



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on Tuesday 2 November 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 T Ayling (Divisional Manager for Planning Policy), Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Ms M Burgoyne (Economic Development Manager), Ms P Bushby (Divisional Manager for Communities), Mr M Catlow (Group Accountant (Technical and Exchequer)), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Mr L Foord (Divisional Manager for Communications, Licensing & Events), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services Manager), Mr D Hyland (Community and Partnerships Support Manager), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mr J Mildred (Divisional Manager for Corporate Services), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

## 71 **Chair's Announcements**

Cllr Lintill welcomed everyone to the meeting and read the fire evacuation procedure. She explained that item 12 had been deferred to the December Cabinet meeting in order to allow more information to come forward. One late item had been accepted regarding the treatment of War Pensions in the calculation of Housing Benefit. The item would be taken later in the agenda under 'late items'.

There were no apologies for absence.

## 72 **Approval of Minutes**

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 5 October 2021 be approved as a correct record.

### 73 **Declarations of Interests**

The following declarations of interest were made:

- Cllr Dignum declared a prejudicial interest in relation to agenda item 8 as a member of the Chichester City Council. He did not speak or vote on the item.
- Cllr Dignum also declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 13 as a member of Chichester City Council. He did not speak on this item either.

### 74 **Public Question Time**

The following public questions were received (responses are indicated in italics):

#### **Question from Ann Stewart (read by Democratic Services):**

The Tyndall Centre is a world renown organisation of British Universities where climate scientists of relevant disciplines work with policy makers. One of their resources is a database of the carbon budgets of UK cities. Their conclusions for Chichester are that to stay within the 1.5°C of the Paris climate agreement Chichester has a “ *maximum cumulative carbon dioxide emissions budget of 4.7 million tonnes (MtCO<sub>2</sub>) for the period of 2020 to 2100.*”

<https://carbonbudget.manchester.ac.uk/reports/E07000225/>

If we continue to emit carbon dioxide at the 2017 rate, we will have used up our entire budget for the century by 2027/2028.

This council report states that by 2023 the additional flights proposed at Gatwick will result in an additional 1.51 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>. This is over a quarter of our carbon budget for this century. Will the council take this into consideration when discussing this report.

#### **Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*In 2019 the requirement for the UK to achieve net zero emissions by 2050 (with all emissions by that date needing to be balanced by greenhouse gas removals) became law. In April 2021, the Government announced it would accept the advice of its expert climate advisory body, the CCC, that the sixth carbon budget (covering years 2033-37) should deliver a 78% reduction in emissions below 1990 levels and, for the first time, should include international aviation and shipping emissions. In July 21, the Government published a draft plan to put aviation on a pathway to net zero by 2050 in its consultation document Jet zero: Our strategy for net zero aviation. Whilst the proposals do not explicitly express support for airport expansion, they focus on technology measures to achieve emissions reductions.*

*The decisions around regional airport expansion is a central government issue due to the legally binding climate targets. In addition major infrastructure projects such as Gatwick or Heathrow expansion will go through public consultation and/or public inquiry as part of the nationally prescribed development consent order process.*

*Currently, there is no UK-wide policy for reducing aviation emissions overall, although ministers are due to announce a strategy for cutting transport emissions. The levers for disincentivising air travel lie with central government. This is illustrated by the latest Budget. The Chancellor said that most emissions come from international rather than domestic aviation, so the Government was introducing a new band of Air Passenger Duty covering flights of over 5,500 miles so that those who fly furthest will pay the most. However, flights between airports in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland will be subject to a new lower rate of Air Passenger Duty from 2023.*

*I can confirm that the Council will take carbon reduction targets into account in considering its response to this consultation and would add that CDC is playing a role through its on-going behaviour change campaign which encourages the use of personal carbon calculators so that people can better understand their carbon footprints and identify areas for change such as flying less.*

*As a point of detail, the Council's report does not mention the date 2023. Paragraph 3.9 refers to 2032 which is the date taken from the Environmental Impact Assessment prepared on behalf of the airport operator.*

**Question from Sally Pavey, Chair of CAGNE:**

A second runway flies in the face of the climate emergency we are all facing. Aviation has no alternative currently to being able to fly lots of people thousands of miles without using fossil fuel – commercial green fuels and technology are years away. Even Crawley Borough Council is no longer focusing on Gatwick for jobs but greener more sustainable industries.

How can this council justify this draft response in favour a new runway at Gatwick Airport, but then Chichester is not local to the airport as such no workers (if any jobs are created as Gatwick will take 6-7 years to recover and automation remove many jobs) should be coming from your area; your area may or may not see the vast increases of noisy aircraft overhead (285-326,000 a year); a second runway alone will add more than 1 million tonnes of extra carbon every year plus greenhouse gases and particles; and how can this draft response talk about Gatwick paying for affordable housing when there is no land to build on as Gatwick safeguard land for a 3<sup>rd</sup> runway and a 3 bedroom house costs far more than most workers can afford?

How can this council support the building of a new runway when I quote – '*as a council we are committed to working with you to tackle climate change. The opportunity to avoid dangerous levels of global warming is closing and action is required swiftly at all levels from the international to the individual. In making its declaration of a climate emergency in July 2019, the council announced its commitment to taking urgent action and asking others - residents, businesses, partner organisations, and the Government*'?

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*The Council is not supporting the building of a new runway. The proposals are for the utilisation of the existing standby runway to be used by smaller aircraft.*

*The proposals are for the building of new associated airport infrastructure to the existing terminal buildings which will result in improvements to the road infrastructure around the airport, together with new hotels.*

*The council supports the economic role that the airport plays within the wider region and the positive contribution it makes to Chichester District. The new physical infrastructure according to the documentation provided by Gatwick is proposed to reach net zero emissions by 2040.*

*The council has drawn attention in its response that the consultation documents do not set out the full picture regarding carbon emissions, which is in the airport's Environmental Impact Assessment – that the proposals will when everything is taken into account result in an increase in carbon emissions as a result of the extra aircraft flights which use carbon fuel, until such a time as they can be fuelled by a renewable resource.*

Cllr Lintill invited a supplementary question from Sally Pavey. The question related to how the scrubbing of tyres would mitigate the construction of a new runway. Cllr Taylor invited Mr Frost to respond. Mr Frost explained that the council is a consultee not the decision maker in the process. Cllr Lintill added that she would be proposing an amended recommendation to agenda item 11 to recommend that the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel (DPIP) consider a response in order to enable all members the opportunity for input.

**Question from George Hibberd:**

I have a very important question to pose to the council for their meeting on Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> November regarding the plans to expand Gatwick's Northern Runway.

"Sir David King, the UK's former Chief Science Advisor, has said that we have just 5 to regenerate planet Earth and what we do in the following 3-4 years will determine the future of humanity.

As a pilot who works with easyJet and is a member of the British Airline Pilots Association Environmental Study Group, I am acutely aware of my industry's massively damaging impact on our life support systems, but also our lack of action and greenwashing campaigns to not only continue flying, but to expand our pollutive industry.

The Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change, the International Energy Agency and the government's own Climate Change Committee have said that we MUST take action to immediately reduce demand and therefore emissions in aviation to avert the worst effects of the climate crisis.

People in the global south are already dying. The natural world is seeing the sixth mass extinction of species. When battery and hydrogen aircraft are decades away, when Sustainable Aviation Fuels are not actually sustainable and won't be price-competitive also for decades, when biofuels are going to cause yet more deforestation and carbon offsets are proven to be almost totally ineffective, what right does Gatwick have to lie to the public about its eco-credentials and expand an already pollutive industry plunging my future and many others' presents into chaos?"

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*The council has drawn attention in its response that the consultation documents do not set out the full picture regarding carbon emissions, which is in the airport's Environmental Impact Assessment – that the proposals will when everything is taken into account result in an increase in carbon emissions as a result of the extra aircraft flights which use carbon fuel, until such a time as they can be fuelled by a renewable resource.*

***In its draft answer to consultation question Q12, the council has stated:***

*The situation described in question 12 does not provide the whole picture. It refers only to construction and the operation of buildings, which represents only a tiny fraction of the true greenhouse gas emissions.*

*The increase in carbon as a result of the additional flights is equivalent to twice Chichester District's whole emissions. It is possible to argue, as the Environmental Impact Assessment report does, that such an increase does not compromise the UK target, but only because it is less than 1% of UK total emissions. It is however, still a huge increase.*

*Carbon-offsetting is not a preferred strategy, and should only be a small part of the plan once all other options have been exhausted. The preferred strategy would be improvements in technology for the aircraft, and maximising public transport journeys to and from the airport via non-carbon modes of transport. Water-efficiency and reduction of waste are other areas that need to be considered. There is little mention of creation of on-site renewable energy sources to supply the new buildings at the airport and there does appear to be land available within the airports ownership to explore this, for example ground source heat pumps and water source heat pumps.*

Cllr Lintill invited a supplementary question from George Hibberd. The question related to whether councillors would use their powers to lobby West Sussex County Council and Central Government on the Green Deal and whether councillors would commit to read the 'Possible' report regarding green solutions providing more jobs. Cllr Taylor reiterated that the discussion would be taken to DPIP.

**75 Adoption of Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Policy review and Adoption of Licensing Act 2003 Statement of Licensing Policy**

Cllr Sutton introduced the item.

Cllr Taylor asked how many applications had been received for outside hospitality seating. Mr Foord estimated that there were between 30 and 40 active applications.

He explained that the council is currently not charging for the service in order to support the local businesses.

*Post Meeting Note: 61 cases have been handled resulting in 48 applications of which 29 are issued, a further 13 to be issued and the remainder awaiting information/detail from potential applicants*

In a vote the following recommendation to Council was agreed:

#### **RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

That the Statement of Licensing Policy 2022-2027 (Licensing Act 2003) at Appendix 1, and the Statement of Policy 2022-2025 (Gambling Act 2005) at Appendix 2, be approved and referred to Council for adoption and publication.

### **76 Financial Strategy and Plan 2022-23 to 2026-27**

Cllr Wilding introduced the item.

Mr Ward was then invited to provide an update following the Governments Spending Review announcement for 2021 which covers a three year period. He explained that the announcement included a £4.8 billion increase in grant funding over the three years although the distribution is yet to be announced. It also remains unclear whether the council will be permitted to go beyond a 2% increase in Council Tax. He outlined the freeze to the business rates multiplier for small businesses for next year. There will also be a 50% discount for hospitality and leisure activities which the council will be recompensed for. Mr Ward wished to draw attention to the anticipated inflation rate for next year of 4%. He explained that the council's Fees and Charges Policy uses the inflation rates set out in the report and therefore the possibility of a 1% variation should be noted. Cllr Lintill requested the revisions be included in the papers for November Full Council.

Cllr Dignum wished to draw attention to the increasing pressure for higher pay, the increase in fuel costs and the parking income which although it had increased did not match like for like with pre-pandemic years.

Cllr Plant asked that members give consideration to the funding arrangements for the food collection service. She also wished to draw attention to section d on page 99 of the agenda pack regarding the pension lock.

In a vote the following recommendations to Council were agreed:

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL**

- a) The key financial principles and actions set out in appendix 1 of the 5 year Financial Strategy report be approved.
- b) That having considered the recommendations of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee, the Minimum Level of Reserves remains set at £4m.

- c) That the current 5 year Financial Model detailed in appendix 2 (Part 2) and the Resources Statement in appendix 3 to the Financial Strategy report be noted.

**77 Funding for Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester**

Cllr Briscoe introduced the item.

Cllr Lintill asked which other organisations provide funding support. Mr Hyland explained that Arun District Council, West Sussex County Council, Littlehampton Town Council and a number of parish councils all provide varying levels of funding support.

In a vote the following recommendations to Council were agreed:

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL:**

1. That the Cabinet recommends to Council the continuation of funding to Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester for the provision of infrastructure support to the voluntary and community groups and charities in Chichester District as set out in para 5.2 of the report.
2. That the Cabinet delegates authority to the Director of Housing and Communities, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, to agree a service specification and signing of a three-year funding agreement and delegates to the Grants and Concessions Panel the annual monitoring of performance.

**78 New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Scheme application from Chichester City Council**

Further to his declaration Cllr Dignum did not participate in the item.

Cllr Briscoe introduced the item.

Cllr Lintill requested clarification on the upper limit of New Homes Bonus applications following comment from the Chichester City Council Finance Committee who had been in touch to query grants given over £25,000. Mr Hyland confirmed that bids to the scheme are not limited to that figure; the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Culture in consultation with the Grants and Concessions Panel can approve up to £25,000, any applications over that level are recommended to Cabinet for determination. Cllr Lintill added that the request had also asked that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider the New Homes Bonus grants process. She explained that she would ensure the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee Cllr Apel was made aware.

In a vote the following resolution was agreed:

## **RESOLVED**

The Grants and Concessions Panel recommendation of the allocation of £43,000 to Chichester City Council in favour of Chichester Runners and Athletics Club and their proposal for a permanent running track at Chichester College be approved.

### **79 2021-22 Treasury Management Half-Yearly Update Report**

Cllr Wilding introduced the item.

Cllr Dignum commented on the investments made in property which had remained good investments.

Cllr Briscoe asked for further information on ethical investments. Cllr Wilding explained that £3 million investments were being made to ethical funds which provide approximately 3% return.

Mr Catlow added that any investments the council wishes to make that are non-compliant have to be justified and then agreed by the S151 Officer. He confirmed that no current investments had been made this way.

Cllr Briscoe wished to thank Mr Catlow and his team for their good work.

## **RESOLVED**

That the Cabinet has duly considered the Treasury activity summarised in the report.

### **80 Business Rates Pool High Street Project**

Cllr Dignum introduced the item.

Cllr Sutton wished to encourage the other members of the Cabinet to attend the market on Sunday. He explained that the difference in the market was its link with the college and the new businesses it showcases.

In a vote the following resolutions were agreed:

## **RESOLVED**

1. That Cabinet agrees the release of the Business Rates Pool monies totalling £70,000 for spend on a 'high street feasibility project'.
2. That Cabinet agrees to work commencing on the feasibility study for the project as set out in section 4 of the report, using the total fund allocated to this Council.

81 **Consultation on bringing Gatwick Airport Northern Runway into use alongside the main runway**

Cllr Lintill explained that she did not intend to debate the item but as she had referred to during Public Question Time she wished to propose a revised recommendation.

The following recommendation was seconded by Cllr Taylor and agreed by vote:

**RESOLVED**

That Cabinet delegates authority to the Cabinet Member for Planning Services to finalise the Council's response to the consultation questions as set out in Appendix 2 to this report regarding bringing the Gatwick Airport northern runway into use alongside the main runway, having taken into account the comments of the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel.

82 **Engagement Response to National Highways A259 Chichester to Emsworth Cycling and Walking Route**

This item was deferred to the December meeting.

83 **Future Funding for Community Wardens**

Cllr Briscoe introduced the item. Mrs Bushby added that the service is well respected within the community.

Cllr Taylor requested clarification of whether the consultation would include the whole district or those areas where the service is currently provided. Mrs Bushby explained that it is currently for those who have a Community Warden. She confirmed that there has to be a need rather than a want for a Community Warden.

Cllr Lintill asked the following questions on behalf of Cllr Apel:

1. Whether the current year's service would remain as it is?
2. Whether the review in 2022/23 would mean any changes be implemented in 2023/24?
3. If any parish does not pay for their proportion would it affect the service as a whole?

Mrs Bushby in answering question one explained that subject to the Cabinet's decision to support the recommendation on the report the current year's service would remain as it is. With regard to question two the timeline indicated is correct. With regard to question three the results of the review as a whole are required before a funding model can be agreed.

In a vote the following resolution was agreed:

## **RESOLVED**

That Cabinet agrees to continue to fund 50% of the Community Warden Service and 100% of the Senior Community Warden post for 1 year (as set out in section 7 below), subject to match funding being secured from partners.

2. That a review of the service and funding is undertaken during 2022 as set out in para 4.2 below.

### **84 Priory Park Task and Finish Group**

Cllr Sutton introduced the item including an amendment to the recommendations which was agreed below.

In a vote the following resolutions were agreed:

## **RESOLVED**

1. That Cabinet agree to the setting up of a Priory Park Task and Finish Group to address the motion passed by the September Council and to delegate the appointments to that Task and Finish group to Cllr Sutton.
2. That Cabinet agree the Terms of Reference of the Task and Finish Group as set out at Appendix B, with the deletion of the words [including the request for information received from the City Council.] from the scope.

### **85 Late Items**

One late item had been accepted regarding the treatment of War Pensions in the calculation of Housing Benefit.

### **86 Treatment of War Pensions in the calculation of Housing Benefit**

Cllr Wilding introduced the item. Mrs Rodgers added that in 2014 the Council had signed up to the Armed Forces Covenant which the resolution would support.

In a vote the following resolution was agreed

## **RESOLVED**

That the content of the report be noted and that it be determined that war pensions continue to be fully disregarded as a source of income by the Council when assessing claims for Housing Benefit.

### **87 Exclusion of the Press and Public**

Cllr Lintill proposed and read the part II resolution in relation to agenda item 17. This was seconded by Cllr Taylor. The Cabinet then voted to go into part II.

**RESOLVED**

That with regard to agenda item 17 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.

**88 Funding for a staff pool car pilot**

Cllr Wilding introduced the item. He then invited Mr Mildred to explain how the location of the pilot would work.

Mr Mildred then responded to questions and comments from Cllr Lintill, Cllr Sutton and Cllr Plant.

In a vote the following resolution was agreed:

**RESOLVED**

That Cabinet agrees the resolutions as set out in sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the report.

The meeting ended at 11.25 am

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date: