authorities collective unmet housing need.*
- The 300,000 Government annual target is not evidenced based and the West Sussex and Greater Brighton authorities consider that there needs to be a robust evidential base to justify this target.*
- There may be many non-methodological reasons for the new projections to be lower – reduced migration for example, so they should be taken into account.*

*However the Government did subsequently confirm their position in the national policy. National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 60 states that to determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance – unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals. The council has also written to the local MP to request a meeting with the Department of Homes, Communities and Local Government requesting a meeting which has since been arranged with the Leader, Chief Executive and a senior member of that department.*

The Chairman allowed Mr Weavis to ask a supplementary question. Mr Weavis asked with reference to South East England Council's Partnership whether there is a possibility that feedback could be given via that group. Mrs Lintill confirmed that she is the council's representative on the group. She assured Mr Weavis that the group continues to lobby the Government on a number of key areas.

**The Chairman invited Mr Dicker to read his question:**

*I have asked this question/s from Councillor Taylor and at full council. I will do so again as I still have not had a concrete response:*

*The SDNP authority claim that they have an unmet housing need of circa 51 houses per year through the life of the plan. Neither they nor CDC know where this unmet housing need comes from. Can this council explain:*

*When the decision on accepting or rejecting the unmet housing need will come for a decision at this council?*

*Whilst we accept that there is a need to cooperate can this council explain why the metric of land suitability includes land in flood plain 3 with iconic views in the preferred approach yet the SDNP are excluding land that is in flood plain 2 with iconic views in their local plan thus leading to the unmet housing need?*

*Whilst I can see that we are to get our next opportunity to comment on the preferred approach when will we expect to see the associated amended evidence base and in particular the completed (not draft) transport study and the alternate transport study as quoted in the minutes and the other incomplete documents that were presented at the last terrible consultation?*

**Mrs Taylor provided the following response:**

*Thank you for your question. The unmet housing need is a result of the difference between the assessments of housing need prepared in accordance with national planning policy, and the level of development set in the South Down Local Plan, which was adopted in July of this year following a public Examination by a Planning Inspector. Further detail is set out in the Council's Housing Background Paper dated January 2019 which is available on the Council's website under Supporting evidence - Local Plan review.*

*In March 2018 the Council considered the request from the National Park Authority for unmet housing needs derived from the part of the National Park within Chichester District should be addressed through the Chichester Local Plan Review. The report acknowledged there was unmet need. The Council resolved that subject to the completion of on-going work Chichester District Council will assess its ability to meet some or all of the unmet housing needs arising from the part of the South Downs National Park within Chichester District via the Chichester Local Plan Review.*

*Therefore the work to determine if unmet needs can be resolved in the Chichester Local Plan review is ongoing. The Preferred Approach Plan included an additional 41 dwellings per annum in recognition of this unmet need. Ultimately, the Council, in the final draft Proposed Submission Plan will propose the level of housing development, including factors including the unmet need from South Downs National Park are, for testing through Examination. The process by which the National Park Authority assessed the suitability of sites for development has been through an Examination and found sound by an Planning Inspector. The District Council can only assess the suitability of sites within its area according the national planning policy.*

*The Local Plan timetable to be considered at this Council meeting proposes that is the subject of public consultation starting in March 2020. The proposed submission Plan will be supported by further evidence on transport and other matters. It should be said that the Local Plan is an iterative process and the document itself, and the supporting evidence, evolves and is informed by the responses from public consultations before a final position is reached.*

The Chairman allowed Mr Dicker to ask a supplementary question. Mr Dicker asked when the decision relating to unmet housing need would be made by Full Council. Mrs Hamilton confirmed that it would be March 2020.

and 14 of the Cabinet agenda for 3 September 2019.

Mrs Lintill explained that the Cabinet recommended the proposal to increase the Chichester District Growth Board's membership for both Chichester District Council and West Sussex County Council.

Mr Moss wished to note his support for the proposal.

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

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

That the membership of the Chichester District Growth Board be increased from 3 to 4 for both Chichester District Council and West Sussex County Council.

### **41 Revised Local Development Scheme 2019 - 2022**

The Chairman invited Mrs Taylor to introduce the report and referred members to pages 15 - 32 of the Cabinet agenda for 3 September 2019.

Mrs Taylor explained that the Local Development Scheme (LDS) is the statutory requirement to publish an up-to-date timetable that demonstrates the progress of the council's development plan and supplementary plan documents. The LDS informs all interested parties of progress and provides a method for monitoring that progress.

At present the proposed date for the Local Review is June 2020 which although later than originally planned falls within the required five years from the adoption of the current Local Plan. Mrs Taylor explained that a number of issues came from the preferred approach plan consultation which will require an update to the evidence base. In addition the recent developments relating to the discharge of nitrates has resulted in the need to draft a Nitrates Neutral Policy. Two additional planning documents are also in draft; a Noise Supplementary Planning Document and an Air Quality Supplementary Planning Document.

Mrs Taylor confirmed that all member briefings are planned.

Mr Moss endorsed the proposal but wished to note the importance of ensuring consultation with the public and members, particularly given the number of new members. He explained that although all member briefings are important they should not be arranged to the detriment of cancelling Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel (DPIP) meetings.

Mrs Sharp explained that she hoped to work together to deliver the best for the community including the best environmental promises.

Mr Oakley asked when the 2025 review would commence. Mrs Taylor explained that it would be likely to be straight after the adoption of the Local Plan.

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

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

That the revised Local Development Scheme be approved.

### **42 2018-2019 Annual Governance Statement and Corporate Governance Report**

The Chairman invited Dr O’Kelly to introduce the report and referred members to pages 15 – 17 of the agenda pack and also pages 91 - 115 of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee (CGAC) agenda for 25 July 2019.

Dr O’Kelly explained that the council is responsible for ensuring that its business is carried out in accordance with the law and proper standards and public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for and used economical, efficiently and effectively. She confirmed that members and senior officers are responsible for ensuring proper arrangements are in place for the governance of the council’s affairs.

Dr O’Kelly then explained that the CGAC considers the organisational risk registers and in 2018/19 found the following eight highest risks:

- Southern Gateway
- The Local Plan
- Universal Credit
- Financial Resilience
- Business Continuity
- Cyber Crime across ICT
- Brexit
- The changing use of the High Street

In addition ongoing risks such as the loss of key staff in Procurement and Communications, Licensing and Events will continue to be reviewed.

Dr O’Kelly added that in January 2018 the Financial Strategy was approved by the Council and the Annual Governance Statement was prepared in accordance with CIPFA. It sets out the seven fundamental principles of good governance as detailed on page 16 of the agenda pack. CIPFA advises a greater level of evaluation should be applied against the seven principles with less description. The CGAC concluded that the council’s supporting controls and procedures are strong and robust and Dr O’Kelly hoped to see less description in the reporting next year.

Mr Plowman requested clarification on whether the risks are listed in order. Dr O’Kelly confirmed that the risks would be reviewed by the council’s Strategic Risk Group shortly but are listed in no particular order. Mrs Shepherd confirmed that each risk is assessed by its significance and impact.

Dr O’Kelly proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Mr Wilding.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

That the Annual Report on Corporate Governance, the Annual Governance Statement 2018-2019 and the Internal Audit and Corporate Investigations Annual Report 2018-2019 be approved.

### **43 Acceptance of grant offer from the Office for Low Emission Vehicles and resolution to spend the related monies**

The Chairman explained that the Council is requested to note the urgent decision taken relating to the acceptance of grant offer from the Office for Low Emission Vehicles and resolution to spend the related monies.

On behalf of the Council the Chairman formally noted the decision.

### **44 Constitution Amendment**

The Chairman explained that following changes to the Cabinet member portfolios and titles it is necessary to amend the delegation relating to the Grants and Concessions in order to ensure a stand-in decision maker where the Cabinet Member for Community Services has a disclosable or prejudicial interest in an item. The Chairman referred members to the current text and the proposed amendment detailed on your agenda front sheet.

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

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

That the Constitution, Part 3, Section 2, page 42 be approved for amendment as follows:

*For the avoidance of doubt, where a request exceeds the delegation, a recommendation will be made to Cabinet. The Leader or Deputy Leader is also delegated the powers relating to Grants and Concessions and New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) held by the Cabinet Member for Community Services, where that member has a prejudicial interest or it otherwise unavailable.*

### **45 Parish Council representation on the Standards Committee**

The Chairman explained that the Constitution requires three parish councillors to be co-opted to the Standards Committee in a non-voting capacity. Nominations were sought at the All Parishes Meeting on 15 July 2019. The following were nominated by the representatives of parish councils and meetings for co-option to the Standards Committee.

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

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

That the following Parish representatives be formally co-opted to the Standards Committee:

- Mr Ray Cooper (Lurgashall Parish)
- Mr David Ribbens (Plaistow and Ifold Parish)
- Mr Jose Galego (Easebourne)

#### 46 **Review of Political Balance**

The Chairman invited Mr Bennett to introduce the report and referred members to pages 23 – 27 of the agenda pack. Mr Bennett explained that the only change since the report was presented to Annual Council in May relates to Mrs Hume moving to the Green Party.

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

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the review of political balance arrangements as set out in tables 1, 2 and 3 of the report be approved and applied in making appointments to committees.

#### 47 **Appointment and Membership of Committees and their Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen**

The Chairman invited Mr Bennett to introduce the report and referred members to agenda supplement. Mr Bennett explained that there were a number of minor amendments since the report to Annual Council in May to reflect members wishes.

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

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the membership of Committees for 2019-2020 following the change to political balance along with the resultant changes to their Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen as set out in the report be approved.

#### 48 **Appointment and Membership of the Boundary Review Panel**

The Chairman invited Mr Bennett to introduce the report and referred members to pages 37 - 39 of the agenda pack and the additional tabled sheet. Mr Bennett confirmed that political balance does not apply to the Boundary Review Panel and as such the membership is made at the Leader's discretion. He outlined the proposed membership as follows:

- Mr Oakley – Chairman
- Mr Brown
- Mrs Hamilton
- Mr McAra
- Mrs Purnell
- Mrs Sharp

Mr Hughes requested clarification of when to expect the next major boundary review. Mr

Bennett confirmed that there is no fixed date but must be more than five years since the previous review.

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

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

That the appointment of members to serve on the Boundary Review Panel 2019-2023 and their Chairmen as set out in the supplementary paper be approved.

### **49 Amendment to Committee Timings**

The Chairman invited Mr Bennett to introduce the report and referred members to pages 41-44 of the agenda pack. Mr Bennett explained that the report had been a result of comments made by several members at the Annual Council meeting. Officers were instructed to carry out an internal consultation on meeting times. He confirmed that the majority of members had expressed a preference to maintaining the status quo. The main reasons including timings of parish councils and the prospect of travelling back through the large geographical area of the district late in the evening. Mr Bennett acknowledged that there is not a perfect meeting time to suit all and recommended that a review take place ahead of the next district election.

Mr Sutton commented that he works full time and still attends seven parish councils and council meetings. He explained that there is no current evidence to suggest that evening meetings would produce a greater turnout from the general public.

Mr Brown commented on the lack of a working group to consider the findings. He then quoted some anonymous responses to the member questionnaire that had been circulated and suggested that those comments had not been included in the report. He asked members to consider where the member input is within the proposals and the 172 district and borough authorities of which only 10 have daytime meetings. He explained that the majority start meetings between 5.30pm and 7.30pm. In response to the members who had suggested that attending parish council meetings would make attending evening meetings difficult he commented that it should be possible to find six evening meeting dates a year to hold Full Council meetings. He further added that he had taken 11 days annual leave and given up most holiday allowance in order to attend council meetings. He then emphasised the need for inclusivity and diversity of members to represent the districts wards who may be put off by daytime meetings. He requested the Leaders support in establishing a working group to discuss the matter in more depth.

Mrs Lintill responded by explaining that all members were aware of the daytime meeting structure when they stood for election. She agreed that a review should take place prior to the next election. She explained that a number of factors would need to be taken into account including financial implications and staffing implications. She confirmed that she felt it would be too soon to establish a working group.

Mr Johnson suggested a small scale trial period prior to the establishment of a working group in order to provide relevant feedback. He also explained that a variety of start times may be a better solution.

Mr Moss then proposed a counter motion as follows:

*That members note the summarised responses to the consultation provided in the agenda papers and propose that:*

- 1. A working group is established by the Leader to undertake a detailed review of meeting times, taking into account the consultation and reviewing best practice with other similar councils.*
- 2. That detailed consultation results be published in full to council members.*
- 3. The working group to include a fair balance of councillors with differing views.*
- 4. Prior to the working group meeting a members workshop should be arranged.*
- 5. The working group to meet at times which allow members of the council in full time employment to attend.*
- 6. The working group to report back to Full Council in January with a proposal to adopt a trial period commencing in May 2020.*

Mr Brown seconded the counter motion.

Dr O'Kelly wished to endorse Mr Moss's counter motion.

Mrs Lintill explained that she felt unable to support Mr Moss's counter motion in particular point six as it would be too soon to establish a working group and carry out the detailed work involved. She acknowledged that it was not to say that there should not be a working group established following a trial period. The Chairman asked Mr Moss if he was willing to withdraw point six. Mr Moss explained that he was not willing to withdraw point six. He read out a statement from Mr Evans who had been unable to attend the meeting due to a work inspection. Mr Moss then added that evening meetings would make a difference to lots of people who work and as such more detailed work should be carried out in order consider the possibility. Mrs Lintill responded that a report back in January 2020 would be too rushed and therefore too soon.

Mrs Johnson explained that in order to affect change in meeting times it had been necessary to become a member to become part of the process to effect that change.

Mrs Purnell explained that when members stood for election they were provided with an information pack detailing the times of meetings and training sessions and therefore it would be appropriate to leave any implementation of revised meeting times until the next election so those who stand will know what to expect. She also reminded members that the council audio records its public meetings so those who are unable to attend have the opportunity to listen back. She then commented that on a parish level only high public interest items create a large turnout of the public for parish evening meetings.

Mrs Sharp supported Mr Moss and Mr Brown's suggestions. She explained that compromise would be required. She suggested maintaining daytime meetings for Planning Committee due to the length of meeting but consider a trial of three Full Council meetings held in the evening during the summer.

Mrs Plant noted that she had been a member of a council which held evening meetings and it had resulted in no greater public attendance. She also drew attention to the consideration needed for staffing as contracts would need amending and consultation with staff would need to take place. With regards to point three of the counter motion from Mr Moss, Mrs Plant noted that it is likely that 60% of members will still wish to have no

change.

Mr Hobbs then explained that he works and is able to organise his diary as such that he can attend most council activities. He commented on the possibility of using technology going forwards to enable remote involvement in meetings.

Mr Plowman asked members to consider what they would like the council to be and how it can be representative of residents if those at work are put off by daytime meetings.

Mr Hughes added that the initial report needed greater depth. He added that he agreed with establishing a working group but it was not appropriate to carry out the working group in the current Full Council meeting.

Mrs Lintill then emphasised the importance of not rushing the work required. She acknowledged that it may be appropriate to consider a trial period prior to the 2023 elections.

Mr Moss withdrew point six from his counter motion which was seconded by Mr Brown.

In a show of hands the Council voted against the counter motion.

Mrs Lintill then proposed the following recommendations which were seconded by Mrs Taylor:

1. That the Council notes the responses to the consultation and that based upon the responses to that consultation confirm that the timings of meetings remain unchanged at this time.
2. That a working group be established by the Leader to undertake a detailed review of meeting times taking into account consultation and best practice of other similar councils to consider whether a change to Committee meetings should be recommended to the Council for the subsequent four year committee cycle form 2023.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

3. That the Council notes the responses to the consultation and that based upon the responses to that consultation confirm that the timings of meetings remain unchanged at this time.
4. That a working group be established by the Leader to undertake a detailed review of meeting times taking into account consultation and best practice of other similar councils to consider whether a change to Committee meetings should be recommended to the Council for the subsequent four year committee cycle form 2023.

## **50 Public Question Process**

The Chairman invited Mr Bennett to introduce the report and referred members to pages 45-50 of the agenda pack. He explained the importance of public question time and the need for informed answers to be provided. He added that the number, detail and complexity of public questions had increased with officers receiving public questions up

until noon on the day before the meeting. He explained that this does not allow a great deal of time to produce a detailed informed response. He confirmed that the last few public questions had not related to the agenda so would be unlikely to be impacted on the deadline being brought forwards. He outlined the recommendation to move the public question time deadline and amend the associated document.

Mrs Purnell suggested amending the time allowed per questioner to three minutes rather than five minutes to enable five questions in the 15 minute timeslot on the agenda.

Mr Moss proposed the following amendments to the public question time document:

- Three minutes per question rather than five minutes per question.
- Rather than questions by noon three working days before, questions should be submitted by noon two working days before (for Cabinet on Tuesday the deadline would be noon on Friday).
- Include a list of meetings where public questions may be submitted in the final document.

He suggested amending the recommendation as follows:

*That the council's procedure for public questions be amended (subject to the amendments listed above) and that the council will use best endeavours to publish agenda seven working days prior to the meeting.*

Mrs Lintill confirmed that she would be comfortable to support the amendments put forward by Mr Moss if officers were content with the proposed timescales.

Mrs Sharp noted her agreement with Mr Moss in supporting a deadline of two working days before a meeting as a reasonable compromise as three working days would be too long. She also noted her agreement that the agenda publication dates should be brought forward.

Mr Hobbs asked Mr Bennett to confirm whether the term *reasonable endeavours* would be more appropriate for the recommendation. Mr Bennett agreed that it would.

Mrs Shepherd clarified that the Cabinet papers are usually published seven working days before the meeting already.

Mr Moss proposed the following which was seconded by Mrs Lintill:

1. *That the council's procedure for public questions be amended as follows:*
  - a. *Three minutes per question.*
  - b. *Questions to be submitted by noon two working days before (for Cabinet on Tuesday the deadline would be noon on Friday).*
  - c. *A list of meetings where public questions may be submitted to be included in the final public question time document.*
2. *That the council will use reasonable endeavours to publish agenda seven working days prior to the meeting.*

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the council's procedure for public questions be amended as follows:
  - a. Three minutes per question.
  - b. Questions to be submitted by noon two working days before (for Cabinet on Tuesday the deadline would be noon on Friday).
  - c. A list of meetings where public questions may be submitted to be included in the final public question time document.
2. That the council will use reasonable endeavours to publish agenda seven working days prior to the meeting.

### **51 Committee Calendar of Meetings - May 2020 - May 2021**

The Chairman invited Mr Bennett to introduce the report and referred members to pages 51-55 of the agenda pack. Mr Bennett explained that the calendar provides future meeting dates in order to allow for work programme planning.

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

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

That the committee calendar of meetings for May 2020 to May 2021 be approved.

### **52 Parish Name Change**

The Chairman invited Mr Bennett to introduce the report and referred members to pages 57-61 of the agenda pack. Mr Bennett explained that the power to change a parish name is rarely used but in this case it is the wish of the parishes involved to make the change in order to increase resident engagement in parish activities.

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

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the change of name of Singleton Parish Council and Charlton Parish Council be authorised.
2. That the Divisional Manager for Democratic Services be authorised to serve notices upon the Secretary of State, the Director General of the Ordnance Survey and to the Registrar General of that name change.

### **53 Motion to the Council to increase the importance of nature in Chichester by six measures**

The Chairman invited Mrs Sharp to move her motion. Mrs Sharp moved her motion which was seconded by Miss Barrie.

Mrs Sharp then outlined her motion below:

## **1) Trees**

*The Council is requested to note:*

- *The importance of trees in slowing the pace of climate change by absorbing carbon dioxide and releasing oxygen into the air, as well as providing a habitat for wildlife*
- *The contribution trees make to the environment in our towns including shading and cooling, pollution and noise mitigation, as well speeding up floodwater drainage and improving the quality of our street scene*
- *The Government's pledge in 2018 to plant 11 million new trees by 2050, including in towns and urban areas*

*In support of the national campaign to increase the number of trees being planted, the Council is requested to:*

- 1. Appoint a District Tree Champion*
- 2. Agree a review of current policies on and attitude towards the planting of trees in our rural and urban area with a view to introducing a more proactive policy to increase the number and regularity of trees planted*
- 3. Recommend West Sussex County Council consider a strategy to educate children in understanding the benefits of trees and tree planting*
- 4. Recommend an urgent **Tree Summit** with the City Council, Parish Councils, District Council and County Council, BID and the Tree Wardens and members of the public to work out how to plant more trees*
- 5. Recommend officers investigate funding streams to enable residents and community groups to fund the planting and future maintenance of trees*

## **2) Wildflowers to support pollinators**

*The District Council is responsible for various areas of land in the district (for example New Park and Priory Park). The way in which the council's teams manage this land which is under our control as a District Council assets has an impact on wildlife and amenity. Being cut several times each year means grass is cut before many wildflower plants have had a chance to flower. Wildflowers need to be available for insects when in flower and to be left long enough to have seeded before being cut. Cutting regimes should be timed to allow wildflower areas to self-perpetuate and improve the wildlife value of the land.*

*The Council is therefore requested to:*

- 1. Review and reduce the timing and frequency of grass cutting across the district to increase biodiversity and manage some of our land as wildlife habitats*
- 2. Work with partners to produce a pollinator action plan to guide cutting contracts and communicate the resulting plan and reasons to residents*

### **3) Pesticide Free District**

*The Council is requested to:*

- 1. Formally congratulate the Property Manager of the City Council on limiting the use of dangerous chemicals which could endanger the health of the City Council employees and the wider public*
- 2. Recommend that the Property Manager coordinates a city wide reduction in the use of pesticides*
- 3. Recommend that the City Council consider joining the Pesticide Free Towns Network which envisions minimised use of pesticides by replacing them with sustainable alternatives*

*In line with the Pesticide Free Towns Network the Council is requested to:*

- Ban the use of herbicides and pesticides in public areas under council's control*
- Help extend the ban of pesticides and herbicides to private areas with public access and agricultural areas next to where citizens live*
- Support the greening efforts towards local biodiversity enhancement already being championed by Transition Chichester*
- Develop and promote a campaign aimed at informing citizens about the transition to become pesticide-free, and the reasons for it; encourage citizens to actively support the transition by promoting the use of sustainable alternatives in private gardens and allotments*
- Communicate with and involve all stakeholders*
- Increase local biodiversity through municipal and citizen-driven activities*

### **4) Green bus stops**

*The Council is requested to work with Stagecoach, Parish and County Councils to consider initiating the use of Green roofs for bus stops. We recommend that sedum or other plants are used on the roofs of bus stops to attract more bees as pollinators, provide more plants to improve air quality and to be a visible sign that the District Council is actively reducing our collective carbon footprint.*

### **5) Greening Flower offer in the park displays**

*The Council is requested to encourage more sustainable forms of planting by:*

- Drought resistance planting*
- Using pollinator friendly planting to encourage bees*
- Using locally grown flowers instead of plants from abroad*
- Using native plants*
- Using perennials and wildflowers as much as possible to draw the public's attention to the importance of supporting native species and encouraging bees*

### **6) Advice to Planning Applicants**

*The Council is requested to recommend to the Planning Department that it sends out a list of ideas that all new applicants for planning can use to "green" their*

*applications by introducing environmental measures such as habitats for hedgehogs, wildflower planting, protecting and increasing bat corridors, installing green roofs or walls or using permeable paving, harvesting rainwater to water the garden, changing power providers to renewables, installing bat and bird boxes, planting trees to support bat corridors and provide shade, less rigorous grass cutting regimes. Councillors are invited to view the advice given to residents in the South Downs National Park.*

The Chairman invited Mrs Plant to respond as the Cabinet member for Environment. Mrs Plant thanked Mrs Sharp for her motions. She explained that the environment is high on the council's agenda and as such many of the suggestions are already in progress.

Mrs Plant added that some of the matters raised are not matters for Council to determine but are either operational Executive matters or matters which Full Council has already established within the terms of reference for the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel (DPIP). As such, Mrs Plant recommended referring the suggestions to the relevant decision making body for debate. Mrs Plant then addressed each point in turn as follows:

### **1. The importance of trees.**

Mrs Plant explained that while the intentions are positive, the practicalities of operational delivery need to be explored further such as how this would be resourced, and ownership issues in relation to residents and community groups planting trees on land that may not be in their or our ownership would need to be explored.

### **2. Wild flowers.**

Mrs Plant explained that she is supportive of the approach and confirmed that in recent years the council had established new wildlife areas as well as areas of parks that are subject to a reduced mowing regime. The council continues to look at sites where mowing can be further reduced. With regards to the introduction of a pollinator action plan she explained that it is important to remain mindful as to how it would be resourced and delivered.

### **3. Pesticide free District.**

Mrs Plant explained that the council could not determine whether Chichester City Council should join the Pesticide Free Towns Network. She added that CDC have reduced the use of pesticides and herbicides over recent years to a minimum and share an ambition to go pesticide free. With regard to fine turf maintenance (bowls and cricket) where a high standard of playing surface is required further discussion would be needed as to go pesticide free could result in a lower standard of playing surface which may not be acceptable to the clubs that use the facilities. She explained that officers continue to keep an eye on industry developments and hope a solution can be found which could be adopted.

Mrs Plant confirmed that although she supported the remaining points under this heading in principle consideration would need to be given to resource and delivery as they will require a districtwide multi-agency approach.

#### **4. Green Bus stops.**

Mrs Plant confirmed her support of the intention but explained that the work would need to be given to the bus stop owners to consider how it could be resourced.

#### **5. Greening Flower offer in the park displays.**

Mrs Plant confirmed that the council no longer plant seasonal displays (as of six years ago). The council's flower beds contain sustainable plants such as Echinacea, Lavender, Sedum and Heather. The council is also tolerant of weeds in bedding such as dandelions and allows them to remain during their pollinating period. Mrs Plant clarified that this should be referred to the Parks Strategy Task and Finish group for review.

#### **6. Advice to Planning Applicants**

Mrs Taylor then responded to the final planning related point. She explained that the council already provides advice on how to implement beneficial ecological and environmental measures within the Environmental Protection section of the website. The advice is available to applicants in drawing up their proposals, although it is not mandatory for such measures to be implemented. Current Local Plan policy requires proposals that may have a negative impact on protected ecological interests to mitigate for this impact, but not to implement greater ecological improvements than that. Mrs Taylor warned that further advice that implies that the council has greater control within the CDC Plan Area than it does risks unrealistically raises expectations. The council is unable to insist on such provision within CDC Planning Applications without a current relevant planning policy in place. Any such aspiration should be drawn out and tested through the Local Plan Review process.

The South Downs National Park Authority advice that is referenced in the motion relates to Ecosystems Services. The advice is technical information to support implementation of their new Policy in the recently adopted South Downs National Park Local Plan. In dealing with applications on behalf of the South Downs National Park Authority CDC planning officers need to ensure that planning applications meet the requirements of the Ecosystems Services policy and have regard to this technical advice in doing so.

Mrs Plant then proposed a counter motion as follows which was seconded by Mrs Lintill:

*That points 1-5 be referred to the Environment Panel and point 6 be referred to the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel.*

Mr Brown then proposed a counter motion as follows which was seconded by Mr Moss:

*That the motion presented in Section 19 to be treated as a report to Council.*

*That the report presented in Section 19 of the agenda be noted and the Council's full support for the aims set out in it be confirmed.*

*That item 1 (Trees) be noted and agreed, subject to the following clarifications:*

- *The District Tree Champion to be appointed by the Council.*
- *Review to be channelled through the Environment Panel.*
- *Remit of Tree Summit to be expanded to include hedgerows.*

- *Investigation to be channelled through the Environment Panel.*

*That item 2 (Wildflowers) be noted and agreed, subject to the following clarifications:*

- *Review to be channelled through the Environment Panel.*
- *Pollinator Action Plan to be developed through the Environment Panel.*

*That item 3 (Pesticides) to be referred in its entirety to the Environment Panel.*

*That item 4 (Bus Stops) be noted and agreed for consideration, with the Environment Panel leading on behalf of the Council.*

*That item 5 (Sustainable Planting) be noted and agreed.*

*That item 6 (Advice to Planning Applicants) be noted and agreed, with the following additions:*

- *That Environment Panel be tasked with overseeing the creation of a 'greened development vision' which can be communicated to all applicants providing context for the advice and recommendations being given.*
- *The vision, accompanying information and advice to include links to sources of information providing more detailed explanations, sources of materials and (if appropriate) contractors and suppliers, to local community conservation groups which may be able to assist, etc.*

Mr Plowman gave his support to the counter motion from Mr Brown explaining that Chichester City Council is taking a holistic approach. He asked members to consider areas which could be utilised as better locations for trees and drew attention to a BBC energy guide which is available online outlining ways to make changes.

Dr O'Kelly gave her support to the counter motion from Mr Brown and urged close working with WSCC.

Mrs Lintill explained that she supports the ethos of the motion but through the relevant channel such as the Environment Panel.

Mrs Taylor added that the council is very proactive in environmental issues.

Mr Brown withdrew his counter motion.

Mrs Plant read out her counter motion as follows which was seconded by Mrs Lintill:

*That points 1-5 be referred to the Environment Panel and point 6 be referred to the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel.*

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

*That points 1-5 be referred to the Environment Panel and point 6 be referred to the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel.*

## 54 Motion to the Council about Electricity Suppliers

The Chairman invited Mrs Sharp to move her second motion. Mrs Sharp moved her second motion which was seconded by Mrs Hume.

Mrs Sharp then outlined her motion below:

*We note that the Council has declared a Climate Emergency in the summer. One of the key actions that individuals, businesses and councils can take to reduce their carbon footprint is to source their electricity from renewable sources and change to a Green Tariff.*

*We therefore recommend to the Council:*

- 1. That enquiries be made to compare different renewable energy providers to demonstrate the council's commitment to reducing its impact on the environment*
- 2. That an evaluation of the comparison of prices between an 100% Green tariff and a Brown tariff takes place including consideration of fixed and flexible pricing and the length of the contracts*
- 3. That the council's energy supply contracts be reviewed*
- 4. That an energy procurement strategy that supports local community energy providers be created (example: the County Council's Your Energy Sussex <https://www.yourenergysussex.org.uk/>)*

The Chairman invited Mrs Plant to respond as the Cabinet member for Environment. Mrs Plant thanked Mrs Sharp for her motion. She explained that the current energy contracts including Electricity and Gas are awarded to Kent County Council, LASER Buying Group. The council procurement strategy for energy supply has in previous years focussed upon lowest price but also required price certainty. To achieve these things the council has opted for a "Purchase In Advance" agreement, which provides a fixed tariff price year on year over the 4 year framework which includes a 2 year break clause. These four year framework contracts will expire on 30 September 2020 and new contracts will be required to be awarded in good time prior to this date.

The council will therefore need to agree on its preferred procurement route for future energy supplies in the lead up to September 2020.

Mrs Plant then proposed a counter motion as follows which was seconded by Mrs Lintill:

*That this matter be referred to the Environment Panel to consider and make its recommendation to the Cabinet as to the council's energy procurement strategy for 2020 and beyond.*

Mrs Hume responded by explaining that although a lot of the work will need to be carried out by the Environment Panel there is value to discussing the issues at Full Council as the climate emergency affects everything the council does.

Mr Moss wished to endorse the comments made by Mrs Hume and acknowledged the importance of renewable energy sources.

Mr Elliott requested clarification of the nature of the current contract. Mrs Plant confirmed that it is a brown contract.

Mr Plowman added that the Chichester City Council energy source is a renewable energy supplier.

Mrs Lintill confirmed that it was something which could be considered further.

Mr Brown asked if the Environment Panel minutes had been published. Mrs Plant explained that they had and members had been notified of how to access the minutes online.

Mrs Plant then read her counter motion which had been seconded by Mrs Lintill as follows:

*That this matter be referred to the Environment Panel to consider and make its recommendation to the Cabinet as to the council's energy procurement strategy for 2020 and beyond.*

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

*That this matter be referred to the Environment Panel to consider and make its recommendation to the Cabinet as to the council's energy procurement strategy for 2020 and beyond.*

### **55 Motion to the Council about Affordable Housing**

The Chairman invited Mr Hughes to move his motion. Mr Hughes moved his motion which was seconded by Miss Lishman.

Mr Hughes then outlined his motion below:

*It is recommended that the Council notes the following:*

- 1. Home-ownership has fallen to a thirty-year low; the average home now costs 13.5 times the average annual pay packet in Chichester and 1.7 million households nationally pay over a third of their income each month to a private landlord.*
- 2. Building more market-price homes can help lower prices only over the long term, so more supply alone cannot fix the problem or help thousands of families in Chichester District with the housing pressures they face now. The crisis requires action to build genuinely affordable homes at scale, and ensure a better balance in the new homes built.*
- 3. Affordable housing is one of the best investments councils can make: not only does it create a home for a family, and regular rental income for the council as landlord, it reduces housing benefit spending in the more expensive private rented sector too. A recent report by Capital Economics confirmed that a national programme of 100,000 genuinely affordable homes a year "will deliver a sustained structural improvement to public sector finances".*
- 4. Investing in affordable housing creates jobs and boosts local economies. It's estimated that every £1 spent on house building generates £2.84 in extra economic activity, and social landlords are also significant local buyers and employers: for every £1 million of housing output, 12 jobs are created.*

5. *There is a pressing need for urgent additional council, social and affordable housing in the District of Chichester as local residents face spiralling rents and house prices, meaning there is a grave shortage of affordable housing for families in the District, which may increasingly force residents' children and grandchildren to move away from the area. This is an unacceptable situation which this council has a moral duty to act upon. There are currently 1358 households on the Council's housing register; there are also currently 42 households in council-owned temporary accommodation and a further 18 households are in non-council-owned temporary accommodation.*
6. *Many of the residents on the District's housing register will be in private rented accommodation, which costs the taxpayer greater amounts in housing support benefits because private rents are extremely high, and temporary accommodation, which means that this council has to spend money that could otherwise be used for other vital council services.*
7. *This council also notes that there is an additional cost to the Council in the difference between the housing benefit paid and what the council can claim back from government, based on Local Housing Allowance rates: in the last year this was estimated to be around £20K.*
8. *It is unacceptable for this council to fail to act positively to meet the housing needs this District has, particularly as significant investment in new council housing will in the long term make savings which will relieve the costs to this council in its duties as a local housing authority.*
9. *However, the council recognises that reactivating the Housing Revenue Account would be a task needing a considerable amount of work. Therefore, as national law permits councils to build up to 199 council houses without an HRA, the council states the following:*

*It is recommended that the Council resolves to:*

1. *Change the council's definition of affordability to that of the formula used for Social rent and Intermediate housing, which is pegged to local incomes.*
2. *Launch a review of our affordable housing target with a view to increasing the minimum in the Local Plan to 40 per cent.*
3. *In the medium term, establish a scrutiny panel to examine the viability of setting up a Local Housing Company (LHC) as an independent, arms-length organisation wholly owned by the council and operated on a not-for-profit basis.*

*However, in the meantime, it is recommended that the council resolves to:*

4. *Commit to building up to 199 Council Houses, available at affordable rent prices, and for rental income to be ring-fenced to reinvest in housing stock.*

The Chairman invited Mrs Graves to respond as the Cabinet member for Housing. Mrs Graves thanked Mr Hughes for his motion. She acknowledged the difficulties faced by local people trying to secure a home in the district and emphasised that housing is a key priority for the council and the Corporate Plan includes the aim that the council will improve the provision of and access to suitable housing. Mrs Graves drew attention to two key

pieces of work underway that address the issues raised, namely, the review of the Local Plan and the preparation of new Housing Strategy. She confirmed that these pieces of work will consider the points raised in the proposed motion. Mrs Graves explained that members also had the opportunity to attend a workshop on 5 September 2019 which considered the viability of the forthcoming Local Plan and also the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment. She confirmed that a pre-Council session is also planned on 26 November 2019 to present the draft new Housing Strategy to all members. The Housing Strategy will then go on to Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC), Cabinet and Full Council.

Mrs Graves explained that it would be premature for the Council to accept the recommendations as Council will have the opportunity to debate these issues at a future meeting once all the relevant evidence has been provided.

Mrs Graves then commented on each recommendation in turn as follows:

Recommendation 1: The definition of affordable housing is set down in the National Planning Policy Framework for planning purposes so the Council is unable to change this definition locally.

Recommendation 2: The Local Plan review will take into account the evidence received in the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment and Viability assessment when considering what percentage of affordable homes should be delivered on market sites. The new Housing Strategy will also consider what additional affordable homes the Council can enable by working with registered providers and community led housing groups. A new affordable housing delivery target will, therefore, form part of the Housing Strategy under consideration by members in the coming months.

Recommendation 3: It is not for the Council to establish scrutiny panels. This is a matter for the Chairman of OSC in consultation with the Committee and the Business Routing Panel. As said, however, the new Housing Strategy will be considered by OSC at its meeting in January 2019.

Recommendation 4: This suggestion has been considered in the past and the Housing strategy will consider our options to identify the best way for us to continue to deliver affordable housing. It is not a decision the Council can make today as the Constitution clearly sets down the requirements for expenditure of capital, which include a project initiation document, with an options appraisal, detailed capital estimates, revenue implications and approval by Cabinet.

Mrs Graves then proposed a counter motion as follows which was seconded by Mrs Lintill:

- *That recommendation 1 of the previous motion is not taken forward as the definition is set down in the NPPF*
- *That recommendations 2 and 4 be considered as part of the work being undertaken for the Local Plan review and Housing Strategy update, both of which will come to Full Council in due course.*
- *That recommendation 3 is referred to the OSC for their consideration.*

Mr Moss then proposed a counter motion as follows which was seconded by Mr Brown:

*That Council resolves to:*

- 1. Receive a report by officers at the next DPIP on the possibility of implications of changing the council's definition of affordability to that of the formula used for social rent and intermediate housing, which is pegged by local incomes.*
- 2. Request that when the council's consultants provide members with their final conclusions on their review of possible changes to the affordable housing target (of "at least 30%" and allowing Neighbourhood Plans to include their own Affordable Housing Strategy) members be presented with a range of options which enable us to see the trade offs between changing the target, raising the CIT for investment in vital infrastructure and improving energy efficiency plans i.e. members should be presented with a range of options not simply a single recommendation or even two diametrically opposed options.*
- 3. Establish a scrutiny panel to examine the medium to long term viability of setting up a Local Housing Company (LHC) as an independent, arms-length organisation wholly owned by the council and operated on a not-for-profit basis.*
- 4. Write to the Housing Minister to request that councils be given the power to suspend the right to buy at the very least for newly-built council houses.*
- 5. Receive a report by officers at DPIP on the risks to capital invested in council housing presented by the current right to buy, specifically referencing how other councils are managing this risk and building new council houses.*
- 6. Review land under council control and/or which has the potential for being brought under council control which could be used for the building of up to 199 council houses. If this option was pursued, these would be made available at affordable (definition as per point one) rent or for part ownership. Rental income to be ring fenced to reinvest in housing stock.*

Mrs Shepherd addressed each point in turn:

- Point one would be more appropriately directed to OSC.
- Point two is premature as officers are working on the evidence base and members need to fully understand the consequences prior to making such as decision.
- Point three would be more appropriately directed to OSC.
- Point four can remain as is.
- Point five would be more appropriately directed to the OSC to establish a task and finish group.
- Point six would be more appropriately directed to an OSC task and finish group.

Mrs Rudziak added that affordability clauses could be considered in the Housing Strategy subject to viability.

Mr Hughes emphasised the importance of points two and three which could make the lives of residents better. He requested a commitment to agreeing point four.

Mr Briscoe drew attention to the resources that are already in place such as Community Land Trusts (CLT) which Mr Hughes acknowledged.

Mr Oakley commented that Mrs Graves proposal remained clear and evidence based. He warned of avoiding unintended consequences if the long term viability is not carefully considered.

Mr Plowman noted his agreement in principle with building 199 council houses as he acknowledged the lack of an affordable house in Chichester.

Mr Brown acknowledged the need for social housing but emphasised the importance of doing it properly with information required.

Mrs Hume supported the motion in principle but emphasised the need for the housing to be genuinely affordable. Mrs Sharp supported Mrs Hume's comments. She explained that the idea of a CLT relies heavily on volunteers and asked if the council could provide officer time to put into such projects.

(Mrs Plant gave her apologies as she left).

Mr Hobbs explained that it is important that members have fully thought out the options before making a decision.

Mr Dignum proposed a motion to go to the vote which was seconded by Mr Elliott.

Mrs Lintill then read out a counter motion which had been seconded by Mrs Taylor as follows:

*Recommendation 1 of the previous motion is not taken forward as the definition is set down in the NPPF, that recommendations 2 and 4 be considered as part of the work being undertaken for the Local Plan review and Housing Strategy update, both of which will come to Full Council in due course, and that recommendation 3 is referred to the OSC for their consideration and that Council invites OSC to establish a scrutiny panel to examine the medium/long term viability of setting up a local housing company as an independent arms length organisation wholly owned by the council and operated on a not for profit basis. That panel is to receive a report by officers on risks to capital invested in council housing presented by the current right to buy specifically referencing how other councils are managing this risk and building new council houses and that they also review the land under council control and/or which has the potential to be under council control which could be used for the building of up to 199 council houses. If this option is pursued the properties would be made available under affordable rent or part ownership. Rental income to be ring fenced to reinvest in housing stock. The council will also write to the Minister for Housing to request that council's be given the power to suspend the right to buy at least for the newly built council houses.*

Mr Moss then withdrew his counter motion.

In a show of hands the Council voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

- 1. That recommendation one of the previous motion is not taken forward as the definition is set down in the NPPF*
- 2. That recommendations two and four be considered as part of the work being undertaken for the Local Plan review and Housing Strategy update, both of which will come to Full Council in due course.*
- 3. That recommendation three is referred to the OSC for their consideration and that Council invites OSC to establish a scrutiny panel to examine the medium/long term viability of setting up a local housing company as an independent arms length*

- organisation wholly owned by the council and operated on a not for profit basis. That panel is to receive a report by officers on risks to capital invested in council housing presented by the current right to buy specifically referencing how other councils are managing this risk and building new council houses and that they also review the land under council control and/or which has the potential to be under council control which could be used for the building of up to 199 council houses. If this option is pursued the properties would be made available under affordable rent or part ownership. Rental income to be ring fenced to reinvest in housing stock.*
- 4. The council will also write to the Minister for Housing to request that council's be given the power to suspend the right to buy at least for the newly built council houses.*

## 56 Questions to the Executive

The Chairman invited Questions to the Executive.

Mrs Bangert asked with regard to cuts to housing support services what the council is doing in relation to the Local Plan to address the shortfall of housing for vulnerable young people within the district who at present are being housed as far away as Crawley. Mrs Graves confirmed that the responsibility lies with WSCC. Mrs Rudziak then explained that the WSCC is the responsible authority and recent cuts to their budgets have impacted on young people's services including the foyer which was run from within East Pallant House. Mrs Rudziak added that she is a member of a Task and Finish Group established to consider ways to best mitigate against the cuts. She acknowledged that there is no one easy solution. She added that going forwards the delivery of accommodation for vulnerable young people in the district will need to be identified and considered through the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment.

Mr Brown explained that last year the Environment Planning and Engagement at the Environment Agency had advised a local resident that there is a partnership of key organisations called the Chichester Water Quality Group which provides a level of scrutiny and oversight on more strategic matters and consider whether any intervention may be necessary to facilitate development whilst ensuring the protection of the environment. As CDC does not have the expertise to understand and scrutinise the problems. Is it possible to ask OSC to set up a task and finish group to review this area. Mrs Shepherd explained that all groups established have to be set up and resourced by officers and have councillors to attend also. She emphasised the importance of prioritising new projects. Mr Brown agreed that the work could be deferred whilst priority is given to the Local Plan. Mr Frost explained that the Chichester Water Quality Group has been established as a multi organisation officer working group and members should be reassured that it is working well.

Mrs Hume in relation to the Government's 0% greenhouse emissions commitment asked whether the council needs to introduce cycle networks throughout the district where residents are forced to travel to access vital services. If not, what will be done to mitigate against it. She confirmed that she did not expect an answer but requested that officers consider the comments made.

Mrs Sharp in relation to Rumboldswyke School possible school closure asked whether the Leader could write a letter to WSCC outlining the transport impacts of their school closure decisions and commit CDC officers to work with WSCC officers to build up connections with local communities and local schools in order to reduce carbon emissions.

Mrs Lintill advised Mrs Sharp to discuss the matter further with her local WSCC county councillor. Mrs Sharp emphasised the need to consider the wider picture of environmental issue not just the school numbers.

Mr Oakley asked in relation to the Tangmere Strategic Development Location whether there are appropriate resources for the Compulsory Purchase Order work to take place in order for a report to be brought before Full Council in November 2019. Mrs Taylor confirmed there is enough resource and the report is expected at the end of November 2019.

57        **Late Items**

There were no late items.

58        **Exclusion of the press and public**

There was no requirement to exclude the press or public.

59        **Southern Gateway - Potential Acquisition**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

The meeting ended at 5.59 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date: