

# Public Document Pack

**JOHN WARD**  
Director of Corporate Services

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

East Pallant House  
1 East Pallant  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1TY  
Tel: 01243 785166  
[www.chichester.gov.uk](http://www.chichester.gov.uk)



## Notice of Meeting

### To All Members of Chichester District Council

You are hereby summoned to attend the annual meeting of **THE COUNCIL** which will be held virtually on **Tuesday 19 May 2020 at 2.00 pm** for the transaction of the business set out in the agenda below.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Diane Shepherd'.

**DIANE SHEPHERD**  
Chief Executive

**11 May 2020**

## AGENDA

- 1 **Election of the Chairman of the Council**  
This will be followed by the declaration of acceptance of office.
- 2 **Appointment of the Vice-Chairman of the Council**  
This will be followed by the declaration of acceptance of office.
- 3 **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 12)  
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2020.
- 4 **Urgent Items**  
The Chairman will announce any urgent items which due to special circumstances are to be dealt with under Late Items.
- 5 **Declarations of Interests**  
Members and officers are reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests they may have in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.
- 6 **Chairman's Announcements**  
Apologies for absence will be notified at this point.  
  
The Chairman will make any specific announcements.

7 **Political Balance to include Appointment and Membership of Committees and their Chairs and Vice-Chairs** (Pages 13 - 19)

The Council is requested to make the following resolutions:

1. That the review of political balance arrangements set out below be approved and;
2. that remaining members to be shown at table 2 be established by members at the meeting
3. That tables 1, 2 and 3 be then applied in making appointments to committees and;
4. that the memberships set out in the appendix to this report be approved.

8 **Appointments to External Organisations** (Pages 21 - 27)

The Council is requested to make the following resolution:

That the external bodies as set out in the attached appendix be approved.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE CABINET**

To consider the following recommendations from the Cabinet.

*The reports giving rise to these recommendations are in the papers for the meeting of the Cabinet on 12 May 2020 and are available in the committee papers section of the Council's website.*

9 **Urgent Decision Notices**

The Council is requested to note the Urgent Decisions made during the current Pandemic which can be found on pages 15 to 25 of the Cabinet agenda pack for 12 May 2020.

### **OTHER REPORTS**

10 **Recovery Plan Motion** (Page 29)

Having complied with the advance written notice requirement in Standing Order 18.1 and the subject requirement in Standing Order 18.2 of the Chichester District Council Constitution the attached motion will be proposed by Cllr Moss and if duly seconded it will then be discussed at this meeting.

11 **Urgent Decision Notices** (Pages 31 - 35)

The Council is requested to note the Urgent Decisions made during the current Pandemic.

12 **Late Items**

To consider any late items as follows:

- a) Items added to the agenda papers and made available for public inspection.
- b) Items which the chairman has agreed should be taken as matters of urgency by reason of special circumstances to be reported at the meeting.

13 **Exclusion of the press and public**

There are no restricted items for consideration at this meeting.

NOTES

The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any item of business wherever it is likely that there would be disclosure of "exempt information" as defined in section 100A of and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972

**MEMBERS**

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

This page is intentionally left blank

# Public Document Pack Agenda Item 3



Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held in Committee Rooms - East Pallant House on Wednesday 11 March 2020 at 9.30 am

**Members Present:** Mr R Briscoe, Mrs D Johnson, Mr G McAra, Mr S Oakley, Mr H Potter, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp, Mr A Sutton and Mr P Wilding

**Members not present:** Mrs C Purnell, Rev J H Bowden, Mr G Barrett and Mrs J Fowler

**In attendance by invitation:**

**Officers present:** Mr O Broadway (Principal Conservation and Design Officer), Miss N Golding (Principal Solicitor), Miss S Hurr (Democratic Services Officer), Mr D Price (Principal Planning Officer), Mrs F Stevens (Development Manager (Applications)), Mr T Whitty (Divisional Manager for Development Management) and Mr J Saunders (Development Manager (National Park))

## 31 **Chairman's Announcements**

In the absence of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, Mr Briscoe was proposed as the Chairman for the meeting by Mr Sutton, seconded by Mr Wilding and agreed by all present. Mr Briscoe took the Chairman's seat.

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, read out the emergency evacuation procedure, and confirmed to all present to be mindful of hygiene during the meeting and breaks, due to the current outbreak of the Covid-19 virus.

Apologies for absence had been received from Mrs Purnell, Rev. Bowden, Mr Barrett and Mrs Fowler.

## 32 **Approval of Minutes**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2020 be approved and signed by the Chairman with the following corrections as requested by Miss Golding and Mr Oakley:

That NM/19/00677/FUL – South Mundham Farm, South Mundham Road, South Mundham, PO20 1LU was permitted 'with S106'.

Consideration of late item: 23 Southgate, Chichester (The Vestry) to authorise the Authority's 'Prinicpal' Solicitor, and not 'Senior' Solicitor as recorded.

SI/19/02417/FUL – Chalk Lane Nursery, Chalk Lane, Siddlesham, PO20 7LW, that the name of the speaker from the Parish Council was Mr Harland and not Mr Hadland as recorded.

**33 Urgent Items**

The Chairman reported that there would be no urgent items.

**34 Declarations of Interests**

Mrs Johnson declared a personal interest in respect of planning application SY/19/02962/FUL as a member of Selsey Town Council.

Mr Oakley declared a personal interest in respect of planning applications BI/19/02797/FUL, CH/19/03029/FUL, CH/19/03030/FUL, EWB/19/00431/AGR and SY/19/02962/FUL as a member of West Sussex County Council.

**35 BI/19/02797/FUL - Martins Cottage, Martins Lane, Birdham, PO20 7AU**

Mr Mew introduced the application.

Further information was provided on the agenda update sheet regarding the review of the Local Plan, explaining that consultation on a Preferred Approach Local Plan had taken place and that following consideration of the responses, it was intended that the Council would publish a Submission Local Plan under Regulation 19 early in 2021.

Further information was also provided on the agenda update sheet regarding comments from the CDC Environment Officer in relation to making appropriate provision for bats, reptiles, and nesting birds. Further requirements were listed, pertaining to enhancements to be incorporated into the scheme for replacement of trees, planting of a wildflower meadow and filling gaps in tree lines and hedgerows. A further five letters of objections had also been received from the same parties as previously. Additional conditions were also listed confirming no structure shall be erected or alteration made without the grant of planning permission, and that the implementation of this planning permission would be carried out strictly in accordance with the measures concluded within the Ecological Report. Amended conditions were detailed stating that no works should be carried out above slab level until a scheme for ecological enhancement had been submitted for approval prior to first occupation. Details of the existing and proposed boundary treatments and walled garden shall also be submitted for approval. The building should only be used only for holiday accommodation, and any scheme for external illumination shall also be submitted for written approval.

The following members of the public addressed the Committee:

Mrs Bernice Culley – Objector  
Mr Paul White – Agent

Members expressed concerns that this would be a new structure in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and the scale of encroachment. Members sought clarification regarding the lack of hedgerows on the northern and western boundaries, issues of building outside the settlement boundary and whether the surrounding land was owned by the applicant and there may be further similar applications. Members also commented that access facilities for wheelchair users were not cited for the proposed dwelling, and that the greenhouse it was replacing, was significantly smaller. Mr Mew responded that landscaping was listed in the conditions, and the supporting statements included hedging to the southern boundary providing connectivity to the woodland to the west enhancing ecological benefits, and that the northern boundary could be considered further. The blue line on the plan included the field which was owned by the applicant and the red line had been tightly drawn to limit encroachment and control the site within the AONB. Any future applications would have to be determined on their own merits. Policy 30 allowed for tourism units to be located outside the settlement boundary in appropriate locations and no objections had been received from the Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC) and this was considered an acceptable site in accordance with the policy.

Mrs Stevens confirmed that the application was for a single unit which would add to the two already on the site. The unit would provide direct employment for the required maintenance of the proposed dwelling, tourism was considered positive within the area and as cited by Mr Mew, policy 30 supported this activity. With regards to the management of disturbance, a financial contribution was being made by way of a mitigation scheme operated by the 'Bird Aware Partnership'. Mrs Stevens further explained that there were no requirements within current policies which required of provision of accessible accommodation, and therefore the application could not be refused on this basis. In terms of landscaping along the northern and western boundary, an informative requiring native hedging would be reasonable to soften the visual impact.

Members sought further clarification regarding whether it was feasible to remove the permitted development rights for the field, in order that this application would be the last development on the site, the meaning within the report of 'No vegetation to be stored on the construction zone', public viewpoint of the site as public footpaths were located to the north, light spillage and controls, the absence of a clear proposal in relation to planting on the northern and western boundaries, and whether it would be possible to stipulate the planting of trees with a subsequent tree preservation orders placed on them to limit further development. Mr Mew responded that a field would not benefit from permitted development rights, there would be an article 4 which restricted camping, and it was proposed to withdraw permitted development rights for the proposed holiday unit. With regards to the statement of 'No vegetation to be stored...' this was to prevent reptiles entering any vegetation from activities such as strimming. The proposed scheme would have rooflights, but a condition had been included for blinds to be used from dusk until dawn. With regards to views within the ANOB, the site was well contained and the CHC had not cited any concerns. The landscaping condition could also be amended to enhance the northern and western boundaries and could include tree planting. Mr Whitty added that that Local Plan was very supportive of tourism, as was the CHC. The viewpoint and the AONB was an important factor, but as explained previously the CHC were not concerned regarding the impact of the development. To the north was a strong

tree belt which separated the site from the harbour and wider landscape, but the Committee could request further screening.

Members sought further clarification regarding limiting permitted development rights, and further commented that if trees were planted, tree preservation orders would not apply unless they were 'fine specimens', and such trees would be newly planted. The Chairman reminded the Committee that they could only deal with what had been currently presented but was inclined to agree with further hedge and tree planting. Mr Whitty advised the Committee to disregard the ownership of whole site in considering this application which related only to the area within the red line and the construction of a building, any further building would require an application, and guarding against mission creep would be by way of scrutiny of any future application and planting was not necessary in order to do so. The landscaping requirement could be strengthened but tree preservation orders could not be applied as trees do not have an amenity value until they have reached a certain age but a condition could require any tree which died within five years to be replanted. With regards to an accessible toilet, Mr Whitty advised this would be covered by Building Regulations and the Disability Discrimination Act and above these requirements, the authority could only state as an informative. Mr Whitty also confirmed that landscaping of the boundaries would form part of the recommendations.

#### **RESOLVED**

Recommendation to **Permit** agreed with additional conditions, informatives and amendments as discussed.

36 **CH/19/03029/FUL - Plot C, Pond Farm, Newells Lane, West Ashling, Chichester, PO18 8DF**

Mr Power introduced the application.

Further information was provided on the agenda update sheet regarding the review of the Local Plan, explaining that consultation on a Preferred Approach Local Plan had taken place and that following consideration of the responses, it was intended that the Council would publish a Submission Local Plan under Regulation 19 early in 2021.

Mr Power also confirmed verbally that temporary planning permission for the siting of a caravan on the site had been granted in 2013.

Members sought clarification regarding sewerage and surface water, the impact on wildlife corridors and the chalk stream, whether the parish could be considered to have an area of dominance, impact on public rights of way access, if further ecological enhancement could be required and the definition of 'Gypsies and Travellers'. Members further commented that the district did not currently have sufficient pitches for gypsies and travellers, the site was not within flood zone two or three, and the length of time the family had been on site and become part of the community. Mrs Stevens responded that at the current time limited weight could be given to the emerging Local Plan review in relation to wildlife corridors and the chalk stream, however it was important to limit erosion prior to the adoption of the plan,

but the Environment Officer had made no objections to the application. Mr Power confirmed that the site was within flood zone one, the impact on the bridle paths was not considered an issue by the highways authority, and any damage would be liable to the applicant. The site was not large but there is some scope to the south and to the entrance, for landscape enhancements. With regards to recreational disturbance payments, the agent had confirmed the applicant was willing to make that payment and was in the process of signing a unilateral undertaking. In relation to the definition of 'Gypsies and Travellers', there was a standard condition within the report, used by the authority and the Planning Inspectorate. The foul drainage was processed via a septic tank which was permitted in the 2013 temporary permission, and the Drainage Officer considered that was acceptable. Mr Power further explained that in terms of the effect on the settled community, a similar comment was raised in connection with the Keynor Lane appeal and the Inspector found in that instance, there would not be an over-burden and dominance within the community.

Miss Golding added that the travelling show people site in Priors Leaze Lane, had been mentioned within the debate and advised this was a different and separate group, with different needs and policies, and was not relevant for the determination of this application. Mr Whitty also confirmed that he was unable to advise how long a single family had occupied the site, and noted that information provided from the public gallery (given as since 2006). The site was one of a number permitted temporary permission in 2014/15.

Members sought further clarification regarding electricity supply, whether an electric charging point for a vehicle had been included in the report and if cycle storage had also been included on the site, and whether a condition governing a lighting scheme might be appropriate. Members further commented that the site would require a condition regarding sewerage and drainage. Mr Whitty responded that there was no specific definition regarding an area and its relation to dominance, in past appeals officers have argued it related to immediate dwellings and Inspectors had consistently treated this, with regards to the size of the parish. The supply of electricity was not normally a material consideration, and only in connection with protecting the environment for example that fuels were safeguarded from spillage. Officers would look to further safeguarding ecological features. With regards to cycle storage and light spillage, permission had already been temporarily granted and impact assessed, therefore it would not now be reasonable to include such requirements. Foul sewerage was already established on the site, but a condition could be added for the need to maintain the facility in perpetuity.

Members further queried that a car charging point had been included potentially in response to the new West Sussex County Council guidelines and therefore could a new condition be added regarding light spillage in relation to the impact on wildlife. Mr Whitty confirmed that the County Council had new guidance on car charging which could now be relied upon. With regards to wildlife corridors the authority now had new and emerging scheme with further available evidence, and therefore that also could be included. A condition relating to lighting had been included repeating the condition as previously cited in the temporary permission. Mr Whitty advised that the requirement for covered cycle provision was not previously required and therefore it would now not be unreasonable for it to be a requirement.

**RESOLVED**

Recommendation to **Permit** agreed with additional conditions and amendments as discussed.

Mr Oakley left the room.

37 **CH/19/03030/FUL - Plot F, Pond Farm, Newells Lane, West Ashling, Chichester, PO18 8DF**

Mr Power introduced the application.

Further information was provided on the agenda update sheet regarding the review of the Local Plan, explaining that consultation on a Preferred Approach Local Plan had taken place and that following consideration of the responses, it was intended that the Council would publish a Submission Local Plan under Regulation 19 early in 2021.

Further information was also provided on the agenda update sheet detailing the siting of caravans on the plan.

The following Members of the public addressed the Committee:

Mr Gowlett – Parish Council  
Mr Angus Murdoch – Agent  
Mr Adrian Moss – Chichester District Council

Members sought clarification regarding temporary permission and the related notice period to residents. Mrs Stevens confirmed that temporary permissions were are not advisable and these were generally used for a period of assessment of impacts to occur and to allow work to be completed on the Local Plan or Supplementary Planning Documents the (SPDs) to support the Local Plan. Situations have occurred in which at appeal, Inspector had granted permanent permission, due to SPD not being produced in a sufficiently short timescale. A temporary permission would normally run for three years although some five year temporary permissions had been granted. Mrs Stevens advised that the Committee should be minded that this site would add to the supply, for which there was currently significant unmet need and that this was a reasonable and appropriate site which would contribute to the unmet need.

**RESOLVED**

Recommendation to **Permit** agreed.

The Committee took a ten minute break.

38 **EWB/19/00431/AGR - Hundredsteddle Farm, Hundredsteddle Lane, Birdham, Chichester, PO20 7BL**

Mr Power introduced the application.

Further information was provided on the agenda update sheet regarding the review of the Local Plan, explaining that consultation on a Preferred Approach Local Plan had taken place and that following consideration of the responses, it was intended that the Council would publish a Submission Local Plan under Regulation 19 early in 2021.

Mr Power gave a verbal correction with regards to the location of the application as cited within the report.

Mr Power played a short video which had been requested to be shown by one of the objectors.

The following members of the public addressed the Committee:

Mr Brian Reeves – Parish Council

Mr Graeme Maycock – Objector

Mr Julian Moore – Objector

Dr Jill Sutcliffe – Objector (from Campaign for the Protection of Rural England {Sussex})

Mrs Lesley Pardoe – Supporter

Mrs Rachel Strange – Agent

The Chairman sought clarification regarding 'article 4' and whether it should be invoked as referenced by one of the speakers. Mr Whitty responded he presumed what had been referred to was article 4 of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) which allowed local authorities to remove general permitted rights for areas of land where there were good grounds to do so, but that was normally undertaken in advance, required consultation and was a policy-related tool rather than a reactive tool (citing the example of an article 4 for the Chichester Conservation Area which prevented the replacement of windows) which could not be used once the process had been invoked. Miss Golding confirmed that an article 4 direction could be issued provided it was prior to the date of any approval of any prior approval. The complication was that if a prior approval was refused unreasonably, and was subsequently allowed on appeal, and in the meantime had been issued with an article 4 direction, and in this situation it was doubtful that the article 4 direction would stand.

Members commented on the need to support food production which may outweigh landscape concerns, further concerns regarding the differences between officer advice and the information put forward by the parish council and objectors, and the scale of the building and traffic. Members further commented on the considerable public interest in terms of objections, concerns regarding the location on a green site, near to the road and the belief that agricultural buildings were required to be clustered together, and with regards to the GPDO, that it was within 25 metres of the highway.

Members sought clarification between the application and a 'full' application.

Mr Power advised that the proposed building was not within 25 metres of a classified road and confirmed the applicant was not proposing any alterations to the

access. In regards to the scale of the building, policy 45 allowed for agricultural buildings to be located within the countryside, provided size, scale and materials used would have minimum impact. The size and scale of the farm had to be considered including the requirement for the storage of machinery and material from the land and the farm, and that the building was broadly in line with the requirement. With regards to the siting, other locations had been considered, the conservation area was to the north of the site, there were also restrictions on access, and that amendments had been made in accordance with officer recommendation. Mr Power added that GPDO and the Local Plan accepted the principle of building in the countryside.

Members further commented on the interpretation of the definition of the countryside and the need to balance protection of the countryside and need to produce food. Members sought clarification regarding whether this determination could be deferred to obtain further information from the highways authority with regards to the junction or for the Committee to undertake a site visit. Mr Whitty advised and that the difference between the application and a full application was that a full application required all matters to be considered and if that was in front of the Committee there would be grounds to refuse with regards to highway concerns. However the Government had effectively granted outline permission via the GDPO, and that there was a requirement for a building of the proposed size to meet the needs of the farmer. The Committee did not have the power to refuse the application on the grounds of access, only on siting and design. The view of the highway authority was documented, they considered this was potentially an unsafe access, which they may need to address, but the Committee could not consider access. Should the highway authority attend Committee, they may provide further details other than those which had been presented.

Mr Sutton proposed and Mrs Sharp seconded:

To defer the decision for further investigations, and information as to the alternative siting of the building.

#### **RESOLVED**

Recommendation to **defer** the decision agreed.

39 **SY/19/02962/FUL - Land West Of Tidewall Cottage, 85 East Street, Selsey, Chichester, PO20 0BU**

Mrs Stevens introduced the application

Further information was provided on the agenda update sheet regarding the review of the Local Plan, explaining that consultation on a Preferred Approach Local Plan had taken place and that following consideration of the responses, it was intended that the Council would publish a Submission Local Plan under Regulation 19 early in 2021.

Further information was also provided on the agenda update sheet stating that the applicant had submitted further information and photographs in support of the application.

The following members of the public addressed the Committee:

Mr Mike Sully – Parish Council  
Mr Derek Garrett – Objector  
Dr Felicia Hughes-Freeland – Objector  
Mr Seymour Baker – Objector  
Mr Neil Kimber- Applicant  
Mr John Elliot – Chichester District Council

Members commented on the issue of the road in which the proposed dwelling would be sited being narrow and difficult for pedestrians with the volume of traffic and that a further smaller piece of pavement could aid this situation, the value of the tide wall in heritage terms, and an awareness that the applicant had retained the material which had broken away from the wall which could be used to rebuild the wall in the new proposed position. Members further commented on the change to the street scene if the proposal was permitted and sought clarification regarding the requirements for rebuilding the wall. Mr Broadway explained that there would be a requirement to reconstruct the wall in an appropriate manner on the grounds of its significance in a conservation area and reminded Members that the current position of the wall was crucially important and should be preserved as a tidewall.

Members sought further clarification regarding access to the site. Mrs Stevens responded that there was no other access to the site, and it was important to consider that the proposals included removing a substantial part of the wall. With regards to the conservation area character appraisal which was a material consideration, the walls made a significant contribution to the conservation area and it was important that they were preserved. One of the recommended actions when the area was designated as a conservation area was that the District Council would continue to protect historic boundary walls from demolition. The proposal included the relocation of a flint wall, in the same design as the adjacent wall with flint panel and brick in-fill. This wall was constructed prior to the area being designated as a conservation area and was considered overly harsh and dominant within the street scene.

Members sought clarification as to whether there was an obligation to rebuild the wall if it fell down. Mr Whitty confirmed there was no requirement to rebuild the wall and that the position within the street scene was favoured for its close-knit appearance.

Members sought further clarification regarding hedging and car charging point and further commented upon the eclectic mix of buildings within the road. Mr Whitty advised that if permission was refused, it was likely that the plot would be sold back to the original owners and returned to being part of their garden. If the wall was removed the hedging would also be removed, some planting had been proposed. The car charging point would be located within the privately created lay-by. If the application was permitted, there would be a requirement to construct a better wall in

terms of appearance than the adjacent wall. Mr Broadway added that the adjacent wall was considered harmful within the conservation area.

**RESOLVED**

Recommendation to **Refuse** agreed.

The Committee took a thirty minute lunch break.

Mr Wilding left the room.

Mr Oakley returned to the room.

40 **Chichester District Council, Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters Between 16 January 2020 and 19 February 2020**

Mr Whitty drew the Committees attention to 17/00061/CONENG – Land North of Cowdry Nursery, Sidlesham Lane, Birdham which related to a decision regarding a barn which the authority had allowed to be converted under prior approval, prior to the requirement for the integrity and structure of the building to be taken into account. However, in converting the barn it had been almost demolished and re-built and therefore was not a conversion. At appeal the Inspector agreed it was not a conversion and the appeal was dismissed and as the original barn had been demolished it could not be argued that the applicant had a fallback position of demonstrating it could be converted. Mr Whitty confirmed that full demolition would be required.

Mr Wilding returned to the room.

Mr Whitty drew attention to the update sheet which provided a summary of the appeal which was allowed for SB/18/03145/OUT – Land North of Crooks Lane, Southbourne. This was a disappointing decision which related to 199 dwellings outside the policy area adjacent to Breach Avenue, a site of 34 dwellings which had been allowed by the Inspector. The Council challenged this decision which was Judicially Reviewed, and lost and gone to the Court of Appeal which had also been lost. This application was wrapped around the Breach Avenue site. The Inspector had recognised that the Council had a five-year housing supply, but the appellant had argued that from June 2020, the Council would cease to have this. This matter was noted by the Inspector, although confirmed as not at the forefront of his deliberations. The Inspector took other policies into account including the Local Plan, which suggested that development should not take place in this location, but concluded that was out-weighted by the Governments desire for housing and therefore considered it would boost the five-year housing supply. Mr Whitty confirmed that Counsel's opinion would be sought and that advice would be brought back to the Committee. Should the advice be for a Judicial Review, officers would normally rely upon delegated powers to take that forward, but whether it should be brought to Committee would be dependent upon the outcome, and what was in the interests of ensuring probity. Mr Whitty also confirmed that dependent upon any costs related with that, a Cabinet decision may be required.

41 **South Downs National Park, Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters Between 16 January 2020 and 19 February 2020**

Members of the Committee did not require any further information.

42 **National Design Guide**

Mr Price gave a presentation regarding a brief overview of Government position in the value of design in the planning process.

Mrs Sharp left the room and did not return.

Mr Price confirmed the presentation would be sent to all Members via email.

Members sought clarification regarding the matter of carbon-neutrality associated with design. Mr Price confirmed that this information was contained within Building Regulations, and added that it was imperative that the Council moved forward with a robust policy.

Members sought further clarification regarding whether considerable weight should be given to this guide or await further advice. Mr Whitty confirmed that currently the Council should follow its own policies and a consultation would take place in relation to the guide.

Members sought further clarification regarding the scope of the document and whether it referenced design as a place-making function as opposed a sustainability function, as it was limited in relation to energy efficiency. Members further queried the extent to which the guide and national model design code would have weight over and above Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements. Mr Whitty responded it would have the same effect as the National Planning Policy Framework, and any Neighbourhood Plan, Village Design Statement or Local Plan and once the guide was in place would have general conformity. The question would then be what weight would be given, and if this guide came into force after a current Neighbourhood Plan, although that would require further consideration before Members were advised. Mr Whitty added that the core of planning was related to place-making, with other elements such building regulations which must be considered.

Members further commented that the guide was to be welcomed.

43 **Consideration of any late items as follows:**

There were no late items.

44 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There was no requirement to exclude the press and public.

The meeting ended at 2.13 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date:

**Chichester District Council**

**Full Council**

**May 2020**

**Review of Political Balance**

**1. Contact**

**Report Author**

Nicholas Bennett – Divisional Manager for Democratic Services  
Telephone: 01243 534657 e-mail: [nbennett@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:nbennett@chichester.gov.uk)

**2. Recommendation**

**2.1. That**

- **the review of political balance arrangements set out below be approved and**
- **that remaining members to be shown at table 2 be established by members at the meeting**
- **tables 1, 2 and 3 be then applied in making appointments to committees and**
- **that the memberships set out in the appendix to this report be approved.**

**3. Background**

3.1. The council has a duty, under Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 to maintain the representation of different political groups in line with the political balance rules set out in the Act and subordinate regulations. This provides the framework for the appointments to committees. Following a resignation and subsequent by-election electing a further conservative Councillor, the membership of the Council changed and the Council amended its allocations in line with that change in January 2020. The ratios have not changed since that previous report but the Leader has put forward some amendments to certain committees.

**4. Proposal - the rules and their application**

4.1. The composition of the Council is as follows:

Conservatives = 19 (52.77%)  
Liberal Democrats = 10 (27.78%)  
Green = 2 (5.56%)  
Labour = 2 (5.56%)  
Local Alliance = 2 (5.56%)  
Independent Member = 1 (2.77%)

4.2. Many of the seats have to be allocated in accordance with the rules of political balance. The following principles apply so far as reasonably practicable. They are applied in descending order of importance and are quoted in plain English rather than wording taken directly from the statute:

- a) Not all seats on the committee are allocated to the same political group.
- b) The majority party has a majority of the seats on each committee.
- c) Each political group is entitled to its proportion of the total number of seats on all the ordinary committees added together, according to the proportion the group holds of seats on the Full Council.
- d) Subject to (c) each political group is entitled to its proportion of the number of seats on each individual committee.

4.3. If more than one minority group are the same size where their entitlement to seats on a committee is less than one, one or other group should take its entitlement. This means the minority groups may wish to reach agreement between themselves as to which group should take each seat. If they both put forward a nomination the Full Council will determine which nomination should be granted the seat.

4.4. The four ordinary committees concerned are:

Corporate Governance and Audit Committee	8 seats
Planning Committee	13 seats
Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee and General Licensing Committee	10 seats
Standards Committee	7 seats
Total	38 seats

4.5. The total seats due per group are as follows:

Conservatives	38 x composition 52.77% = 20 seats (20)
Liberal Democrats	38 x composition 27.78% = 10.56 seats (11)
Green Party	38 x composition 5.56% = 2.11 seats (2)
Labour	38 x composition 5.56% = 2.11 seats (2)
Local Alliance	38 x composition 5.56% = 2.11 seats (2)
Independent Member	No entitlement as not a group, however 1 seat remains which could be allocated as follows: 38 x composition 2.77% = 1.05 seats (1)

4.6. If these proportions are applied to individual committees the results are as indicated in Table 1:

Table 1	Con	LD	Green	Labour	Local Alliance	Independent Member
Corporate Governance and Audit Committee (8)	4	2	1	0	1	0
Planning Committee (13)	7	4	1	0	1	0
Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee and General Licensing Committee (10)	5	3	0	1	0	1
Standards Committee (7)	4	2	0	1	0	0
Total	20	11	2	2	2	1

4.7. The increase of Conservative members means that they are entitled to one additional seat. The Green Party lose one seat.

4.8. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is not included in the list above but the seats on its still need to be allocated to parties in the proportion of seats that they have on the whole Council as indicated in Table 2 below. In this case there are 2 remaining seats that need to be allocated between the three minority groups. The Leader will advise Council of her recommendations as to the final make up of this Committee at the meeting.

4.9.

Table 2	Con	LD	Green	Labour	Local Alliance	Independent Member
Overview and Scrutiny Committee (11)	6	3	TBC	TBC	TBC	0

4.10. The various committees and panels concerned with discipline and dismissal of senior staff are also not ordinary committees but still need to be allocated to parties in the proportion of seats that they have on the whole Council. In each case in table 3 below there is one seat available for each minority group (Green, Labour or Local Alliance) and one for the Independent Member.

Table 3	Con	LD	Green	Labour	Local Alliance	Independent Member
Investigation and Disciplinary Committee (5+2 subs)	4	2	1	0	0	0
Appeals Committee (5 + 2 subs)	4	2	0	1	0	0
Executive Directors Disciplinary Appeal Panel (3 + 2 subs)	3	1	0	0	1	0
Redundancy Appeal Panel (3 + 2 subs)	3	1	0	0	0	1

4.11. The political groups regulations do not apply to the Cabinet, the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee established under the Licensing Act 2003 and the Independent/Parish Remuneration Panels.

4.12. Generally the Council is obliged to appoint to the committees the members proposed by the respective political groups (section 16 (1) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989). However, the Council does not have to adhere to the political groups regulations if:

- a) a political group does not use up its allocation (regulations 13 to 15).
- b) notice of alternative proposed allocations is given to all members and no member objects (Section 17 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and regulation 20).
- c) an area committee covers an area or population which is less than 40% of the total and the committee members are drawn from that area (regulation 16A) (this does not apply as the council has no area committees).

## 5. Alternatives Considered

5.1. No alternatives were considered as this is a statutory obligation.

6. **Resource and Legal Implications**

6.1. The normal obligations to hold meetings were suspended by operation of the Coronavirus Act 2020 but the Council remains entitled to make decisions as to committee membership if it so decides and may make those decisions in virtual meetings.

7. **Consultation**

7.1. The proposals have been shared with the leaders of each of the political groups.

8. **Community Impact and Corporate Risks**

8.1. None.

9. **Other Implications**

<b>Are there any implications for the following?</b> If you tick "Yes", list your impact assessment as a background paper in paragraph 13 and explain any major risks in paragraph 9		
	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b> The Council has a duty "to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area". Do the proposals in the report have any implications for increasing or reducing crime and disorder?		✓
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b> Are there any implications for the mitigation of/adaptation to climate change or biodiversity issues? If in doubt, seek advice from the Environmental Strategy Unit (ESU).		✓
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b> You should complete an Equality Impact Assessment when developing new services, policies or projects or significantly changing existing ones. For more information, see Equalities FAQs and guidance on the intranet or contact Corporate Policy.		✓
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b> The Council has a duty to cooperate with others to safeguard children and adults at risk. Do these proposals have any implication for either increasing or reducing the levels of risk to children or adults at risk? The Council has committed to dealing with issues at the earliest opportunity, do these proposals have any implication in reducing or increasing demand on Council services?		✓
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b> Does the subject of the report have significant implications for processing data likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of individuals? Processing that is likely to result in a high risk includes (but is not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>systematic and extensive processing activities and where decisions that have legal effects – or similarly significant effects – on individuals.</li> </ul>		✓

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• large scale processing of special categories of data or personal data relation to criminal convictions or offences.</li> <li>• Any larger scale processing of personal data that affects a large number of individuals; and involves a high risk to rights and freedoms eg based on the sensitivity of the processing activity.</li> <li>• large scale, systematic monitoring of public areas (including by CCTV).</li> </ul> <p>Note - If a high risk is identified a Privacy Impact Assessment must be provided to the Data Protection Officer.</p>		
<p><b>Health and Wellbeing</b></p> <p>The Council has made a commitment to ‘help our communities be healthy and active’. You should consider both the positive and negative impacts of your proposal on the health and wellbeing of communities and individuals living and working in the district. Is your proposal likely to impact positively or negatively on certain groups and their ability to make healthy choices, for example low income families, carers, older people/children and young people. Are there implications that impact on areas of the district differently? eg the rural areas or those wards where health inequalities exist. If in doubt ask for advice from the Health and Wellbeing team.</p>		✓
<p><b>Other</b> (please specify)</p>		✓

## 10. Appendices

10.1. List of amended Committee Memberships

## 11. Background Papers

11.1. None.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Appendix to Report as to Appointments to Committees.**

**Overview and Scrutiny.**

6 Cons. 3 LD. 2 Minor Parties

Current Membership.

2020-2021 membership

Chairman – Mr A.Moss.  
Vice Chairman. Mr T Johnson.  
Mrs C Apel.  
Mrs T Bangert.  
Mr A Dignum.  
Mr D Palmer.  
Mr C Page.  
Mr H Potter.  
Mrs S Sharpe.  
Mr K Hughes  
Mr A Sutton.

Chairman - Mr A Moss  
Vice Chairman – To be confirmed at Full Council  
Mrs C Apel  
Mrs T Bangert  
Mr A Dignum  
Mr D Palmer  
Mr C Page  
Mr H Potter  
  
Mrs N Graves  
Mr G Barrett  
Two from minor parties to be debated at meeting

**Corp gov and Audit.**

**Con 4, LD2, Green 1, LA1**

**Membership unchanged but Mr A Dignum to chair and Dr K O’Kelly to Vice chair.**

Reason : The council is going to be severely financially challenged. Mr Dignum’s financial experience will be invaluable in chairing this group.

**PLANNING**

NO change

**LICENSING**

NO Change

**STANDARDS.**

**Cons 4, LD2, Lab1**

**One change. Replace Mrs Sharpe with Mrs Graves.**

**Note: Table 3 is unchanged.**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Chichester District Council**

**ANNUAL COUNCIL**

**May 2020**

**Appointment to External Bodies**

**1. Contact**

**Report Author**

Nicholas Bennett – Divisional Manager for Democratic Services  
 Telephone: 01243 534657 E-mail: nbennett@chichester.gov.uk

**2. Recommendation**

2.1. **That the Council appoints to external bodies as set out in the attached appendix.**

**3. Background**

3.1 The Council is asked by various bodies to appoint representatives to attend their relevant committees on behalf of this authority.

**4. Alternatives Considered**

4.1. No alternatives were considered.

**5. Resource and Legal Implications**

5.1. None. A position as an appointed representative of the Council is dealt with differently to a normal position with another body as the appointees are present on behalf of council and not personal interests.

**6. Consultation**

6.1. None

**7. Community Impact and Corporate Risks**

7.1. By working with the bodies in question the Council is aware of their activity and can work to improve the community impact of them and the Council in a mutually beneficial way.

**8. Other Implications**

<b>Are there any implications for the following?</b>		
If you tick "Yes", list your impact assessment as a background paper in paragraph 13 and explain any major risks in paragraph 9		
	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b> The Council has a duty "to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions		✓

on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area". Do the proposals in the report have any implications for increasing or reducing crime and disorder?		
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b> Are there any implications for the mitigation of/adaptation to climate change or biodiversity issues? If in doubt, seek advice from the Environmental Strategy Unit (ESU).		✓
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b> You should complete an Equality Impact Assessment when developing new services, policies or projects or significantly changing existing ones. For more information, see Equalities FAQs and guidance on the intranet or contact Corporate Policy.		✓
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b> The Council has a duty to cooperate with others to safeguard children and adults at risk. Do these proposals have any implication for either increasing or reducing the levels of risk to children or adults at risk? The Council has committed to dealing with issues at the earliest opportunity, do these proposals have any implication in reducing or increasing demand on Council services?		✓
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b> Does the subject of the report have significant implications for processing data likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of individuals? Processing that is likely to result in a high risk includes (but is not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• systematic and extensive processing activities and where decisions that have legal effects – or similarly significant effects – on individuals.</li> <li>• large scale processing of special categories of data or personal data relation to criminal convictions or offences.</li> <li>• Any larger scale processing of personal data that affects a large number of individuals; and involves a high risk to rights and freedoms eg based on the sensitivity of the processing activity.</li> <li>• large scale, systematic monitoring of public areas (including by CCTV).</li> </ul> Note - If a high risk is identified a Privacy Impact Assessment must be provided to the Data Protection Officer.		✓
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b> The Council has made a commitment to ‘help our communities be healthy and active’. You should consider both the positive and negative impacts of your proposal on the health and wellbeing of communities and individuals living and working in the district. Is your proposal likely to impact positively or negatively on certain groups and their ability to make healthy choices, for example low income families, carers, older people/children and young people. Are there implications that impact on areas of the district differently? eg the rural areas or those wards where health inequalities exist. If in doubt ask for advice from the Health and Wellbeing team.		✓
<b>Other</b> (please specify)		✓

## 9. Appendices

### 9.1. List of Appointments

10. **Background Papers**

10.1. None.

This page is intentionally left blank

## CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

### APPOINTMENTS TO EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS

(Number of representatives shown in brackets)

**2020-2021**

ORGANISATION	CURRENT REPRESENTATIVES 2019-2020	PROPOSED REPRESENTATIVES 2020-2021
1. Action in Rural Sussex (1)	Kate O'Kelly (LD)	Kate O'Kelly (LD)
2. Brandy Hole and East Broyle Copse – Local Nature Reserve Management Board (1)	Clare Apel (LD)	Clare Apel (LD)
3. Chichester Business Improvement District Board (1 + alternative director)	Martyn Bell (C) <i>Alternative Director</i> – Clare Apel (LD)	Martyn Bell (C) <i>Alternative Director</i> – Clare Apel (LD)
4. Chichester Community Development Trust (1)	Richard Plowman (LD)	Richard Plowman (LD)
5. Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee (2)	Susan Taylor (C) Richard Plowman (LD)	Susan Taylor (C) Richard Plowman (LD)
6. Chichester Festival Theatre (1)	Judy Fowler (LD)	Judy Fowler (LD)
7. Chichester Ship Canal Restoration Project Board (1)	No appointment made 2019	No appointment made 2019
8. Chichester Vision Delivery Steering Group (1)	Martyn Bell (C)	Martyn Bell (C)
9. Coastal West Sussex Partnership (1+ substitute)	Adrian Moss (LD) <i>Substitute</i> – Eileen Lintill (C)	Adrian Moss (LD) <i>Substitute</i> – Eileen Lintill (C)
10. Coast to Capital Joint Committee (1+ substitute)	Adrian Moss (LD) <i>Substitute</i> – Eileen Lintill (C)	Adrian Moss (LD) <i>Substitute</i> – Eileen Lintill (C)
11. Community Safety Partnership (1)	Roy Briscoe (C)	Roy Briscoe (C)
12. District Councils' Network (1)	Eileen Lintill (C)	Eileen Lintill (C)
13. Goodwood Aerodrome Consultative Committee (1)	John-Henry Bowden (LD)	John-Henry Bowden (LD)
14. Goodwood Motor Circuit Consultative Committee (1)	Richard Plowman (LD)	Richard Plowman (LD)
15. iESE Transformation Limited (1)	Peter Wilding (C)	Peter Wilding (C)
16. Local Government Association – Coastal Issues Special Interest Group (1)	Penny Plant (C)	Penny Plant (C)
17. Local Government Association – General Assembly (1)	Eileen Lintill (C)	Eileen Lintill (C)
18. Local Government Association – Sparsity Partnership for Delivering Rural Services (1)	Kate O'Kelly (LD)	Kate O'Kelly (LD)
19. Manhood Peninsula Partnership (1)	Graeme Barrett (C)	Graeme Barrett (C)
20. Midhurst Community Partnership (1)	Judy Fowler (LD)	Judy Fowler (LD)
21. Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH)	(a)Susan Taylor, Diane Shepherd, Chief	(a)Susan Taylor, Diane Shepherd,

(a) PUSH Joint Committee (2) (b) Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership Project Board (1) (c) Planning & Infrastructure Panel (2)	Executive (b)Mike Allgrove, Planning Policy, Conservation & Design Service Manager (c)Susan Taylor (C) Mike Allgrove, Planning Policy, Conservation & Design Service Manager	Chief Executive (b)Toby Ayling, Planning Policy, Conservation & Design Service Manager (c)Susan Taylor (C) Toby Ayling, Planning Policy, Conservation & Design Service Manager
22. Petworth Vision Ltd (1)	Alan Sutton (C)	Alan Sutton (C)
23. Portsmouth Water Customer Forum (1)	Simon Oakley (C)	Simon Oakley (C)
24. Rolls Royce Liaison (1)	Francis Hobbs (C)	Francis Hobbs (C)
25. Rural Mobile Youth Trust (1)	No appointment at this time	No appointment at this time
26. South East Employers (1 + substitute)	Norma Graves (C)	Norma Graves (C)
27. South East England Councils (1)	Eileen Lintill (C)	Eileen Lintill (C)
28. Standing Conference on Problems Associated with the Coastline (SCOPAC) (1 + deputy)	Graeme Barrett (C) <i>Deputy – Penny Plant (C)</i>	Graeme Barrett (C) <i>Deputy – Penny Plant (C)</i>
29. Sussex Downs and Coastal Plain LEADER Local Action Group (1)	Jonathan Brown (IND)	Jonathan Brown (LD)
30. Sussex Police and Crime Panel (1 + deputy)	Roy Briscoe (C) <i>Deputy – Clare Apel (LD)</i>	Roy Briscoe (C) <i>Deputy – Clare Apel (LD)</i>
31. The Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London Adjudication Joint Committee (1 + deputy)	Eileen Lintill (C)	Eileen Lintill (C)
32. Tourism South East (1)	Mrs J Hotchkiss, Director of Growth and Place Services	Mrs J Hotchkiss, Director of Growth and Place Services
33. Visit Chichester Ltd (1)	Francis Hobbs (C)	Francis Hobbs (C)
34. Western Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust Council of Governors (1)	Donna Johnson (LA)	Donna Johnson (LA)
35. West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board (1)	Susan Taylor (C)	Susan Taylor (C)
36. West Sussex Civilian Military Partnership Board (1)	Tracie Bangert (LD)	Tracie Bangert (LD)
37. West Sussex Forum for Accessible Transport (1)	Clare Apel (LD)	Clare Apel (LD)
38. West Sussex Health and Adult Social Care Committee (1)	Tracie Bangert (LD)	Tracie Bangert (LD)
39. West Sussex Joint Leaders Group (1)	Eileen Lintill (C)	Eileen Lintill (C)
40. West Sussex Rural Partnership (1)	Eileen Lintill (C)	Eileen Lintill (C)
41. Wey and Arun Canal Trust Completion Strategy Steering Group (1)	Gareth Evans (C)	Gareth Evans (C)

### Longer Term Appointments

<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<b>APPOINTMENTS 2016-2017</b>	<b>NOTE</b>
42. Bourne Community College Governing Body (1)	(4 year appointment until 2021) Diane Shepherd – Chief Executive	Ongoing
43. Bourne Trust Board (1)	(4 year appointment until 2021) Diane Shepherd – Chief Executive	Ongoing
44. Chichester College Group Corporation Board of Governors (1)	(4 year appointment until 2021) Jane Dodsworth – Director of Residents' Services	Cllr Susan Taylor will proceed as Council representative.
45. Chichester Harbour Conservancy (2 + 2 deputies)	(3 year appointment until 2022) Adrian Moss (LD) Graeme Barrett (C) <i>Reserve:</i> <i>Penny Plant (C)</i>	ONGOING
46. Pallant House Gallery – Trust and Company (1)	(Up to 4 year appointment expiring on any 30 September) Clare Apel (LD)	Note that Cllr Apels position was reconfirmed during the year to match PHG membership cycle.
47. South Downs National Park Authority (1)	(appointment is for councillor's term of office, ie until May 2022) Henry Potter (C)	ONGOING
48. West Sussex Pensions Forum	John Ward, Director of Corporate Services	ONGOING

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Recovery Plan Motion submitted by Cllr Adrian Moss for the Council Meeting Tuesday 19 May 2020**

"This Council believes that in these unprecedented times the District needs an overarching coronavirus recovery plan for the local economy.

A Recovery Framework Document is being developed by officers for consideration by Overview and Scrutiny Committee in June

Council resolves to invite Overview and Scrutiny to consider the following:

Once the worst of the short-term health impacts are over the Council needs a plan to drive and promote economic recovery in changed circumstances. The success of this strategy will be crucial to the wellbeing of our residents and all our communities now and in the years and decades to come.

The first and key element of this strategic recovery plan will be to set up an all party task force."

- The task force will work on the strategy for the short / medium and long term recovery plan.
- The Task Force's Terms of Reference will require it to focus not only on economic recovery but critically in view of the climate emergency on the long-term environmental impact of its plans as well.
- Chichester District Council to consider leading the task force and will invite membership including outside experts representing the best thinking and insight of the business community, retailers, hospitality, horticulture, tourism, culture, the education sector and the City, Town and Parish Councils.

This page is intentionally left blank

### Notice of the Making of an Urgent Decision

Para 1 of the second sub-section of section 3 in Part 3 of Chichester District Council's *Constitution* provides for any senior officer to make urgent decisions following consultation with the Leader or Deputy Leader of the Council and the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on any matters where it is not practicable to refer these to a meeting of the Council, the Cabinet or other committee provided that a full report on any decisions taken shall subsequently be made.

A decision of this nature has been made as set out below:

Decision title	Amendment to Treasury Management Policy
Decision taker	John Ward
Decision consultees	Eileen Lintill – Leader Adrian Moss - Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Peter Wilding – Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate Services and Revenues and Benefits
Decision date	Thursday 26 March 2020
Decision details	Following the announcement of a government scheme to support small businesses the council was informed of the value of funding it would receive to help those businesses. In order to best facilitate the fund and in the absence of a Council meeting the increase of the Money Market Funds was approved from the current limits of £6 million per fund and £60 million in total, to £10 million per fund, and £60 million in total.
Reason for urgency	Coronavirus pandemic.
Name and date of the meeting to receive a full report	To be noted at the next Council meeting.

John Ward  
Director of Corporate Services  
26 March 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

### Notice of the Making of an Urgent Decision

Para 1 of the second sub-section of section 3 in Part 3 of Chichester District Council's *Constitution* provides for any senior officer to make urgent decisions following consultation with the Leader or Deputy Leader of the Council and the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on any matters where it is not practicable to refer these to a meeting of the Council, the Cabinet or other committee provided that a full report on any decisions taken shall subsequently be made. A decision of this nature has been made as set out below:

Decision title	Financial support for the Council's leisure contractor, Sport & Leisure Management Limited
Decision taker	Jane Hotchkiss
Decision consultees	Eileen Lintill – Leader Adrian Moss - Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Decision date	Friday 27 March 2020
Decision details	<p>That in the absence of a Cabinet meeting the following be approved:</p> <p>1) The leisure contract management fee and capital fees for March, April and May be cancelled. The capital fees are to be repaid to the council over the remaining years of the contract. The costs of 3.66fte staff and building costs for April and May to be covered. The retained staff are required to complete necessary building checks/maintenance, and provide continued access to Westgate Leisure Centre for keyworker childcare provision. The building costs have been reduced significantly to cover essential contracts and services only. In addition, CDC normally refund Everyone Active on a monthly basis for car parking payments made to their customers who use the parking whilst at the centre. Due to the centre being closed and car parking currently be free, no refunds are being given which results in an approximate saving to the leisure budget of £45k during March, April and May.</p> <p>The overall impact to the leisure budget is loss of income and costs totaling £184,000.</p>
Reason for urgency	Coronavirus pandemic.
Name and date of the meeting to receive a full report	To be noted at the next Council meeting.

Jane Hotchkiss  
Director of Growth and Place  
17 April 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

### Notice of the Making of an Urgent Decision

Para 1 of the second sub-section of section 3 in Part 3 of Chichester District Council's *Constitution* provides for any senior officer to make urgent decisions following consultation with the Leader or Deputy Leader of the Council and the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on any matters where it is not practicable to refer these to a meeting of the Council, the Cabinet or other committee provided that a full report on any decisions taken shall subsequently be made. A decision of this nature has been made as set out below:

Decision title	Suspension of Parking Charges and delay of amendment to Parking Order, including inflationary car parking charge increase in District Council-owned car parks
Decision taker	Jane Hotchkiss
Decision consultees	Eileen Lintill – Leader Adrian Moss - Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Decision date	Tuesday 24 March 2020, Thursday 17 March 2020, Tuesday 5 May 2020
Decision details	<p>That in the absence of a Cabinet meeting the following be approved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That parking charges are suspended across all of Chichester District Council's car parks from 24<sup>th</sup> March 2020 until 8 June 2020 – this position to be kept under review.</li> <li>2. That the previously approved decision to increase charges across car parks by the inflationary increase from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020 be delayed.</li> </ol> <p>These decisions will assist the continuation of essential services in the district as a result of the coronavirus pandemic. The decision to suspend parking charges is in line with the approach taken by other district and borough councils in the county.</p>
Reason for urgency	Coronavirus pandemic.
Name and date of the meeting to receive a full report	To be noted at the next Cabinet and Council meetings.

Jane Hotchkiss  
Director of Growth and Place  
06 May 2020

This page is intentionally left blank