

# 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



## Notice of Meeting

### To All Members of Chichester District Council

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of **THE COUNCIL** which will be held in the **Committee Rooms - East Pallant House** on **Tuesday 21 September 2021** 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

**9 September 2021**

## AGENDA

- 1 **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 38)  
The Council is requested to approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2021 and the All Member Session held on 29 July 2021.
- 2 **Urgent Items**  
The Chair will announce any urgent items which due to special circumstances are to be dealt with under Late Items.
- 3 **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.
- 4 **Chair's Announcements**  
Apologies for absence will be notified at this point.  
  
The Chair will make any specific announcements.
- 5 **Public Question Time**  
In accordance with Chichester District Council's scheme for public question time the Council 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 BY THE CABINET

To consider the following recommendations of the Cabinet requiring the approval of the Council.

- 6 **Commissioning of West Sussex Community Advice and Support Service**  
The report can be found on pages 17-20 of the Cabinet agenda for 7 September 2021.

The Cabinet made the following recommendation to Full Council:

That the Cabinet recommends to Council the continuation of the Funding Partnership to commission a Community Advice and Support Service across West Sussex for up to seven years from April 2022 with West Sussex County Council as the lead authority.

- 7 **Housing Grants**  
The report can be found on pages 11-14 of the Cabinet papers for Tuesday 7 September 2021.

The Cabinet made the following recommendation to Full Council:

That delegated authority is given to the Director of Housing and Communities in consultation with the Cabinet member for Housing and Communities to spend the grant funding received from Government set out in para 3.1 to 3.8 of this report in accordance with the terms of the grant.

- 8 **Making the Westbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan**  
The report can be found on pages 15-16 of the Cabinet agenda for 7 September 2021.

The Cabinet made the following recommendation to Full Council:

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMITTEES

None.

## MOTIONS PROPOSED IN ADVANCE BY MEMBERS

- 9 **Motion from Cllr Plowman (Page 39)**  
Having complied with the Motions Procedure as set out in the council's Constitution the motion attached will be proposed by Cllr Plowman and if duly seconded it will then be discussed at this meeting.

## OTHER REPORTS

- 10 **Delegation to Chief Executive - Local Plan Review Update**  
When discussing agenda item 15 from the Full Council meeting held on 20 July 2021 members made the following resolution.

*To give an administrative delegation to the Chief Executive to enact all decisions from the remote session of Councillors on 29 July 2021, and to report that enactment to the next Full Council.*

The Chief Executive will therefore provide an update on the enactment.

**11 Questions to the Executive**

Members are invited to ask a question of a member of the Executive (maximum of 40 minutes duration).

**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 Chair 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

- (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 ask their question 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

**Please note that the council is following Government guidelines which may be subject to change prior to the meeting taking place. The webpage will be updated accordingly.**

### **MEMBERS**

Mrs E Hamilton	Mrs D Johnson
Mr H Potter	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 B Brisbane	Mr C Page
Mr R Briscoe	Mr D Palmer
Mr J Brown	Mrs P Plant
Mr A Dignum	Mr R Plowman
Mrs J Duncton	Mrs C Purnell
Mr J Elliott	Mr D Rodgers
Mr G Evans	Mrs S Sharp
Mrs J Fowler	Mr A Sutton
Mrs N Graves	Mrs S Taylor
Mr F Hobbs	Mr P Wilding

# Public Document Pack Agenda Item 1



Minutes of the meeting of the **Full Council** held in the Committee Rooms - East Pallant House on Tuesday 20 July 2021 at 2.00 pm

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

**Members not present:** Miss H Barrie, Mrs E Lintill, Mrs S Lishman and Mr A Sutton

**Officers present all items:** Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

## 19 Minutes

### RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 27 April 2021 and the Special Council held on 22 June 2021 be approved.

## 20 Urgent Items

There were no urgent items.

## 21 Declarations of Interests

Declarations of Interest were declared as follows:

- Cllr Dignum declared a personal interest in agenda item 9 as the Chichester District Council representative on the BID and explained that he would not speak or vote on the item.
- Cllr Duncton declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- Cllr Donna Johnson declared a personal interest in agenda item 8 as the Vice-Chair of Selsey Town Council and in agenda item 14 as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- Cllr O'Kelly declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of West Sussex County Council.

- Cllr Oakley declared a personal interest in agenda item 8 as a Member of the West Sussex County Council Electoral Review Panel and in agenda item 14 as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- Cllr Plowman declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as the Chairman of Goodwood Motor Circuit Consultative Committee.
- Cllr Potter declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of the South Downs National Park Authority.
- Cllr Purnell declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of Selsey Town Council.
- Cllr Sharp declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of West Sussex County Council.

## 22 **Chair's Announcements**

Apologies were received from Cllr Barrie, Cllr Lintill, Cllr Lishman and Cllr Sutton.

The Chair welcomed Cllr Bill Brisbane to his first meeting. He received a round of applause from members to welcome him to the council.

The Chair then explained that she had been undergoing medical treatment for cancer during the pandemic and wished to raise awareness of the importance of seeking early medical intervention. The Chair received a round of applause from members for her courage in sharing her story.

## 23 **Public Question Time**

The following public questions and answers were heard:

### **Question from Lucia Withers and 62 others:**

The following questions are from 63 undersigned individuals, many of whom attended the CDC Climate Emergency Action Plan (CEAP) progress meeting hosted by Extinction Rebellion Chichester on 6 June 2021. They are submitted collectively to demonstrate the continued high level of interest and concern around CDC's progress towards implementing its CEAP, and to call for accelerated action and greater public engagement on it.

It is two years since the CDC declared a climate emergency (19 July 2019); 18 months since the initial CEAP was approved (January 2020); and more than six months since the final plan was approved (January 2021). Presentations by Council Officers on 6 June highlighted the significant number of actions that have been taken over the past months to implement the plan. However, most were focused on internal processes and/or achieving greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) reductions from CDC operations. While action on this front is commendable, CDC GHG emissions only account for around 1-2% of emissions in the district. It is therefore of serious concern that 18 months into the five-year CEAP, little or no progress appears to have been made on implementing actions that relate to area-wide targets, and there is still no coherent strategy which sets out what needs to be done to achieve 10% year on year area-wide reductions of GHG to 2025.

The logic of declaring an EMERGENCY is that urgent action should be taken. We believe that the climate emergency should therefore be treated on a par with the response to the crisis resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. As with the health crisis, the climate emergency presents new challenges and will require different ways of working that take

account both of what the CDC can influence directly, but also where it needs to lead and inspire others to play their role and/or to work collaboratively with others.

Either way, urgent action is needed -- as noted in the December 2020 Climate Change Committee's report, "Local Authorities and the Sixth Carbon Budget" (whose author briefed the CDC in March 2021), "*Actions taken now locally will grow the pipeline of projects, jobs and skills to scale up delivery of zero carbon buildings and transport, waste reduction and low carbon land use. For local authorities, this does not entail focused emissions cuts in separate sectors, but means transforming whole places towards Net Zero, working with residents, communities and businesses to deliver the right changes and investments for the area.*"

### **Questions to the Cabinet Member for the Environment:**

- According to presentations on the 6 June, CDC divisional annual services plans have been reviewed for their carbon implications and guidance developed on factoring climate change in to CDC decisions. *In the interests of transparency, will the CDC publish the reviews of service plans so that we can be assured that all plans support, and do not in any way undermine, GHG-reduction targets. Further will CDC make it mandatory that all council decisions, not only factor-in climate change, but actively support GHG reduction targets?*
- Transparency, communication and public engagement will be fundamental to achieving the levels of change needed to come close to reaching GHG emission reductions in the district, yet, the 6 June event represented the first public update on the CEAP since its adoption, and was initiated and hosted not by the CDC but by Extinction Rebellion Chichester. *Will the CDC commit to facilitating regular (three monthly) meetings to update the public on the CEAP and its implementation, that could also act as a forum for engagement and dialogue with local climate/environmental groups, activists and others to support the further development and implementation of area-wide plans?*
- Under the CEAP, the CDC committed to holding a Citizens' Assembly in 2021 as one of the core elements of the area-wide strategy. We were informed on 6 June that research has been done but no information was provided on when this action will be implemented. *Please provide details on when the Citizens' Assembly is expected to take place and what format it will take? If it is not now scheduled for 2021, please explain why not?*

### **Answer from Cllr Plant:**

Responding to climate change is a top priority for the council and we have already started to deliver a number of projects from our adopted Climate Change Action Plan. We are working closely with our partners and are carefully reviewing the delivery of each project with the council's Environment Panel. Alongside this, West Sussex County Council has been developing a Climate Change communications campaign that all district and borough councils plan to use. This campaign will be heavily promoted through all of our communication channels and will target various stakeholder groups.

The climate change communications campaign is not the sole means of engagement. We are establishing a renewable energy working group and have had discussions with employers about how to bring them together to identify how they can work together to

reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These discussions are focussed on action, implementing projects to reduce emissions. If there is local support, we are also proposing as part of the engagement campaign, to run practical workshops for residents giving them the opportunity to talk to experts about various carbon saving technologies that might be suitable for domestic properties.

As we have explored other areas' experiences of Citizens' assemblies, some of the feedback has made us re-consider the approach in the Action Plan. Assemblies are primarily useful for providing feedback to the council decision makers, from an informed and representative group of people. When it comes to raising general awareness, this is at best a side-benefit. The one off nature of the event is also a concern and these points underlie the proposal for the alternatives options for engagement which will be presented to Cabinet for approval. As well as the actions already outlined above, we will be utilising the Council's existing Let's Talk Panel and targeting specific demographics to get a better spread of individuals engaged on climate change; utilising existing communication routes such as those for the Local Plan Newsletter and formalising the holding of twice-yearly public meetings on the progress under the Climate Emergency Action Plan.

We believe all these approaches will enable us to have ongoing conversations with a wider base of residents and businesses and by involving a wider audience will be more effective. They will be recommended to Cabinet, which will make a final decision at its meeting in September.

We will make our regular updates on Action Plan progress available, and these will include all the operational projects from the Council's Service plans that have a climate change implication to them. The template for Committee Reports has also been amended to ensure that the climate change implications have been considered for all project and new policy proposals. All key future decisions for the Cabinet are detailed within the Council's Forward Plan which is on our website.

We should not discount action to reduce the Council's own carbon footprint as a means to lead and inspire others – demonstrating what can be done. We have secured an investment of £1.3m to reduce carbon emissions from Westgate Leisure Centre and are also evaluating and prioritising further action across our estate and vehicle fleet.

With regards to transforming whole places towards Net Zero, we cannot achieve this alone, other public sector organisation, private sector employers and, crucially, central government will have to set out their plans for decarbonisation in order for a whole District target to be achieved.

**Question to the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive:**

We recognise that achieving the area-wide target was always going to require national and regional action but the target was set because it was recognised that CDC could nevertheless play a leadership role, working in partnership with local organisations and communities to drive progress towards it. *In the absence of any regular community engagement, a plan for a Citizens' Assembly or any alternative means of galvanising public support for change, is the Council's corporate leadership really committed to this target? What resourcing is being provided to meet it, and is it sufficient? How does this compare with other Council priorities?*



**Answer from Cllr Lintill read by Cllr Taylor:**

Yes, the Council's leadership are committed to leading action on both the Council's internal carbon emissions target and the District target. Yes, we are putting resources in, and I welcome your acknowledgement that we need others to also lead and work alongside us. Tackling the Climate Emergency is one of the key priorities in our new Corporate Plan. However, we are still in a pandemic and the Council has many urgent and competing priorities, and so over the summer we are considering all the options in order to set a sustainable budget that delivers the range of actions our District needs. Without unlimited resources, it is especially important that we succeed in winning funding from outside the Council. We are doing just that - £400,000 for tree planting, £185,000 for improving the energy efficiency of households in fuel poverty with £364,000 more to come. As Cllr Plant has already outlined, we are investing in our own estate and fleet vehicles and alongside the range of methods for engagement and dialogue with local residents, interested groups and businesses, we aim to strike the right balance between action and communication.

**Question from Deborah May read by Nick Bennett:**

Councillors will have noticed that there is a silent protest outside the Council offices today. One of the main concerns is the dreadful state of the water quality in Chichester harbour, and the discharges of raw sewage into the harbour by Southern Water. Only last week Southern Water (SW) were fined £90m for discharges between 2010 and 2015. Yet still these discharges persist.

Just this week a young local family had a child hospitalised after playing near one of the discharge pipes. There are numerous reports of sewage floating in the harbour along with sanitary products. Is this what we really want our harbour to look like? As I write this on 13 July, SW has discharged for a total of 49.98 hours from 2 locations in Chichester harbour - so this has been continuous since sometime yesterday. It just isn't good enough. The discharges are not timed to coincide with an outgoing tide, and so the releases just get washed back up the harbour. There are also no notices warning residents and visitors about reporting sewage to the Environment Agency - this should be speedily rectified.

So - the law and heavy fines don't really affect Southern Water as it persists in releasing untreated sewage into the harbour, which is illegal if done on an almost continual basis. Directors are not held personally liable, and so the practice continues. What could CDC do to stop this ruination of our harbour?

One solution could be to STOP allowing planning permission for new homes, as it is clear that SW cannot legally manage the sewage it already has. More homes = more sewage. It's quite simple really.

Someone has to take a stand. Would CDC consider saying to central government "We won't build any more new homes until Southern Water can effectively and legally manage the sewage they currently have"?

I don't see how anyone in government could object to this stance. If CDC continues to allow further housing, knowing that there is a huge issue with legally disposing of sewage, councillors are actually aiding Southern Water's illegal sewage-dumping activity. So my question is, Please could CDC take this above suggestion of limiting the number of new homes seriously, and undertake to come up with a solution - perhaps in partnership

with Natural England and other agencies. We really can't have any more homes built until sewage can be properly disposed of - legally! No more excuses. No more passing the blame to someone else.

As a resident of CDC, I am fed up with the rapidly declining state of the water quality in Chichester Harbour and demand that something more be done. Agencies must find a better way to work together so that companies do not run rings around government and local government, creating a mockery of the rules and flouting common sense to the detriment of our environment.

Deborah May

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

Southern Water is the statutory sewage undertaker responsible for collecting, conveying and treating wastewater. As such Southern Water has a statutory duty to serve new development and to meet environmental criteria set by the Environment Agency. Investment is planned in 5 year periods and is informed by the Local Plan – this means that Southern Water's business planning and bids to OFWAT for funding to deliver new infrastructure take account of additional development proposed in Local Plans, and are reviewed on a 5 yearly cycle.

CDC officers have been working closely with both Southern Water and the Environment Agency to agree a position in relation to future provision of waste water treatment and to understand if the significant environmental constraints in the area will limit or delay the treatment that Southern Water can provide. Southern Water will be considering all the options through preparation of their Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP). CDC officers are fully engaged in this process so that emerging outcomes can be used to inform the Local Plan ahead of the DWMP being finalised.

When planning applications are considered, if further infrastructure improvements are required to support the development, this will often be secured as part of any planning permission, however it is for the statutory sewage undertaker to make necessary adjustments to their network.

In addition to this, Southern Water and the Environment Agency agreed a Position Statement in 2018 which limits new connections to Apuldram Waste Water Treatment Works.

The Environment Agency (EA) issues permits to Southern Water for the regulation of their treatment works that discharge to the harbour. The treatment works are obliged by the EA permits to report sewage discharges to the harbour. As such to suggest that the public should also report sightings of sewage would only duplicate the information that the EA already receive.

However, Southern Water has an online notification system, called Beachbuoy. [Beachbuoy \(southernwater.co.uk\)](https://www.southernwater.co.uk/Beachbuoy) This is available free to the public, is very accurate, shows live data on pollution events and from the exact locations shown on the map.

Cllr Moss commented that he felt that a further response should be provided as some of questions had not been sufficiently answered.

## 24 Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2020-21 Annual Report

Cllr Moss introduced the report and wished to thank officers for their support over the last year. In particular he wished to thank Katherine Davis from Democratic Services. Cllr Moss explained that he would be stepping down as Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee but wanted to highlight the role of scrutiny in democracy.

Cllr Moss proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Bangert. In a vote the following resolution was agreed.

### RESOLVED

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2020-21 Annual Report be noted.

## 25 Recommendation from the Boundary Review Panel - 25 June 2021

Cllr Oakley proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor.

In a vote the following resolution was agreed.

### RESOLVED

That the number of councillors elected to Rogate Parish Council be reduced from 13 to 9.

## 26 Recommendation from the Boundary Review Panel - 5 July 2021

Cllr Purnell proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor. Mr Mildred then introduced the item. He noted the recent concerns raised by Littlehampton Parish Council.

Cllr Brown then proposed the following alternative:

*Both of these options are – **for this area** - preferable to your proposals as they maintain the strong and obvious links between the Manhood Peninsula and Chichester City. Some wards in the north of Chichester District are used to being in a separate constituency (previously Arundel and Southdowns) and this reflects the linkages with Chichester as a major settlement being less exclusive in the northern wards.*

***It is recognised that further thought would need to be given to the knock-on impact on the two constituencies to the east. In particular we look forward to studying proposals being promoted by our neighbours in the second round of consultations.***

Cllr Moss seconded Cllr Brown's proposal.

Cllr Oakley thanked officers Mr Mildred for his work in providing members with options to consider in a short space of time.

Cllr Donna Johnson asked members to support maintaining a cohesive Manhood Peninsula.

Cllr Tim Johnson compared splitting up the city into different political constituencies and explained how the scenario would mirror if the Manhood Peninsula were separated.

Cllr Sharp supported maintaining the Manhood Peninsula as a whole but wished to for completeness share the views she had received from some residents who would prefer that it be linked with the local seaside town of Bognor Regis.

Cllr O’Kelly explained that she saw unsatisfactory options proposed and could not support the Boundary Review Panel recommendations.

Cllr Page explained that he would not feel comfortable splitting the Manhood Peninsula.

Cllr Moss explained he would be concerned splitting the following areas of Littlehampton, the Manhood Peninsula and Easebourne each into two constituencies.

Cllr Duncton explained that her preference would be to keep the district under one Member of Parliament. However, she confirmed that she would support the recommendation.

Cllr Purnell reminded members that they would be voting for a consultation not a final decision.

Cllr Briscoe explained that he would prefer not to see the Manhood Peninsula split. He suggested that the proposals put forward remain the best options for the district.

In a vote the original recommendation with the amendment by Cllr Brown to the final paragraph 13 was carried:

## **RESOLVED**

That the council’s response to the Boundary Commission for England’s initial proposals for the 2023 Parliamentary Constituency boundaries is as attached (pages 19 to 27 of the agenda pack) subject to the amendment to paragraph 13 read as follows:

Both of these options are – **for this area** - preferable to your proposals as they maintain the strong and obvious links between the Manhood Peninsula and Chichester City. Some wards in the north of Chichester District are used to being in a separate constituency (previously Arundel and Southdowns) and this reflects the linkages with Chichester as a major settlement being less exclusive in the northern wards.

**It is recognised that further thought would need to be given to the knock-on impact on the two constituencies to the east. In particular we look forward to studying proposals being promoted by our neighbours in the second round of consultations.**

## **27 Chichester Business Improvement District Ballot**

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe.

Cllr Taylor then introduced the report.

Cllr Plowman requested stronger action from the BID.

Cllr Hobbs gave his support to the BID.

Cllr Moss explained that the BID had brought a report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. He commended its new leadership.

Cllr Sharp gave her support to the BID.

Cllr Bell explained that he felt the BID levy is good value for money for the council.

Cllr Purnell explained that she would abstain as members were not voting on the BID only to allow the Leader to cast a vote.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

#### **RESOLVED**

That subject to section 2.1 of the report, that the Council delegates to the Leader the authority to vote in accordance with Cabinet's decision in relation to the ballot to renew the BID.

### **28 Chichester District Council Annual Report 2020-21**

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe.

Cllr Bowden gave support to the recommendation. With regard to page 31 he commended the Chichester Contract Service for maintaining its service to the community throughout the pandemic. With regard to page 36 he requested further information of when the CO2 emissions outturn figures would be available. With regard to page 49 he requested clarification of whether there had been any major planning applications in the South Downs National Park Authority. Taking the last question first Cllr Taylor clarified that a major application is for an application of over 20 dwellings. In the absence of the Director for Planning and Environment she sought to come back to Cllr Bowden on the number of applications in the South Downs National Park Authority. With regard to the CO2 emissions Mr Buckley was able to confirm that there had been 5.2 tonnes of CO2 in the 2019 data and an overall reduction of 40% over the last 14 years.

Cllr O'Kelly with regard to page 30 requested that the number of people receiving financial assistance could be greater as the target figure had been met and the number of affordable homes could also be greater. With regard to page 33 she requested a greater detail of the Performance Indicators in next year's Annual Report. Mrs Rudziak explained in relation to LPI 002 that the level of affordable homes is set out in the Housing Strategy as 1000 homes over six years. She clarified that where it can be exceeded the council would want to do so.

Cllr Brown requested more plans on how to decarbonise the district. Mr Buckley explained that members had been invited to a session to revisit the Corporate Plan in the coming weeks.

Cllr Graves wished to note that the Sygenta site has been approved after 15 years of work.

Cllr Hobbs wished to highlight that the council is actively looking at ways to declare real Climate Emergency investment publically.

Further to Cllr Bowden's comments Cllr Apel recommended that all members go out on a round with the Chichester Contract Services team as she had done. She congratulated the team on their hard work.

Cllr Bangert congratulated the Housing Team on the Rough Sleeper Initiative and hoped to see more long term work in this area.

Cllr McAra outlined how a Community Land Trust works following a recent site of that nature being completed in Midhurst.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

**RESOLVED**

That the Chichester District Council Annual Report 2020-21 be received.

**29 Covid Outbreak Management Fund**

Cllr Wilding proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor. Cllr Wilding then introduced the item.

Cllr Bowden with reference to page 53 asked how value for money is measured in relation to the Covid-19 post allocations. He also requested clarification on the part time/full time split of the cost of the Environmental Health post. Cllr Wilding confirmed that the higher salary of £102,000 relates to a contractor. Mr Ward agreed to seek written response from Mr Frost.

Cllr O'Kelly requested an update on the current situation with the Test, Trace, Contain work. Mrs Shepherd clarified that the Test, Trace, Contain work is a West Sussex County Council's responsibility and a protocol had been agreed with the Districts and Borough that they would assist if requested. She suggested as Cllr O'Kelly is a County Councillor she could contact the County Council for an update.

In a vote the following resolutions were carried:

**RESOLVED**

1. That the Covid Outbreak Management Fund grant allocation be spent as set out in section 5.
2. That delegation be given to The Chief Executive to vary allocations of funding between the headings in section 5 following consultation with the Leader of the Council.

**30 Local Plan Review Budget Update**

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe. Cllr Taylor then introduced the item.

Cllr Brisbane requested further information on the cost of the Local Plan 2016. Mrs Shepherd agreed to seek written response from Mr Frost.

Cllr Tim Johnson with regard to page 149 queried the costings detailed. Mrs Shepherd clarified that the costings related to transport may vary following members discussion at the All Member Session on 29 July 2021.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

**RESOLVED**

That Council approves the release of £500,000 from the Local Plan Reserve in 2021/22 and £275,000 in 2022/23 to fund necessary Local Plan technical work, specialist advice and examination costs.

**31 Independent Persons**

Cllr Plowman as Chairman of the Standards Committee proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor. He then introduced the item.

Mr Bennett, the Monitoring Officer explained the process before inviting the candidates Mr Andrews and Mr Thompson to introduce themselves.

In a vote the following resolutions were carried:

**RESOLVED**

1. To note that the Standards Committee have completed their interview and consideration process and recommend the appointment of two persons to Council as Independent Persons.
2. To appoint those persons as Independent Persons as provided for under the Council Constitution.

**32 The Council's proposed Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy and Conditions 2021**

Cllr Briscoe proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor. He then introduced the item.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

**RESOLVED**

That the revised proposed Hackney Carriage (Taxi) and Private Hire Licensing Policy 2021 at Appendix C be approved.

**33 Motion from Cllr Page**

Cllr Page proposed his motion. Cllr Bell seconded.

Cllr Page outlined as follows:

The Local Plan Review's Transport Policies are limited only to mitigate that plan's effect on the A27 at Chichester, in other words to make things no worse. It promises no improvement. Inevitably therefore there will be increasing pressure from new development

in Chichester and adjacent Districts and Boroughs. Road transport (however it is powered) will remain necessary for economic and social purposes.

As a result:

- 1. The already unacceptable levels of congestion and safety issues on the A27 Chichester by-pass will continue to worsen, with all the environmental, social and economic harm that entails.*
- 2. The District's local highway network will see increasing amounts of traffic along mainly minor roads and through the City seeking to avoid the congested A27 by-pass junctions and lengthening queues on to those junctions.*
- 3. Local Plan A27 by-pass junction mitigation works themselves will result in enormous disruption and inconvenience over a number of years and have very limited benefit before further works are required.*

*Recommendation:*

*Given the above, this Council,*

- a. is convinced that only a by-pass that separates local traffic from through traffic will provide a cost effective and comprehensive long term solution for the strategic road network at Chichester, and*
- b. that only such a by-pass will allow sufficient existing local highway network road space to be reallocated for walking, cycling and bus infrastructure to make a significant change in local residents' travel choices.*

*As the Council's preferred solution to this problem is a mitigated northern route as proposed by the BABA27 study, and noting that Highways England have announced that the A27 is among the list of projects to be developed for possible future funding with public participation, this Council calls on the Secretary of State for Transport to ensure that all options, including a northern route, will be the subject of earliest possible consideration by Highways England to resolve the chronic traffic problems of Chichester once and for all, and invites the support of Chichester's MP and WSCC.*

Cllr Taylor as portfolio holder was invited to speak next. She responded as follows:

*Thank you Councillor Page for your motion.*

*Can I say firstly that the Council has long sought a scheme of government funded improvements to the A27 at Chichester in order to address issues of capacity, congestion, journey reliability and environmental issues such as air quality. The A27 corridor is a key foundation for our efforts to deliver housing and economic growth in this part of West Sussex but if no improvements are forthcoming for the A27 at Chichester, then it is clear that severe congestion will continue to occur. This will constrain the performance of the local economy and delivery of the Government's objectives to deliver economic growth and housing. A well designed improvement at Chichester is needed that provides long term benefits and also addresses local concerns.*



*Following the cancellation by the Secretary of State for Transport of the A27 Chichester Bypass scheme within Road Investment Strategy 1 (RIS1) in 2017 due to a lack of local consensus, I'm sure many members will recall the BABA27 initiative which this Council actively supported and which resulted in two conceptual options prepared by consultants Systra being considered by this Council in June 2018. At that meeting, the Council resolved that in promoting a scheme to the government for inclusion in RIS2 our preference was for the 'Mitigated Northern Route' to be developed by Highways England with the 'Full Southern Route' as an alternative.*

*We were regrettably subsequently advised by Highways England that neither scheme was workable or affordable and so would not be taken forward within RIS2 although Chichester was included as a RIS3 Pipeline scheme meaning that funding was allocated for feasibility work and development of options. I understand that Highways England have now begun the Pipeline project and will assess the feasibility and viability of all potential options, including northern route options and that they intend to engage with stakeholders this Autumn.*

*Whilst this is positive news and Highways England have on many occasions indicated that they consider Chichester to be a priority, they have also made it clear that there is no guarantee of funding for a scheme within RIS3. We do nevertheless have a clear opportunity through this process to press our case for inclusion of a scheme for Chichester within RIS3.*

*I therefore support this motion that we do all we can as a Council to lobby the Secretary of State for Transport to ensure that all options, including a northern route, are fully considered by Highways England and agree that we should seek the support of our MP's and WSCC in this process.*

Cllr Palmer then spoke in opposition of a northern route. He explained that he agreed with all but the last paragraph of the motion.

Cllr Duncton supported the motion. She explained that it encouraged all options to be considered.

Cllr Bowden supported the motion. He asked members to consider the economy when evaluating the best route.

Cllr O'Kelly spoke about the levels of the congestion on the A27 and the A272 and explained that the traffic often deters cyclists and walkers.

Cllr Potter explained that he could not support the motion whilst it included a northern bypass option.

Cllr Oakley asked members to consider all options and all evidence.

Cllr Plowman explained that he supported all but the final paragraph of the motion. He requested the opportunity to propose an amendment. The Chair used her discretion and decided in line with the Motions Procedure as set out in the Constitution that the amendment would be too significant to take at the meeting.

Cllr Brown spoke in favour of a northern route being the most environmental route.

Cllr Bangert and Cllr Moss both gave their support to the motion.

Cllr Sharp asked members to provide a full consultation for residents. She then spoke about making bus journeys, cycling and walking more convenient ways to travel.

Cllr Barrett explained that the Manhood Peninsula Forum fully supported the motion.

Cllr Tim Johnson asked members to consider every route. He proposed a minor amendment to add an 's' to the end of motion to read 'northern routes' plural.

Cllr Page was then invited to sum up his motion and agreed to the inclusion of the additional 's' as proposed by Cllr Tim Johnson.

Cllr Bell requested a recorded vote which was supported by members.

The recorded vote was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – Absent  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – For  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Tim Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – Absent  
Cllr Lishman – Absent  
Cllr McAra – For  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – For  
Cllr O'Kelly – For  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Page – For  
Cllr Plant – Abstain  
Cllr Plowman – Against  
Cllr Potter – Abstain  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – Abstain  
Cllr Sutton – Absent  
Cllr Taylor – For

Cllr Wilding – Abstain

For = 26

Against = 3

Abstain = 3

Absent = 4

The following motion was therefore carried:

*This Council,*

*a. is convinced that only a by-pass that separates local traffic from through traffic will provide a cost effective and comprehensive long term solution for the strategic road network at Chichester, and*

*b. that only such a by-pass will allow sufficient existing local highway network road space to be reallocated for walking, cycling and bus infrastructure to make a significant change in local residents' travel choices.*

*As the Council's preferred solution to this problem is a mitigated northern route as proposed by the BABA27 study, and noting that Highways England have announced that the A27 is among the list of projects to be developed for possible future funding with public participation, this Council calls on the Secretary of State for Transport to ensure that all options, including northern routes, will be the subject of earliest possible consideration by Highways England to resolve the chronic traffic problems of Chichester once and for all, and invites the support of Chichester's MP and WSCC.*

#### **34 Delegation to Chief Executive - Local Plan Review Update**

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe. Mr Ward then introduced the item.

Cllr Bowden thanked Mr Ward and Mr Bennett for the change to the meeting arrangements.

Cllr Oakley requested clarification of any legal implications. Mr Ward explained that this had been fully considered and no difficulties were anticipated. Mr Bennett added that he had discussed the decision with a number of other Monitoring Officers before reaching a final conclusion.

Cllr Moss endorsed the approach and requested an email confirmation of the outcome of the meeting as soon as practicable afterwards. Mrs Shepherd confirmed she would be emailing all members after the meeting to detail what had been agreed.

Cllr Taylor explained that the session would be webcast live and would provide an opportunity for public question time.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

## **RESOLVED**

That Council gives an administrative delegation to the Chief Executive to enact all decisions from the remote session of Councillors on 29 July 2021, and to report that enactment to the next Full Council.

### **35 Review of Political Balance**

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe. Mr Bennett then introduced the item.

Mr Bennett explained that the final seat on Corporate Governance and Audit Committee was to be gifted to Cllr Tim Johnson from the Liberal Democrats. Mr Bennett sought any disagreement from members in including this in the vote on the recommendations. No member disagreed with the approach.

In a vote the following resolutions were carried:

## **RESOLVED**

That:

1. the review of political balance arrangements set out in this report be approved.
2. the memberships set out in appendix being circulated at the meeting be approved.

### **36 Urgent Decision Notice - Welcome Back Fund**

On behalf of the Council the Chair noted the Urgent Decision Notice relating to the Welcome Back Fund as detailed on pages 39 to 40 of the agenda pack.

### **37 Questions to the Executive**

Members were advised to submit any Questions to the Executive to Democratic Services who would collate the responses.

### **38 Late Items**

There were no late items.

### **39 Exclusion of the press and public**

Cllr Taylor moved the recommendation to go into part II which was seconded by Cllr Briscoe.

Members voted in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

The in respect of agenda items 22 and 23 the public, including the press, should be excluded from the meeting on the grounds of exemption under Parts I to 7 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as indicated against the item 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.

40      **CCS Refuse Collection Vehicle Procurement Strategy**

Cllr Plant proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Taylor. Cllr Plant then introduced the item.

In a vote the following resolutions were carried:

**RESOLVED**

That Council resolves to make the resolutions as set out in section 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of the Cabinet report.

41      **Urgent Decision Notice - St James**

On behalf of the Council the Chair noted the Urgent Decision Notice relating to St James as detailed on pages 41 to 43 of the agenda pack.

The meeting ended at 6.18 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank



Minutes of the meeting of the **All Member Session** held in Virtual on Thursday 29 July 2021 at 9.30 am

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

**Members not present:** Mrs N Graves

**In attendance by invitation:**

**Officers present all items:** Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mr T Ayling (Divisional Manager for Planning Policy), Mrs F Baker (Democratic Services Officer), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

## 1 **Announcements and Apologies for Absence**

The Chair opened the briefing session and welcomed all those present. She explained that the All Member Session was not a meeting being held under the Local Government Act 1972 meeting legislation and as such a resolution had been passed at the Full Council meeting on 20 July 2021 to allow the Chief Executive to enact the exact recommendations agreed by members at the Session.

Apologies were received from Cllr Graves (post meeting).

The following declarations of interest were made:

Cllr Brisbane declared a personal interest in Peter Brett as an old work associate of the company. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that Cllr Brisbane had sought his advice on the declaration and confirmed that as he had had no association with the company since 2014 and was therefore able to stay and vote on the recommendations being discussed.

Cllr Duncton declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Cllr Donna Johnson declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Cllr Oakley declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Cllr Sharp declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

## 2 **Public Question Time**

The Chair explained that no subsidiary questions would be allowed. The following questions and answers were received:

### **Question from Jane Towers:**

The Local Plan and Strategic Infrastructure Update shows that waste water treatment infrastructure is a significant constraint on the level of and location of housing development. It is well known that Thornham Wastewater Treatment works has finite capacity and does not have the technical or environmental conditions to be upgraded in the near future. Yet the actual capacity is still not in the public domain. It is therefore essential there is a Statement of Common Ground for Thornham, exactly as for Apuldram, and signed off by CDC, Havant BC, Southern Water and the EA as quickly as possible. This will enable Chidham and Hambrook, Southbourne and Westbourne in our District and Emsworth in Havant to better defend what is now well over 1000 houses in planning applications.

1. When will you put in the public domain the remaining capacity for each Waste Water Treatment Plant?

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

*An estimate of the capacity at each WWTW, made by comparing the EA permit to the average Dry Weather Flow information from Southern Water can be made available in August. This information will change each year as new Dry Weather Flow data becomes available.*

*This estimate will be supplemented by information on recent completions and permissions - an update to this information is currently in progress alongside work on the Five Year Housing Supply for the Chichester plan area.*

*We are currently working with both Southern Water and the Environment on a Statement of Common Ground which will include this information, with Southern Water also providing information on development in other Districts using WWTWs in the Chichester plan area. Further updates may be needed to reflect any changes in the emerging Local Plan Review Development Strategy. Once this Statement of Common Ground is agreed it will be published on the Council's website at the earliest opportunity.*



2. Given the simplicity of the current Apuldram Position Statement that has been in place since 2018, and the urgency with respect to planning applications, what is the barrier to getting an individual Position Statements issued for Thornham by the end of August?

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*We are currently in discussion with Southern Water and the Environment Agency concerning the need for and content of a Position Statement for Thornham and will also be discussing this with Havant. Subject to the agreement of all parties it is anticipated that a position statement will be progressed shortly.*

**Question from Roderick Hague, Chair of Oving Parish Council – read by Ruth Palmer, Clerk of Oving Parish Council**

1. Given the letters that were sent out to all of the Parish Councils on the 26th November 2020, would this Council (if they agree to item 10.4) include in those letters the analysis of each of those proposed allocations for their impact on the new revised situation of only minor mitigation measures along the A27? This will be critical part of many ongoing Neighbourhood Plan processes.

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*It is envisaged that following this meeting parish councils are written to outlining the current position with the local plan and the implications for neighbourhood plans.*

2. Given the recommendations of the Stantec Modelling Review is the distribution of housing likely to be changed again to reflect this new information, particularly its recommendation on the Development Distribution?

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*It is very likely that the distribution of development which was communicated to Parish councils in November 2020 will change before the Plan is finalised, either in location or phasing of development. This will require further work and in particular an agreed way forward with the highway authorities and others to consider the transport and waste water issues. Parish councils will be kept informed of progress.*

**Question from Mrs Susan Milnes:**

The Chichester District Council website states that the new local Plan will be published in Spring 2022, submitted to the Inspector in Summer 2022 and the Examination will commence in Autumn 2022. How reliable are these dates considering the delays already experienced, the latest developments and need to reassess the location and size of development sites taking into account the limitation of funding for transport improvements and challenges around waste water?

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*The report today provides an update for Members on the transport work for the local plan, and a snapshot of the progress with securing a deliverable, affordable package of measures for the A27 in the absence of a national scheme. The report does not propose an amendment to the local plan timetable at this point. Clearly this issue has the potential to delay the local plan process, but it is only when further discussions have been held with the highway authorities that any implications for the local plan programme can be determined.*

**Question from Mr Andrew Kerry-Beddell:**

Since the Local Plan went out of date exactly a year ago, all Parishes have been inundated with developer planning applications, due to the false promise the CDC HELAA gives them and which still includes many entirely unsuitable sites with no mains sewage, lack of transport access, unsafe road widths and regular site flooding.

The only defence any Parishes have from developers is delivered by a Council with an up to date Local Plan, a 5 Year Housing Land Supply and a robust road and sewage infrastructure plan.

Precisely what dates are these three key factors – the Local Plan, 5 Year Housing Land Supply and detailed road and sewage plans going to be in the public domain, in order to try and deliver the number of houses Government insists the Council take based on its mutant new housing calculation system?

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*The report today provides an update for Members on the transport work for the local plan, and a snapshot of the progress with securing a deliverable, affordable package of measures for the A27 in the absence of a national scheme. The report does not propose an amendment to the local plan timetable at this point. Clearly this issue has the potential to delay the local plan process, but it is only until further discussions have been held with the highway authorities that any implications for the local plan programme can be determined.*

*Regarding the next 5 year housing supply position, the Council has procured the advice of consultants who specialise in this matter to ensure that it sets out the best possible defensible case on housing supply. An exact date is not fixed, but it is expected that this statement will be published in August.*

*Regarding road and sewerage, the relevant infrastructure providers are working to their own timescales. Southern Water's Drainage Waste Management Plan is due to be finalised in 2023. West Sussex County Council's Transport Plan is due to be finalised in early 2022. Highways England's next Road Investment Strategy is expected to cover the period 2025-2030, though it is anticipated that a consultation on the A27 will be undertaken in in the next year. The Local Plan can only reflect as best it can the progress made by those partners at any particular point in time, which is why the report being considered by Members proposes further discussions to*

*seek an agreed basis for managing development (and bringing forward the Local Plan) in the meantime.*

**Question from David King:**

Given that it has recently been reported that CDC officers have concluded that the Stockbridge link Road “is currently not fundable or deliverable through the local plan process and therefore should not be proceeded with” and that “it is clear that from projected funding sources it is not currently possible to fully secure the money necessary to be able to deliver the full level of development envisaged in the preferred approach plan published in late 2018:-

**Will Chichester District Council now pause the progress of the Southbourne Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan?**

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*The examination of the Southbourne Neighbourhood Parish Plan Review will formally commence once the independent examiner has been appointed and received the documents that are required to be submitted to him/her. However the plan can be withdrawn at any time by the qualifying body, Southbourne Parish Council, and that is a decision for the Parish Council.*

**3 Local Plan and Strategic Infrastructure Update**

(Please note that the full debate can be viewed online:  
<https://chichester.nucast.live/frontend/meeting/4105153>)

The Chair explained that the Session is not a meeting being held under the Local Government Act 1972 meeting legislation and as such a resolution was passed at the Full Council meeting on 20 July 2021 for the Chief Executive to enact the exact recommendations agreed by members.

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Sutton. Cllr Taylor then introduced the report.

Cllr Moss proposed amendments which were seconded by Cllr Brown which read in full as follows:

- 1. That in the absence of significant external strategic infrastructure funding, the full scheme of improvements for the A27 Chichester Bypass prepared by Stantec consultants to support the Local Plan review including the proposed Stockbridge Link Road is undeliverable. Therefore the full package (and the Stockbridge Link Road) will not be progressed further as part of the Local Plan process barring a significant change in the availability and likelihood of securing public sector funding support.*
- 2. That on the basis of recommendation 2.1 above, the Local Plan Review is unable to meet full housing needs and the Plan strategy should therefore*

*focus on delivering as much development as possible based upon the capacity of the plan area to accommodate development within an affordable and deliverable package of transport mitigation taking into account all sources of available funding.*

- 3. That discussions are held with Highways England and West Sussex County Council to agree a revised phased distribution of development for further testing of highways capacity within the Chichester Plan Area until any decision is confirmed regarding the A27 Chichester Bypass.*
- 4. That, notwithstanding the Council's commitment to securing national funding for improvements to the A27 through the RIS scheme, the opportunity must be taken to develop the district's sustainable transport infrastructure. The District's, County's and Country's climate change obligations cannot be met without a modal shift in the way we travel. The "deliverable package of transport mitigation" must therefore include sustainable travel options, such as walking, cycling and bus improvements, all of which will contribute to reducing the impact of development upon our local and national road network.*
- 5. That the Council undertakes to review the Local Plan within 5 years of the date of adoption of the emerging Local Plan Review once clarity regarding a national scheme for the A27 at Chichester has been obtained.*
- 6. That the Council's position in respect of the Duty to Cooperate with other local authorities is updated to reflect that the Council is unable to meet the full housing needs of the Chichester plan area.*
- 7. That a Statement of Common Ground between Chichester District Council, the Environment Agency (EA) and Southern Water (SW) is urgently published that clearly and unambiguously states the challenges and issues surrounding the limitations and restrictions affecting Waste water Treatment Works ( WwTWs) operated by Southern Water in the District.*
- 8. That the EA be urgently requested to formally recognise the need for development to be phased so that it aligns with infrastructure provision. Consequently the Council will liaise with the EA, Natural England and SW to agree a phased programme of WwTW capacity enhancements. This programme will assist in determining the location and phasing of future housing provision in the Local Plan Review. Furthermore, the Council, SW and EA will jointly prepare Position Statements for all WWTWs with insufficient headroom capacity at 2025, to ensure that decisions made prior to the adoption of the LPR will reflect the predicted cumulative effect of future development proposals.*
- 9. That the EA provides comprehensive, current data on the flood risks to the coastal and harbour areas by way of a Position Statement for the District, to support planning officers and developers working within this District.*

*10. That this Council requests the Secretary of State to now re-validate the policies on house numbers in the existing 2015-2029 Local Plan, given the new evidence on transport option costs and the absence of adequate wastewater treatment capacity now shown to have caused a serious deterioration to Chichester Harbour (resulting in a unprecedented £90million fine for Southern Water).*

This relates to the Inspectors Report by Sue Turner 18th May of 2015, which requested the following modification to: Include a commitment to an early review of the Plan (5 years) in recognition of the limitations of the transport study and to enable full and detailed consideration of the potential offered through the proposed government funding for upgrading of the A27. We now have confirmation that the current Local Plan Review cannot rely upon government funding for upgrading the A27.

Cllr Lintill then proposed that all recommendations on the report remain the same except two minor recommendations to add 'from the date of adoption' to recommendation 2.4 and to add the words in recommendation 2.5 'likely to be' after the word is and before the word unable. This was seconded by Cllr Sutton. The Chair confirmed that these would be classed as minor amendments and therefore would be allowed.

Cllr Tim Johnson then proposed a minor amendment to recommendation 2.2 by inserting in brackets after 'to accommodate development' (demonstrating that prioritising brownfield sites and the re-designation of unused commercial land is our priority). This was seconded by Cllr Donna Johnson.

Cllr Sharp then proposed the following amendment if the amendments put forward by Cllr Moss were to not be carried. The amendment would read 'that housing, sewage and transport developments are phased in a staged approach'. Cllr Sharp also put forward some minor amendments. Recommendation 2.2 and 2.5 to change the word 'needs' to 'quota' and add 'improvements to alterations for the A27' and recommendation 2.4 to add the words 'measures to reduce the need to travel'. All amendments were seconded by Cllr Barrie.

The Chair then invited Cllr Moss to speak on his amendment motion. Cllr Moss confirmed he was happy to include Cllr Sharp's minor amendment to recommendation 2.4 to add the words 'measures to reduce the need to travel'. Cllr Moss then outlined his amendment motion.

Cllr Moss then called for the Cabinet Member for Planning to step down from her role.

Cllr Lintill was then invited to respond. With regard to the call for the Cabinet Member for Planning to move on Cllr Lintill clarified that it is the Leader's decision as to who the Cabinet Member is. With regard to the amendment motion Cllr Lintill outlined the reasons why she could not support the amendments.

Mrs Shepherd was then invited to outline advice from The Planning Inspectorate (PINS).

Mr Ayling was invited to speak. He wished to advise members that by not including the words 'likely to not meet housing needs' in recommendation 2.2 it will not demonstrate to PINS that we have done all that we can do to try and meet housing needs. Mrs Shepherd clarified that to come to the conclusion that the housing need cannot be met without investigating all options would not provide evidence for the PINS. Cllr Moss confirmed that he would leave 'likely to be' in recommendation 2.2 and withdraw his proposed amendment on that point.

Cllr Taylor was then invited to speak. She explained the steps she had taken in working on the Local Plan as Cabinet Member for Planning. This included the challenges faced and the ongoing work.

The Chair then opened up for debate.

Cllr Plowman wished to comment on amendment 2.10. He wished the Leader to go back to the Secretary of State. Cllr Lintill confirmed that she had gone back to the Secretary of State.

Cllr Sharp wished to comment on the concerns and worries of residents.

Cllr Oakley commented on focussing on enabling officers to progress Highways work within the constraints. Cllr Taylor responded to Cllr Oakley's question on funding for the current Local Plan mitigation. Mr Ayling added that £12.8 million mitigation costs package was from five years ago. To date £14 million has been collected to date. He clarified that it would not be enough to carry out all of the mitigation measures.

Cllr Apel wished to comment on Southern Water and contamination of Chichester Harbour. Cllr Taylor explained that sewage discharge into the contributed approximately 10% to contamination the main source was from farmland.

Cllr Brown commented on the need to move forward with the Local Plan by putting pressure on the agencies that have yet to provide the information the council requires. He also wished to question the level of support given by the MP for the local area in relation to supporting progress with the Local Plan.

Cllr Briscoe raised concerns that adding additional amendments could cause further delays to the Local Plan.

Cllr O'Kelly wished to draw attention to the need for school places and doctors surgeries. She asked that the reason for the A27 delay be addressed. Mrs Shepherd reminded members that the discussion should relate to the infrastructure attached to the Local Plan.

The Chair used her discretion to move on to the next speaker.

Cllr Plant wished it to go on record that she did not agree with the Cllr Brown's comments regarding the local MP. Mr Bennett reminded members of the Code of

Conduct and speaking of others who are not present and able to respond to comments made.

Cllr Purnell raised concerns that the amendments put forward are less clear than the original recommendations.

Cllr Brisbane requested more detail on sewer water capacity re: amended recommendation 2.8.

Cllr Evans read a statement on behalf of a number of northern parishes he represents. The statement outlined concerns relating to percentage growth rate, infrastructure provision and provision of foul water drainage. Cllr Taylor responded by explaining that when different areas of the district are considered the provisions will form part of the consideration.

Cllr Hobbs commented on the need for a simple, impactful and clear message from the resolution made.

Cllr Donna Johnson raised concerns about lack of support for the Local Plan, flooding and the delays caused by the A27.

Cllr Potter commented on Southern Water waste water capacity and raised concerns that there would not be capacity to support any further development.

The Chair called a 10 minute break.

Cllr Tim Johnson outlined his minor amendment. He explained that he felt it would help accommodate redevelopment such as creation of more affordable rent housing.

Cllr Rodgers raised concerns that Chidham and Hambrook had not been considered. Cllr Taylor explained that many of the issues raised are applicable for other areas.

In summing up Cllr Lintill agreed to include Cllr Tim Johnson's amendment within her proposed amendments. Cllr Tim Johnson agreed to the approach.

In summing up Cllr Moss agreed to maintain recommendation 2.2 and also agreed the inclusion of Cllr Tim Johnson's minor amendment.

In summing up Cllr Sharp explained her amendments sought to include neutral words.

Mr Ward asked Cllr Moss whether he accepted Cllr Sharp's amendments to his amendments. Cllr Moss confirmed he would accept the amendment to his amendment to recommendation 2.4 only.

Cllr Tim Johnson confirmed his amendment could be included within Cllr Lintill's amendment.

In summing up Cllr Taylor reminded members of the duty to have a Local Plan. She directed members to the PINs report, page 96 regarding the districts housing need being met. In that before reaching a conclusion that housing needs cannot be met, the Council needs to determine:

- what level of housing could be achieved based on the required improvements to the A27 without undermining viability, and thus deliverability;
- whether the housing needs could be met in another way, which includes taking a step back and reassessing the spatial strategy and distribution of development in other parts of the district; and
- if not, then whether housing needs could be met elsewhere through constructive, active and on-going engagement as part of the Duty to Cooperate.

As requested a recorded vote was carried out.

Mr Bennett confirmed that Cllr Fowler had joined after the meeting and would need to decide whether she had heard the full debate. Cllr Lishman would be voting via the chat function due to technical issues. Cllr Fowler confirmed that she had watched the webcast from the start.

Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.1 and 2.2 which incorporated the amendment put forward by Cllr Timothy Johnson for clarity was as follows:

- 2.1 That in the absence of significant external strategic infrastructure funding, the full scheme of improvements for the A27 Chichester Bypass prepared by Stantec consultants to support the Local Plan review including the proposed Stockbridge Link Road is undeliverable. Therefore the full package (and the Stockbridge Link Road) will not be progressed further as part of the Local Plan process barring a significant change in the availability and likelihood of securing public sector funding support.
- 2.2 That on the basis of recommendation 2.1 above, the Local Plan Review is ~~likely to be~~ unable to meet full housing needs and the Plan strategy should therefore focus on delivering as much development as possible based upon the capacity of the plan area to accommodate development demonstrating that prioritising brownfield sites and the re-designation of unused commercial land is our priority within an affordable and deliverable package of transport mitigation taking into account all sources of available funding.

The vote for Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.1 and 2.2 which incorporated the amendment put forward by Cllr Timothy Johnson was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – Abstain



Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – For  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – For  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – For  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – For  
Cllr Plant – For  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – For  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – Abstain  
Cllr Sutton – For  
Cllr Taylor – For  
Cllr Wilding – For

The result of the vote was 32 For, 2 Abstain and 2 Absent. The motion was carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss’s amendment on 2.3 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For

Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – Against  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O'Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against, the Chairman used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.4 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill - Against  
Cllr Lishman – For

Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss’s amendment on 2.5 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – Against  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For

Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.6 which incorporated the motion put forward by Cllr Eileen Lintill was as follows:

Cllr Apel - For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden - For  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – For  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – For  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – For  
Cllr O'Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – For  
Cllr Plant – For  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – For  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – Abstain  
Cllr Sutton – For  
Cllr Taylor – For  
Cllr Wilding – For

The result of the vote was 33 For, 1 Abstain and 2 Absent. The Motion was carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.7 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – Against  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O'Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss's amendment on 2.8 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against

Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – Against  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss’s amendment on 2.9 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against

Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – Against  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

The vote for Cllr Moss’s amendment on 2.10 was as follows:

Cllr Apel - For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – Against  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – Against  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – Against  
Cllr Duncton – Against  
Cllr Elliott – Against  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – Against  
Cllr Hobbs – Against  
Cllr Brisbane – For  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For

Cllr Lintill – Against  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Against  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Against  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – Against  
Cllr Plant – Against  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Against  
Cllr Purnell – Against  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Against  
Cllr Taylor – Against  
Cllr Wilding – Against

The result of the vote was 17 For and 17 Against. The Chair used their casting vote to vote against the recommendation. The Motion was not carried.

A recorded vote for the report recommendations 2.3 and 2.4 was as follows:

The vote for Cllr Moss’s amendment on 2.9 was as follows:

Cllr Apel – Abstain  
Cllr Bangert – Abstain  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – Abstain  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – Abstain  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – Abstain  
Cllr Fowler – Abstain  
Cllr Graves – Absent  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Brisbane – Against  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Timothy Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – For  
Cllr Lishman – Abstain  
Cllr McAra – For  
Cllr Moss – Abstain  
Cllr Oakley – For  
Cllr O’Kelly – Abstain



Cllr Page – Absent  
Cllr Palmer – For  
Cllr Plant – For  
Cllr Plowman – Abstain  
Cllr Potter – For  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – Abstain  
Cllr Sharp – Against  
Cllr Sutton – For  
Cllr Taylor – For  
Cllr Wilding – For

The result of the vote was 21 For, 1 Against and 12 Abstain. The Motion was carried.

### **RESOLVED**

1. That in the absence of significant external strategic infrastructure funding, the full scheme of improvements for the A27 Chichester Bypass prepared by Stantec consultants to support the Local Plan review including the proposed Stockbridge Link Road is undeliverable. Therefore the full package (and the Stockbridge Link Road) will not be progressed further as part of the Local Plan process barring a significant change in the availability and likelihood of securing public sector funding support.
2. That on the basis of recommendation 2.1 above, the Local Plan Review is likely to be unable to meet full housing needs and the Plan strategy should therefore focus on delivering as much development as possible based upon the capacity of the plan area to accommodate development (demonstrating that prioritising brownfield sites and the re-designation of unused commercial land is our priority) within an affordable and deliverable package of transport mitigation taking into account all sources of available funding.
3. That discussions are held with the highway authorities seeking to agree a basis for delivering growth in the Chichester Plan Area until any decision is confirmed regarding a national road scheme for the A27 Chichester Bypass, to inform (along with waste water and other constraints) a revised distribution of development for further testing.
4. That the Council undertakes to review the Local Plan within 5 years from date of adoption, or earlier if a national scheme of improvements for the A27 Chichester Bypass is agreed by government via the Roads Investment Strategy 3 (RIS).
5. That the Council's position in respect of the Duty to Cooperate with other local authorities is updated to reflect that the Council is likely to be unable to meet the full housing needs of the Chichester plan area.

*\*Cllr Page left the meeting at 10.15.*

*\*Cllr Fowler joined the meeting at 11.15.*

4 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There was no requirement to exclude the press or public.

The meeting ended at 2.03 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date:

Priory Park: Motion to Full Council 21st September, 2021

Proposer: Councillor Richard Plowman

Seconder: Councillor Martyn Bell

The construction and dismantling of the large stage for the BEL Events in Priory Park on July 30th and 31st caused serious damage to fabric of Park similar to the damage caused by the operation, construction and dismantling of the Ice rink. The weather was a contributing factor but with climate change, this will become more severe and unpredictable.

1. In the light of this and recognising the Events Strategy and Policies for Chichester District 2020-2025 are evolving documents, the following addition of a third bullet point is proposed to Page 5 under the heading CDC hire of land to recognise the limitations of Priory Park.

*The district has its challenges when it comes to hosting events, the following needs to be recognised in order to manage expectations:*

- *CDC Hire of Land*
  - o *We have limited number of suitable spaces for events to take place, with the majority of these being in Chichester City Centre*
  - o *The largest spaces and most suitable spaces are close to residents and a major tourist destination, both of which impact the number, size and type of events we are able to host*
  - o *Priory Park has limitations in terms of access and the dual role as a war memorial making it unsuitable for Headline and large scale feature events involving construction of major temporary buildings or structures which have the potential to damage the fabric of this historic Park.*

2. That any Events Policies affected by this addition are reviewed by Officers and subject to public consultation.

3. That Overview and Scrutiny committee consider setting up a Task and Finish group to look at the operation, management and future of the Park particularly given the poor state of the buildings with the exception of Fenwick's Café and the Guildhall.

This page is intentionally left blank