

# Public Document Pack

**JOHN WARD**  
Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Lisa Higenbottam on 01243 534684  
Email: lhigenbottam@chichester.gov.uk

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



A meeting of the **Cabinet** will be held in the Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on **Tuesday 1 June 2021 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mrs S Taylor (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Briscoe, Mrs E Lintill (Chairman), Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Plant, Mr A Sutton and Mr P Wilding

## AGENDA

- 1 **Chair's Announcements**  
The Chair will make any specific announcements for this meeting and advise of any late items which due to special circumstances will be given urgent consideration under Late Items.
- 2 **Approval of Minutes** (Pages 1 - 4)  
The Cabinet is requested to approve as a correct record the minutes of its meeting on Tuesday 4 May 2021.
- 3 **Declarations of Interests**  
Members are requested to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests they might have in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.
- 4 **Public Question Time**  
In accordance with Chichester District Council's scheme for public question time the Cabinet will receive any questions which have been submitted by members of the public in writing by noon two working days before the meeting. Each questioner will be given up to three minutes to ask their question. The total time allocated for public question time is 15 minutes subject to the Chair's discretion to extend that period.

## RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

- 5 **Making the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Development Plan** (Pages 5 - 7)  
The Cabinet is requested to consider the report and make the following recommendation to Council:

That Council makes the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

- 6 **Making the Selsey Neighbourhood Development Plan** (Pages 9 - 11)  
The Cabinet is requested to consider the report and make the following recommendation to Council:

That Council makes the Selsey Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

#### **KEY DECISIONS**

- 7 **Repurpose of ARP Budget to Fund Major CRM Upgrade** (Pages 13 - 19)  
The Cabinet is requested to consider the report and its appendix and make the following resolutions:

1. That Cabinet approve the replacement of the existing Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system.
2. That in order to fund the new CRM system £50,000 of existing ARP funding is repurposed.

#### **OTHER DECISIONS**

- 8 **Neighbourhood Plans Update and Resourcing** (Pages 21 - 28)  
The Cabinet is requested to consider the report and make the following resolutions:

1. That Cabinet Notes the current situation regarding neighbourhood planning work in the Chichester local plan area.
2. That Cabinet approves an additional Senior Planning Officer post in the Planning Policy Division at a cost of £54,000 per annum funded from reserves in the current year and subsequently from base budget to support neighbourhood planning work.
3. That Cabinet endorses the use of the specialist SDNPA officers for short term support on neighbourhood planning work when required subject to budget.
4. That Cabinet endorses the priority criteria set out in paragraph 7.4 to respond to neighbourhood planning work.

9 **Late Items**

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

10 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The Cabinet is asked to consider in respect of agenda item 11 whether the public including the press should be excluded from the meeting on the following ground of exemption in Schedule 12A to the *Local Government Act 1972* namely Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

[**Note** The report and its appendices within this part of the agenda are attached for

members of the Council and relevant only (printed on salmon paper)]

- 11 **CCS Refuse Collection Vehicle Procurement Strategy** (Pages 29 - 43)  
The Cabinet is requested to consider the report and its appendices and to make the recommendations to Council as set out in section 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of the report.

### NOTES

- (1) The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any item of business wherever it is likely that there would be disclosure of 'exempt information' as defined in section 100A of and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.
- (2) The press and public may view the report appendices which are not included with their copy of the agenda on the Council's website at [Chichester District Council - Minutes, agendas and reports](#) unless they contain exempt information.
- (3) Subject to the provisions allowing the exclusion of the press and public, the photographing, filming or recording of this meeting from the public seating area is permitted. To assist with the management of the meeting, anyone wishing to do this is asked to inform Democratic Services of their intentions before the meeting starts. The use of mobile devices for access to social media is permitted, but these should be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting. Those undertaking such activities must do so discreetly and not disrupt the meeting, for example by oral commentary, excessive noise, distracting movement or flash photography. Filming of children, vulnerable adults or members of the audience who object should be avoided. [Standing Order 11.3 of Chichester District Council's Constitution]
- (4) Subject to Covid-19 Risk Assessments members of the public are advised of the following:
  - a. Where public meetings are being held at East Pallant House in order to best manage the space available members of the public are in the first instance asked to listen to the meeting online via the council's committee pages.
  - b. Where a member of the public has registered a question or statement they will be invited to submit the question or statement in advance to be read out by Democratic Services. They may attend the meeting but will be asked to sit in an allocated seat in the public gallery.
  - c. It is recommended that all those attending take a lateral flow test prior to the meeting.
  - d. All those attending the meeting will be required to wear face coverings and maintain social distancing when in the building/meeting room.
  - e. Members of the public must not attend any face to face meeting if they or a member of their household have Covid-19 symptoms and/or are required to self-isolate
- (5) A key decision means an executive decision which is likely to:
  - result in Chichester District Council (CDC) incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the CDC's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates or

- be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards in the CDC's area or
- incur expenditure, generate income, or produce savings greater than £100,000

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

Standing Order 22.3 of Chichester District Council's Constitution provides that members of the Council may, with the Chair's consent, speak at a committee meeting of which they are not a member, or temporarily sit and speak at the committee table on a particular item but shall then return to the public seating area. As part of the Covid-19 Risk Assessment members are asked to register in advance by the deadline indicated below. Where additional seating is not available questions registered in time will be read by Democratic Services.

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



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Virtual on Tuesday 4 May 2021 at 9.30 am

**Members Present** Mrs E Lintill (Chairman), Mrs S Taylor (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Briscoe, Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Plant, Mr A Sutton and Mr P Wilding

**Members Absent**

**In attendance by invitation**

**Officers Present** Mr S Ballard (Senior Environmental Protection Officer), Mrs V Dobson (Principal Planning Officer), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services Manager), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services) and Western (Housing Delivery Manager)

## 1 **Chair's Announcements**

There were no apologies for absence.

## 2 **Approval of Minutes**

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 6 April 2021 be approved as a correct record.

## 3 **Declarations of Interests**

Cllr Briscoe declared a prejudicial interest in relation to agenda item 7 as a member of the Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan Working Group. He had sought advice from the Monitoring Officer and turned his microphone and video off for the duration of the item and did not participate in the vote.

## 4 **Public Question Time**

There were no public questions.

## 5 **Draft revised Air Quality Action Plan**

Cllr Plant introduced the item.

Mr Ballard noted a minor amendment to section 8.2, page 3 of the agenda report pack to include Midhurst Town Council and Midhurst Vision Steering Group in the consultation.

In response to members' comments and questions Mr Ballard explained that the air quality data is subject to quality assurance processes which are carried out at the year end. As such there is always a lag in reporting the last year's air quality data. He noted that the 2020 data although interesting will provide less useful information about true trends in air quality due to the unprecedented year of the pandemic and the related reduction in traffic volumes and related emissions. He confirmed that the Statutory Annual report which updates the data is due in June and is scheduled to be discussed at Environment Panel in due course.

Mr Ballard explained that modelling predicts a continued gentle positive trend towards greater compliance with the UK air quality standards. He outlined the focus from nitrogen dioxide to particulate matter and explained that 38% of PM2.5 derives from domestic wood and coal burning. With regard to electric vehicle charging the council has installed 18 electric vehicle charging points with an informal policy to monitor the demand before investing further. Mr Ballard explained that as the Government has not classified Chichester as one of the designated clean air zones it would be unlikely that the council could attract associated funding for diesel scrappage schemes.

Mr Ballard confirmed that he would be working with the PR team on a multimedia approach to the consultation. Discussions are also planned with West Sussex County Council to provide input on the revised West Sussex Local Traffic Plan.

Cllr Lintill noted that the report had already been considered by the Environment Panel with no recommendations made to Cabinet.

In a vote the following resolution was made:

### **RESOLVED**

That the revised Air Quality Action Plan be approved for public consultation.

## 6 **Review of the Allocation Scheme for Social and Affordable Housing**

Cllr Sutton introduced the item.

In response to members comments and questions Mr Western clarified that the Scheme proposed to increase the savings threshold to allow for a more generous approach as the threshold has not been increased for a number of years. He confirmed that once the new Scheme has been adopted an easy read version of the Scheme could be created.

Cllr Lintill noted that the report had been considered by a Task and Finish Group and Overview and Scrutiny Committee with no recommendations made to Cabinet.

In a vote the following resolutions were made:

**RESOLVED**

1. That the Allocation Scheme for Social and Affordable Housing as set out in Appendix 2 be approved.
2. That the Cabinet authorises the Director for Housing and Communities, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, to make minor changes to the scheme in response to statutory requirements or as otherwise required to maintain operational effectiveness.
3. That officers undertake a further review of the Rural Parish Connection and bring forward proposals for further changes if considered necessary.

**7 Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement**

Cllr Briscoe who had declared a prejudicial interest in relation to this agenda item as a member of the Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan Working Group turned his microphone and video off for the duration of the item and did not participate in the vote.

Cllr Taylor introduced the item.

In a vote the following resolutions were made:

**RESOLVED**

1. That the Decision Statement as set out in the appendix be published.
2. To approve the examiner's recommendation that the Neighbourhood Development Plan proceed to referendum, subject to modifications as set out in the Decision Statement.

**8 Urgent Decision Notice**

Cllr Lintill introduced the item.

On behalf of the Cabinet Cllr Lintill made the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**

That the Urgent Decision Notice relating to the Welcome Back Fund be noted.

**9 Late Items**

There were no late items.

10 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

Cllr Lintill proposed and read the part II resolution in relation to agenda item 11 which was seconded by Cllr Taylor.

The Cabinet then voted to go into part II.

**RESOLVED**

That with regard to agenda item 11 the public including the press should be excluded from the meeting on the grounds of exemption in Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 namely Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Members took a short break.

11 **Recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Cllr Lintill introduced the item and invited Cllr Moss to speak.

Cllr Moss reflected on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting as a long and positive meeting which enabled conversation to continue in relation to Southern Gateway.

Cllr Dignum as Portfolio holder confirmed that he had no difficulty in accepting the recommendations made. Cllr Lintill agreed.

In a show of hands the following resolution was made:

**RESOLVED**

That the recommendations made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee relating to Southern Gateway as detailed at page 131 in the private agenda pack be agreed.

The meeting ended at 10.21 am

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date:

**Chichester District Council**

**Cabinet**

**1 June 2021**

**Making the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**1. Contacts**

**Report Author:**

Valerie Dobson

Tel: 01243 534594

Principal Planning Policy Officer

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

**Cabinet Member:**

Susan Taylor,

Tel: 01243 514034

Cabinet Member for Planning Services

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

**2. Recommendations**

**2.1. That Cabinet recommends to the Council to:**

**Make the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).**

**3. Background**

- 3.1. At its meeting on 7 July 2020 Cabinet approved the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's recommendations that the Plan should proceed to referendum subject to modifications and approved the Decision Statement. Following government guidance all referendums were delayed as a result of the on-going pandemic until 6 May 2021. A referendum on the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan was therefore held on 6 May 2021. The referendum was held in accordance with the requirements of the *Localism Act 2011* and the *Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012*. There were 305 votes in favour of the neighbourhood plan which represents 89% of those who voted and a turnout of 42.2%. As more than 50% of those who voted in the parish were in favour of the plan being used to help decide planning applications in the plan area, then the neighbourhood plan can be 'made'.
- 3.2. Accordingly, on the basis of the favourable referendum result, it is recommended that the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan is made part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park). A copy of the Neighbourhood Plan is available on the Council's website.
- 3.3. Chichester District Council will publish a formal decision statement as required under the *Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012*.

#### 4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1. A community based statutory plan that can be used to identify local features of importance and to guide future development in the plan area.

#### 5. Proposal

- 5.1. That the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Development Plan be made so that it forms part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

#### 6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1. Paragraph 38A (4) (a) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* requires that Chichester District Council must make the neighbourhood plan if more than half of those voting have voted in favour of the plan being used to help decide planning applications in the plan area. Chichester District Council is not subject to this duty if (and only if) the making of the plan would breach or would otherwise be incompatible with any EU obligation or any of the Convention rights (within the meaning of the *Human Rights Act 1998*).

#### 7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1. The referendum incurred appropriate costs in line with the Council's duties and procedures. These costs will be met through existing budgets and grant money can be reclaimed from the Government to cover this part of the process.

#### 8. Consultation

- 8.1. Boxgrove Parish Council, the local community and local members have been involved throughout the process of preparation of the neighbourhood plan.

#### 9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1. There has been strong community involvement throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. There are no additional corporate risks to making the plan.

#### 10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>		x
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b> The plan recognises the value of supporting renewable and low carbon sources. It also seeks to incorporate biodiversity within and around development in general	x	
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b>		x
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>		x
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		x
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b> The plan supports independent living along with overall provision of	x	

general healthcare facilities. In addition, it looks to protect open space and local green space.		
<b>Other</b>		x

## 11. Appendices

11.1 None.

## 12. Background Papers

12.1. None.

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

Cabinet

1 June 2021

**Making the Selsey Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**1. Contacts**

**Report Author:**

Hannah Chivers  
Tel: 01243521272

Principal Planning Policy Officer  
E-mail: [hchivers@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:hchivers@chichester.gov.uk)

**Cabinet Member:**

Susan Taylor,  
Tel: 01243 514034

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

**2. Recommendations**

**2.1. That Cabinet recommends to the Council to:**

**Make the Selsey Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).**

**3. Background**

- 3.1. At its meeting on 7 July 2020 Cabinet approved the Selsey Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's recommendations that the Plan should proceed to referendum subject to modifications and approved the Decision Statement. Following government guidance referendums were delayed as a result of the on-going pandemic until 6 May 2021. A referendum on the Selsey Neighbourhood Plan was therefore held on 6 May 2021. The referendum was held in accordance with the requirements of the *Localism Act 2011* and the *Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012*. There were 2,206 votes in favour of the neighbourhood plan which represents 79% of those who voted and a turnout of 32.9%. As more than 50% of those who voted in the parish were in favour of the plan being used to help decide planning applications in the plan area, then the neighbourhood plan can be 'made'.
- 3.2. Accordingly, on the basis of the favourable referendum result, it is recommended that the Selsey Neighbourhood Plan is made part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park). A copy of the Neighbourhood Plan is available on the Council's website.
- 3.3. Chichester District Council will publish a formal decision statement as required under the *Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012*.

#### 4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1. A community based statutory plan that can be used to identify local features of importance and to guide future development in the plan area.

#### 5. Proposal

- 5.1. That the Selsey Neighbourhood Development Plan be made so that it forms part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

#### 6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1. Paragraph 38A (4) (a) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* requires that Chichester District Council must make the neighbourhood plan if more than half of those voting have voted in favour of the plan being used to help decide planning applications in the plan area. Chichester District Council is not subject to this duty if (and only if) the making of the plan would breach or would otherwise be incompatible with any EU obligation or any of the Convention rights (within the meaning of the *Human Rights Act 1998*).

#### 7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1. The referendum incurred appropriate costs in line with the Council's duties and procedures. These costs will be met through existing budgets and grant money can be reclaimed from the Government to cover this part of the process.

#### 8. Consultation

- 8.1. Selsey Town Council, the local community and local members have been involved throughout the process of preparation of the neighbourhood plan.

#### 9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1. There has been strong community involvement throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. There are no additional corporate risks to making the plan.

#### 10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>		x
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b>		x
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b>		x
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>		x
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		x
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>		x
<b>Other</b>		x

## **11. Appendices**

11.1 None.

## **12. Background Papers**

12.1. None.

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

CABINET

1 June 2021

**Repurpose of ARP Budget to Fund Major CRM Upgrade**

**1. Contacts**

**Report Author:**

Andrew Forward, ICT Manager

Tel: 01243 534770 E-mail: [afoward@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:afoward@chichester.gov.uk)

**Cabinet Member:**

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

Tel: 01428 707324 E-mail: [pwilding@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:pwilding@chichester.gov.uk)

**2. Recommendation**

- 2.1. **Cabinet approve the replacement of the existing Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system**
- 2.2. **In order to fund the new CRM system £50,000 of existing ARP funding is repurposed.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1. CRM is a technology used to support the way customers and residents access council services. Designed to compile information on and about customers and their requirements across different points of contact, i.e. website, telephone, mail and social media. It helps us build relationships and streamline processes so we can improve customer services, efficiencies and satisfaction levels.
- 3.2. Our corporate CRM system is 7 years old. It now represents aging technology, is becoming increasingly expensive to maintain, with limited scope for improvement and development.
- 3.3. Substantial investment in our current system is required (£30k upgrade) now, and within the next 18 months (£25k to replace eforms package), simply to maintain current levels of capability.
- 3.4. An appraisal has been undertaken to examine the business case options given the above. Findings have been presented to the Organisational Recovery Group and Senior Leadership Team. Initial Project Proposal Document (IPPD) is available under appendix 1.
- 3.5. Preferred solution is to move to the latest version of our current system. This can be achieved within existing revenue budget parameters, but will require repurposing of existing CRM allocated capital budgets to fund one off implementation costs.
- 3.6. Permission is therefore sort for cabinet agreement to repurpose existing capital programme funding to cover new implementation costs.

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

- 4.1. To move to the latest version of our current CRM system, shifting from the present on-premises configuration to their latest cloud based platform.
- 4.2. Reduction and transference of operational risks through improving maintenance and security update cycles, as well as having better ongoing revenue cost visibility. Currently we are responsible for undertaking periodic and costly system upgrades. Under a new cloud agreement these will be performed by the system provider as part of our new annual licence agreement.
- 4.3. One off implementation costs will result in a subsequent reduction in future ARP Capital funding requirements. The current ARP provision of £25,000 every 5 years will be removed post implementation. As well as removing the need for significant, currently unbudgeted, additional medium term investment.
- 4.4. Delivery of the most up to date CRM platform available, ensuring we are able to continue to support our Corporate Priorities and improve business continuity.

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

- 5.1. Full cost benefit analysis and business case appraisal undertaken to examine options
  - (a) Upgrade our current version of LAGAN and continue to use
  - (b) Move to a new version of LAGAN called Verint EM (engagement management) – preferred option
  - (c) Scope an alternative CRM system and provider.

Details are contained within the IPPD document referenced under appendix 1.

#### **6. Resource and legal implications**

- 6.1. Following full consultation with Customer Services, The Digital Working Group and ICT we are confident that resourcing will be fully covered in house. Professional (consultancy) services are required to undertake the technical implementation, and it is for this purpose that we are seeking permission to utilise existing capital allocations.
- 6.2. There are no specific legal implications associated with this proposal. Direction has been sort from both legal and procurement services as to the proposed use of the Central Buying Consortium (Kent County Council) National Framework Agreement. They have confirmed that we are able to procure using Framework Y20011 - delivery of Software Products and Services, as this is in accordance with best procurement practice, EU and UK procurement Directives and Regulations. Further, that in meeting objective conditions (under the Framework Agreement) we are able to make use of their Direct Award provision.

#### **7. Consultation**

- 7.1. Consultation with all internal stakeholders has been ongoing throughout the development of this proposal.

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

- 8.1. Whilst fundamental good use is being made of our current CRM system, it is aging technology and has limited functionality.
- 8.2. Continuing with the existing system will require additional investment but will not improve system flexibility. This will compromise the council's ongoing ambition for 'customer first' and digital delivery.

**9. Other Implications**

	Yes	No
<b>Crime &amp; Disorder</b>		✓
<b>Climate Change</b>		✓
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b>		✓
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>		✓
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		✓
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>		✓
<b>Other (Please specify):</b>		✓

**10. Appendices**

- 10.1. Appendix 1 – Initial Project Proposal Document (IPPD) – Customer Relationship Management (CRM) System Improvements

**11. Background Papers**

- 11.1. None.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix 1:

### **Project Documentation - Initial Project Proposal Document Project: Customer Relationship Management (CRM) System Improvements**

**Author: Andrew Forward. ICT Service  
Version: 1.0**

#### **1. Purpose of Document**

The purpose of this document is to justify the undertaking of the project based on the estimated cost of delivery and the anticipated benefits to be gained. The proposal outlined in this document will be used as part of the process for prioritising future projects.

#### **2. Project Description**

The proposed project will see us move to the latest version of our current CRM system. It will require shifting from our present on-premises configuration to their latest cloud based platform. This will deliver to the council the most up to date CRM platform available and ensure that we are able to continue to support our Corporate Priorities. In addition, it will provide clearer direct sight of associated revenue costs, reduce future ARP funding requirements, and remove the need for significant additional medium term investment.

##### **In scope:**

- a. Move from present on-premises LAGAN CRM system to latest cloud based Veriant platform.
- b. Integration of CRM portal into Council web site.

##### **Out of scope:**

- a. Consolidation of current eforms (web site) with CRM Veriant workflows.

#### **3. Background**

- Present CRM system represents aging technology.
- It is becoming increasingly expensive to maintain, with limited scope for improvement and development.
- Substantial investment in our current system is required now, and within the next 18 months, simply to maintain current levels of capability.
- Restricted development of current system will compromise Council's ongoing ambition for 'customer first' and digital delivery.

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

- Cloud based platform includes (as part of annual licence fee) security and patching upgrades. Currently these are *in addition* to our annual fee.
- Cloud based platform improves business continuity.
- System/operator familiarity as new system based on our current CRM programme.
- Resource shift away from system support to focus on operational and customer journey efficiencies

- Increased self-service submission / customer progress update
- Improved case process automation
- Proactive case updates
- Improved channel shift & data metrics
- Opportunity to link existing e-forms (GOSS) to improve back office processes/automation
- Easier and less costly configuration
- Wider benefits for internal customers e.g. case management
- Worldwide community of users; user development forum

## 5. Timescales

The average implementation time for a new Verint system is 6 months. However, as we are moving from an older version (and not a new install) this will be less. A detailed implementation plan will be developed with Verint once the project is authorised.

Implementation anticipated to commence Q1 21/22.

## 6. Project Costs and Resources

	Costs (£)	Source
One-Off	50,000 (top end estimate for professional service costs for Verint to move system)	Existing capital & ARP budgets
Revenue	47,998	£10,721 – existing CRM licence fee; £14,277 – revenue savings identified by Customer Services; £23,000 – existing IT budget saving (Oracle licence)
Savings	14,277 – to offset increased revenue (licence) cost 23,000 – to offset increased revenue (licence) cost	– revenue savings identified by Customer Services – existing IT budget saving (Oracle licence)
Services to be involved in the project delivery	ICT Service: 1.5 FTE will be allocated to this project. Customer Contact: Service involvement in roll out will be significant. They have been involved in the development of the business case and fully support this project.	

## 7. Benefits vs. Cost

As identified above impact on revenue budget will be nil, but due to the timing of current payments may need to be smoothed over two financial years.

Existing capital and ARP budgets already allocated to CRM projects, together with the budget for LAGAN upgrades are more than sufficient to cover one-off implementation costs. There will be a reduction in the future call on the ARP due to LAGAN upgrades no longer being required. IT resources identified for allocation to this project are already engaged full time supporting LAGAN.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	
<b>Upgrade Current</b>						
licence costs (revenue)	10,721	10,721	10,721	10,721	10,721	
oracle licence (revenue)	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	*2
service cost (revenue)	14,277	14,277	14,277	14,277	14,277	*3
upgrade cost (capital)	30,000	0	25,188	30,000	0	*1
<i>Annual revenue cost</i>	<i>47,998</i>	<i>47,998</i>	<i>73,186</i>	<i>77,998</i>	<i>47,998</i>	

Annual capital cost	30,000	0	25,188	30,000	0
---------------------	--------	---	--------	--------	---

### Upgrade to Cloud

licence costs (revenue)	47,998	47,998	47,998	47,998	47,998
upgrade cost (capital)	50,000	0	0	0	0
Annual revenue cost	47,998	47,998	47,998	47,998	47,998
Annual capital cost	50,000	0	0	0	0

### Comparison Costs – upgrade current vs move to cloud

Revenue: Annual +/-	0	0	0	0	0
Capital: Annual +/-	+20,000	0	-25,188	-30,000	0

**Existing ARP Capital** 67,900 \*5

**\*1** – Year 1 & Year 4 show anticipated upgrade (capital) costs. Year 3 shows current cost of replacing the eforms package.

**\*2** – Oracle licence required for on premise system. This responsibility will be removed with the cloud based version.

**\*3** – Anticipated Service calculated efficiencies.

**\*4** – High end estimation of Verint implementation costs. Detailed scoping will provide a more realistic figure.

**\*5** – Existing capital/ARP budgets 2021/22 for CRM projects and LAGAN upgrades

## 8. Identify Risks

This is a relatively straight forward project from an IT implementation perspective. Therefore the risks are more relevant to *not* perusing the project.

The alternative options to the proposal are:

- a. Maintain the current version of LAGAN
  - i. Will require £30k upgrade in next 6 months
  - ii. Elements of current system will become unsupported over next 18 months, requiring additional investment of £25k minimum
  - iii. Future (in house) development will become limited as platform ages and support is withdrawn.
  
- b. Source a new CRM system
  - i. Will require extensive staff training and skills transfer
  - ii. Implementation plan will be more complex
  - iii. G-Cloud (government framework) comparative costs indicate no procurement savings.

### G-Cloud CRM Pricing Framework:

Dynamic CRM: £62,502 (50 licences @ £104 per user per month)

MS Dynamics: £75,000 (50 licences @ £125 per user per month)

Arcus: £57,000 (50 licences @ £95 per user per month) *Mid Sussex DC CRM*

Verint £47,998 (50 licences @ £80 per user per month)\*

\* discounted due to existing relationship with CDC. G-Cloud pricing £128 per user per month

This page is intentionally left blank

**Chichester District Council**

**Cabinet**

**1 June 2021**

**Neighbourhood Plans Update and Resourcing**

**1. Contacts**

**Report Author**

Toby Ayling - Planning Policy Divisional Manager

Telephone: 01243 521050 E-mail: [tayling@chichestegov.uk](mailto:tayling@chichestegov.uk)

**Cabinet Member:**

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Planning Services

Telephone: 01243 514034 E-mail: [sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk)

**2. Executive Summary**

This report sets out the current situation with regards to neighbourhood planning work, the needs to support neighbourhood planning in a timely manner and the ongoing demands this is making on the planning policy team. It sets out the current factors which are considered relevant for prioritising neighbourhood plan work and seeks Cabinet's agreement with this approach. Finally, it sets out both short and longer term measures to secure additional resource to support neighbourhood planning within the Chichester Plan area.

**3. Recommendations**

**3.1 That Cabinet:**

- (a) Notes the current situation regarding neighbourhood planning work in the Chichester local plan area.**
- (b) Approves an additional Senior Planning Officer post in the Planning Policy Division at a cost of £54,000 per annum funded from reserves in the current year and subsequently from base budget to support neighbourhood planning work.**
- (c) Endorses the use of the specialist SDNPA officers for short term support on neighbourhood planning work when required subject to budget.**
- (d) Endorses the priority criteria set out in paragraph 7.4 to respond to neighbourhood planning work.**

#### 4. Background

- 4.1 The Council's support for Parish Councils seeking to prepare neighbourhood plans, where they wish to do so, is now well established. Currently a total of 23 parishes within, or partly within, the Chichester local plan area are subject to neighbourhood plan area designations. Eleven neighbourhood plans have now been 'made' and form part of the development for that area including Lavant and Petworth jointly with the South Downs National Park Authority.

Parish	Date 'made'
Birdham	July 2016
Bosham	November 2016
Chidham & Hambrook	September 2016
Fishbourne	March 2016
Kirdford	July 2014
Lavant	July 2017 ( <i>SDNPA lead authority</i> )
Loxwood	July 2015
Petworth	July 2018 ( <i>SDNPA lead authority</i> )
Southbourne	December 2015
Tangmere	July 2016
Wisborough Green	July 2016

- 4.2 The neighbourhood plans that are now 'made' relate to the policies and requirements set out in the adopted Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 (CLPKP). A number of these plans are now being reviewed and revised. This report updates members on the position with regard to the outstanding neighbourhood plans going through the system and related to the CLPKP, and also sets out progress being made by parishes on the revisions or new plans that relate to proposals in the Local Plan Review. As well as a general update on the overall position and timing of Neighbourhood Plans, the report addresses the associated resource implications.

#### 5. Neighbourhood plans related to the CLPKP

##### Boxgrove and Selsey Neighbourhood Plans

- 5.1 These two plans were delayed as a consequence of EU environmental case law in 2018, the effects of the decisions of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) necessitating further work to support the plans to ensure compliance with the Habitat Regulations and related assessment (HRA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and relevant consultation in each case.
- 5.2 With the completion of this work and the examinations, the Decision Statements on Boxgrove and Selsey Neighbourhood Plans were agreed by Cabinet and published last summer. Unfortunately, due to the Covid 19 restrictions, the Government

postponed all referendums until 6 May 2021. Following the referendums, these two plans are the subject of reports elsewhere on this Cabinet agenda.

#### Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan

- 5.3 This plan has suffered severe delays as a result of similar HRA and SEA work being required as indicated in paragraph 5.1. The plan was then further delayed on the basis that Natural England's assessment during 2019/20 suggested that the intertidal parts of Chichester Harbour, subject to several European designations, was now classified as 'unfavourable-declining' condition. As a consequence, further HRA was required to assess the potential impact of the plan's proposals on the Harbour and a subsequent Addendum to the SEA was also published, both for public consultation prior to submission as part of the examination.
- 5.4 Following the publication of the Examiner's report the Decision Statement was considered and agreed by Cabinet on the 6 May and this plan will now move to referendum at a date to be agreed.

#### *Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan*

- 5.5 As a result of the Covid 19 restrictions, a second round of CDC public consultation was undertaken on the draft submission Neighbourhood Plan to meet the revised Government requirements. This was completed at the end of October 2020. The examination is well advanced, although advice has been received from Natural England which indicates that there are likely to be additional issues which will need to be addressed. The Examiner and Parish Council have been advised of the position and it is anticipated that subject to further work being undertaken, the examination will proceed in due course.
- 5.6 As with Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan, once the examiner's final report has been received and published, there will be a need for Cabinet to consider the Decision Statement for the neighbourhood plan before it can then potentially move on to referendum.

### **6. Neighbourhood plans related to the Local Plan Review**

- 6.1 Many parishes have chosen to revise their neighbourhood plans in order to address the forthcoming requirements for development in their local communities set out in the Local Plan Review (LPR). There are also a number of parishes that have now chosen to pursue a neighbourhood plan for the first time. As members will be aware the Preferred Approach version of the LPR set out strategic allocations for various parishes and a separate policy, Policy S5, set out draft parish figures for other parishes. This is a not dissimilar approach to that taken in the CLPKP.
- 6.2 However, the level of development anticipated in each parish is not yet finalised. It is recognised by officers that it is difficult for parishes to move forward with their preparations for neighbourhood plans in this fluid situation. This has been compounded by the delays in the LPR process and the current testing of the revised draft development distribution strategy. The parishes were informed of the revised potential figures for their area in December as it is clear they need to be kept informed of these changes as we move forward through the LPR process.

- 6.3 The relevant parishes have again been advised that the housing numbers are not yet final, and indeed may be subject to change through the examination of the LPR, and if they choose to move ahead of the LPR with insufficient evidence there are various risks that present themselves. Officers are continuing to support and advise the parishes to allow them to make decisions on what steps to take in relation to the progress of the neighbourhood plan for their own community. Not all parishes will choose the same path.
- 6.4 One of the risks parishes will face if they move ahead of the LPR process is that the neighbourhood plan has the potential to become rapidly out of date. For example, if a neighbourhood plan is prepared on the basis of a draft housing figure that is eventually superseded, for instance by the recommendations in the Inspector's report on the LPR for a higher figure, then there would be a need for the parish to undertake a swift review of their neighbourhood plan.
- 6.5 There is also a need for further evidence to be provided where a neighbourhood plan is moving ahead of the LPR where that evidence base has yet to be tested by the Inspector of the LPR and put in place to support later neighbourhood plans. This is particularly the case in relation to requirements relating to strategic environmental assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessments (HRA) of the plans. Without the benefit of a tested evidence base including these aspects on the strategy set out in the LPR, including any required mitigation proposals, then parishes are faced with the need to undertake additional work to meet these requirements in order to move through to examination ahead of the LPR. Whilst there is some growing Government recognition that such lengthy and onerous procedures were never envisaged for neighbourhood plans, the various regulations and legal requirements that need to be adhered to have not yet been varied.
- 6.6 Despite these difficult considerations, many parishes are choosing to move forward with their neighbourhood plans in order to guide development in their local communities. This also reflects CDC's current lack of a five year housing land supply which has resulted in many parishes feeling they are under significant development pressure.
- 6.7 Set out below is a brief summary of the progress that has been made to date on the neighbourhood plans related to the Local Plan Review. Discussions continue with all parishes that are preparing neighbourhood plans, at whatever stage they may be, and advice and support is available from the planning policy team as and when they have queries. In the majority of cases parishes employ consultants to work and support them with their plan preparation and Government grants are available to support that work with separate funding available for technical work.

*Revised Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan 2019 to 2037*

- 6.8 Loxwood Parish Council submitted their draft submission plan, along with relevant supporting documentation, to CDC in December. In this instance Natural England has now advised that additional work needs to be required to address an issue regarding water supply.

- 6.9 Officers recognise Loxwood PC is keen to make good progress with their revised neighbourhood plan, particularly in the light of the pressure from planning applications in that area. However, in supporting their work CDC is required to undertake the necessary procedures to make sure the plan is in a robust position before moving on to consultation and examination.

*Hunston Neighbourhood Plan 2019 to 2037*

- 6.10 Hunston Parish Council submitted their draft submission plan, along with relevant supporting documentation, to CDC in December. This is the parish's first neighbourhood plan. As with Loxwood, those documents are now being checked before they are formally accepted by CDC to move forward to the CDC formal public consultation period and then on to examination.

*Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan Review 2019 - 2037*

- 6.11 The draft submission plan was submitted to CDC along with the relevant supporting documentation at the beginning of March. Given the level of development proposed in the plan and the development pressures being faced by the parish from potential speculative applications that may undermine a plan-led master planned approach to development, work on the plan was prioritised and the Neighbourhood Plan is currently out for public consultation under regulation 16.

*Chidham and Hambrook Neighbourhood Plan Review*

- 6.12 Work has been underway in the parish for some considerable time with the parish working with consultants on a review of its neighbourhood plan. Officers are aware of the pressure on the parish in relation to current applications and discussions are continuing between officers and the parish as to how best to advance their plan. As yet the parish has not undertaken its own regulatory parish consultation on the revised plan which would mark a significant step in its progress.

*Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan Review*

- 6.13 Work began on a review of the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan some time ago. This is currently being considered further but as yet the parish has not undertaken its own regulatory parish consultation on the revised plan.

*Other Neighbourhood Plans*

- 6.14 Work is also progressing on a number of other neighbourhood plans in the Chichester plan area. These are all at different stages but are in general well underway in terms of their background work and supporting evidence. These include Birdham, Chichester city, North Mundham, West Wittering and Wisborough Green. Oving Parish has also recently been designated as a neighbourhood plan area and is considering the next steps for its plan.

**7. Conclusion on current situation**

- 7.1 The level of activity concerning Neighbourhood Plans is increasing. We have the last of the "old" neighbourhood plans (associated with the adopted Chichester Local

Plan which have been delayed for a variety of technical reasons) being completed, while the first tranche of “new” neighbourhood plans (either in accordance with or in response to the emerging Local Plan Review) are being progressed.

- 7.2 Naturally, each neighbourhood plan group is keen for its Plan to be progressed as quickly as possible, but the range and level of activity outlined in this report is proving difficult to manage, given it requires detailed knowledge of the regulations and input from a range of specialists, including services from across the Council. So far, priority has been given to ensuring the referenda for the Boxgrove and Selsey neighbourhood plans were undertaken on 6 May, and that progress towards a referendum is made on the Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan. Thereafter some judgement has been applied with regards to priorities to date.
- 7.3 It is apparent the current workload associated with neighbourhood plans within the planning policy team is leading to delays in their progress. Furthermore, the understandable decision by many parishes to proceed with neighbourhood plans in advance of the Local Plan Review is drawing an increasing amount of planning policy team resource away from the production of the local plan. Cumulatively, parishes require an increasing amount of officer time to provide general advice and support to address the regulatory requirements, technical issues and other queries that arise.
- 7.4 At present, officers have prioritised work according to a range of factors, including the date neighbourhood planning work was received, the scale of development sought in the neighbourhood plan area, and the development pressures in that area. It is not considered appropriate for one “formulaic” rule to be established – but Cabinet is asked to confirm that these are relevant factors when prioritising work.

## **8. Outcomes to be Achieved**

- 8.1 Given the above, and notwithstanding the approach to prioritising neighbourhood planning work set out in paragraph 7.4 above, it is suggested that additional resources are now necessary to assist with neighbourhood plan work. There are two actions which are proposed

## **9. Proposal**

- 9.1 The proposal is for a short-term measure to assist with the current volume of work, and a longer-term solution to be secured, as set out below.

### Additional resource from South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)

- 9.2 Chichester District Council already has a Service Level Agreement with the SDNPA which sets out a framework for utilising appropriately skilled and experienced SDNPA officers to undertake work on neighbourhood planning issues. This includes input on many procedures and stages in the process including for example, collating and drafting officer responses to neighbourhood plan consultations. The process is well understood by relevant SDNPA officers and has proved to be effective in assisting with temporary peaks in work. In light of the current workload this arrangement has been resumed and SDNPA officers are

currently assisting with some of the current work. It should be stressed they are treated as part of the CDC team in this regard, with no input to their activities from SDNPA management or Members.

- 9.3 Funding for this resource is currently being met from the dedicated Neighbourhood Planning budget, which is small in scale and primarily aimed at meeting direct costs of neighbourhood plans, such as examiners fees. However, as a short-term solution this is considered appropriate. But there is insufficient budget for this arrangement to continue indefinitely, and in any event, this is not considered to be the best long-term solution. Therefore a further longer term solution is proposed as follows.

#### Additional CDC officer resource

- 9.4 Currently, the planning response to Neighbourhood Plan work, draws heavily upon an experienced principal officer who provides advice across the whole Chichester plan area. It is proposed that an additional post is created within the planning policy team to work on neighbourhood planning matters. This role needs to be sufficiently senior with the appropriate experience to be able to give clear advice to neighbourhood plan groups and other parties.
- 9.5 Such a role will provide the following benefits to planning and development and the Council -
- First, it will aid the Council in providing timely and appropriate advice to neighbourhood planning groups reducing the time they have to wait for responses given the volume of enquiries and work involved.
  - Second, it will build resilience in the Council for neighbourhood planning issues. As outlined above, the Council is at present reliant upon one experienced officer. Having another appropriately qualified and experienced officer will ensure continuity and provision of service.
  - Finally, it will assist the planning policy team to focus on the local plan review and other local plan related matters.
- 9.6 Although this additional officer resource is being requested as a result of current workload pressures, given the cyclical nature of local plan and neighbourhood plan preparation, it is not expected that these workloads will reduce in the foreseeable future. In any event, given the skill set and experience sought, *should* the current workload change any additional capacity provided by the additional resource would be available for work on the local plan and other associated matters.
- 9.7 Unlike the short-term use of SDNPA officers, this additional full-time role cannot be met through existing service budgets. As outlined above, the resource needs to be appropriately experienced and therefore, based on a senior planning officer post, the cost including on-costs would be £54,000 per annum.

## **10. Alternatives Considered**

- 10.1 One alternative is to seek to appoint to a temporary post for two years. However, it is considered less likely that this option would attract appropriately experienced candidates.

10.2 Another option is to continue to deliver the service as effectively as possible within the existing resources. However, it is considered that this would be likely to lead to continued delays to neighbourhood plan work and also potentially impact on progress on the local plan review.

**11. Resource and Legal Implications**

11.1 The resource implications are set out in paragraph 9.7 above. The cost of the proposed post can be met from reserves in the current year. However, this will add additional budget pressure to the base revenue budget from April 2022. If members decide that this is a priority and commit to funding the post on a permanent basis, then in accordance with the adopted Financial Strategy equivalent savings will need to be identified to accommodate this in future years. This will need to be considered as part of the future services prioritisation process later this year.

**12. Consultation**

12.1 It is not considered that the recommendations in this report would require any additional consultation.

**13. Community Impact and Corporate Risks**

13.1 If CDC is not able to appropriately respond to neighbourhood planning issues, this may result in reputational damage to the Council and result in delays to the preparation of neighbourhood plans.

**14. Other Implications**

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>		x
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b>		x
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b>		x
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>		x
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		x
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>		x
<b>Other</b>		x

**15. Appendices**

15.1 None.

**16. Background Papers**

16.1 None

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank