

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD
Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Democratic Services
Email: democraticservices@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 the Annual meeting of **THE COUNCIL** which will be held in the **Committee Rooms - East Pallant House** on **Tuesday 17 May 2022** 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

6 May 2022

AGENDA

- 1 **Election of the Chairman**
This will be followed by the declaration of acceptance of office.
- 2 **Appointment of the Vice-Chairman of the Council**
This will be followed by the declaration of acceptance of office.
- 3 **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 22)
The Council is requested to approve as a correct record the minutes of the 8 March 2022 Special Council and 15 March 2022 Full Council meetings.
- 4 **Urgent Items**
The Chair will announce any urgent items which due to special circumstances are to be dealt with under Late Items.
- 5 **Declarations of Interests**
Members and officers are reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests they may have in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.
- 6 **Chair's Announcements**
Apologies for absence will be notified at this point.

The Chair will make any specific announcements.
- 7 **Review of Political Balance** (Pages 23 - 27)
The Council is requested to consider the report and make the following resolution:

That the review of political balance be noted.
- 8 **Appointments of Committees** (Pages 29 - 33)
The Council is requested to consider the report and its appendix and make the

following resolution:

That the Committee memberships 2022/23 as set out in the appendix to the report be agreed.

9 Appointments to External Organisations (Pages 35 - 41)

The Council is requested to consider the report and its appendix and make the following resolutions:

1. That the Council votes on the following nominations as detailed in the appointments to the external bodies as set out in the appendix to the report:
 - a) Chichester Community Development Trust – nominations are Cllr Tony Dignum (current appointment) or Cllr Jonathan Brown
 - b) Chichester College Group – Corporation Board of Governors – nominations are Cllr Susan Taylor (current appointment) or Cllr Richard Plowman
2. That the remaining appointments to the external bodies 2022/23 as set out in the appendix to the report be agreed.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE CABINET

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

10 Energy, Efficiency and thermal Comfort Works at Westward House, Chichester

The Council is requested to consider the report as detailed on pages 9 to 25 of the 5 April 2022 Cabinet agenda pack and agree the following recommendations:

1. The approval of the Project Initiation Document (PID) for the energy efficiency and thermal comfort works at Westward House (as detailed in the Appendix to the report).
2. The approval of the Council's financial contribution of up to £80,000 funded from council reserves. The overall project cost to install energy efficiency measures at Westward House is up to £305,000. The Council will receive a grant of up to £205,000.

11 Delegation to Director of Growth & Place for lease values

The Council is requested to consider the report as detailed on pages 9 to 10 of the 3 May 2022 Cabinet agenda pack and agree the following recommendation:

That the Director for Growth & Place's delegation to enter into leases to a value of £60,000 per annum be increased to up to £100,000 per annum, until such time as the Constitution is updated and approved.

12 Development Management Division Workloads and Resourcing

The Council is requested to consider the report as detailed on pages 11 to 14 of the 3 May 2022 Cabinet agenda pack and agree the following recommendations:

1. The release of £56,600 from reserves to cover the cost of retaining temporary agency staff to address current staff vacancies, and;
2. The release of £84,225 from reserves to cover the cost of engaging specialist professional services to support the local planning authority in

defending a planning appeal.

13 Stock Condition Surveys

The Council is requested to consider the report as detailed on pages 15 to 17 of the 3 May 2022 Cabinet agenda pack and agree the following recommendation:

That Council approves the release of £150,000 from reserves to cover the cost of engaging a specialist company to carry out stock condition surveys for all Council built assets.

**RECOMMENDATIONS BY CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE -
14 MARCH 2022**

14 Governance Arrangements

The Council is requested to consider and approve the following recommendations to Full Council made by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee at its meeting on 14 March 2022:

1. That Questions to the Executive remain at the same position in meetings with a discretionary option for the Chair, Mr Ward or Mr Bennett to move them as required.
2. That the time allotted for Questions to the Executive be reduced from 40 to 30 minutes.
3. That it be noted that the Chair should show robustness in encouraging adherence to a time limit for each question.

OTHER REPORTS

15 Levelling Up - Round Two Application for funding (Pages 43 - 48)

The Council is requested to consider the report and make the following resolutions:

1. That Council approves that an application to the Levelling Up Round two (LUF(2)) is submitted and that delegated authority is approved for Chief Executive, Director for Corporate Services and the Director for Growth and Place to submit the application in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition.
2. That Council approves that a UK Shared Prosperity Investment Plan is submitted, and that delegated authority is approved for Chief Executive, Director for Corporate Services and the Director for Growth and Place to submit the Investment Plan in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition.

16 Urgent Decision Notice - Levelling Up Fund Round two application support

The Council is requested to note the Urgent Decision Notice relating to Levelling Up Fund Round two application support.

17 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.

18 **Exclusion of the press and public**

The Council is asked to consider in respect of agenda items 19 and 20 whether 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. **The reports dealt with under this part of the agenda are attached for members of the Council and senior officers only (salmon paper).**

19 **Urgent Decision Notice - Leisure Management Contract Agreement for 2022-23**

The Council is requested to note the part II Urgent Decision Notice - Leisure Management Contract Agreement for 2022-23 as detailed on the part II page 53 of the Cabinet agenda pack for 5 April 2022.

20 **Leisure Management Contract 2022-23**

The Council is requested to consider the part II report on pages 51 to 54 of the 3 May 2022 Cabinet agenda pack and agree the recommendation set out in section 2.1a of the report.

NOTES

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

(2) The press and public may view the report appendices which are not included with their copy of the agenda on the Council's website at [Chichester District Council - Minutes, agendas and reports](#) unless they contain exempt information.

(3) Subject to 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 they will be invited to attend the meeting and will be allocated a seat in the public gallery.
- c. You are advised not to attend any face to face meeting if you have symptoms of Covid.

(4) 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 the chairman of the meeting 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]

MEMBERS

Mrs E Hamilton
Mr H Potter
Mrs C Apel

Mrs D Johnson
Mr T Johnson
Mrs E Lintill

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 N Graves
Mr F Hobbs

Mrs S Lishman
Mr G McAra
Mr A Moss
Mr S Oakley
Dr K O'Kelly
Mr C Page
Mr D Palmer
Mrs P Plant
Mr R Plowman
Mrs C Purnell
Mr D Rodgers
Mrs S Sharp
Mr A Sutton
Mrs S Taylor
Mr P Wilding

This page is intentionally left blank



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in Committee Rooms - East Pallant House on Tuesday 8 March 2022 at 2.00 pm

Members Present: Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mr H Potter (Vice-Chairman), 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 G Evans, Mrs N Graves, Mr F Hobbs, Mrs D Johnson, Mr T Johnson, Mrs E Lintill, 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, Mr A Sutton, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

Members not present: Mr J Elliott, Mrs J Fowler and Mrs S Lishman
Officers present all items:

94 **Chair's Announcements**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Elliott, Cllr Fowler and Cllr Lishman.

The Council observed a minutes silence for those affected by the war in the Ukraine.

95 **Declarations of Interests**

The Monitoring Officer advised as to interests as members of other bodies not needing to be declared on a strategic budget report item including County Council. Reference was made to ensuring the accuracy of the register of interests in this advice. Following that advice no specific interests were declared.

96 **2022-23 Treasury Management & Investment Strategy and Capital Strategy update**

Cllr Wilding moved the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Wilding then introduced the item.

Cllr O'Kelly asked whether the council has any investments linked to Russia or effected by Russia. Mr Ward clarified that the council's fuel is purchased through Kent County Council. Mr Catlow explained that the council's investment are not linked to Russia.

RESOLVED

1. That the Treasury Management Policy Statement, the Treasury Management Strategy Statement, the Investment Strategy and relevant Indicators for 2022/23 be approved.
2. That the Council's Capital Strategy for 2022/23 to 2026/27 be approved.

97 **Budget Spending Plans 2022-23**

Cllr Wilding introduced the item.

Cllr Lintill was then invited to speak as Leader of the Council.

Cllr Moss was then invited to speak as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Ward referred to the supplement pack, page 6 referring to the second line of Planning Services. He confirmed that there has been no cut in the budget for Planning Services. The figure related to the processing of CIL.

Cllr Brown then outlined his amendment seconded by Cllr Bangert which incorporated suggested changes by Cllr Dignum as follows:

To employ a full time Growth & Sustainability Officer to promote economic growth in the District by supporting local businesses and the creation of local apprenticeships and jobs - all in the context of supporting the Climate Emergency Action Plan.

1. *Full Time, Two Year role (reviewed in year 2 to determine whether or not to incorporate into the base budget)*
2. *Working in the Economic Development Team (working closely with the Environment Team)*

Funding for this temporary position to be drawn from reserves:

- *Up to a maximum of £60,000 per year for two years*

That the job specification for the position is presented to the Economic Development Panel meeting scheduled for July 2022 (to be rescheduled to May 2022) for approval to support the targets within the agreed corporate plan and to provide support to businesses in the sectors of renewable, retrofitting and the circular economy.

Cllr Dignum confirmed he would support the amendment motion subject to the inclusions of his suggestions above.

Cllr Purnell explained that she felt that this amendment motion and the next amendment motion should have come from officers not members. Cllr Page wished to note his support of Cllr Purnell's comments.

Cllr Sharp spoke of transformation and changing practices. She supported the role.

Cllr Oakley explained that the Budget proposal showed the council was able to still support a number of discretionary services.

Cllr Donna Johnson spoke in support of the role for both addressing the Climate Emergency and economy. Cllr Plowman spoke in agreement.

Cllr Briscoe spoke in favour of the role.

Cllr Sutton asked for clarification of inflation on the Budget. Mr Ward explained that the Budget allowed for 5% increase in gas, 8% increase in electric and 10% in diesel. He explained that diesel prices were currently exceeding the rate. This would be monitored.

A recorded vote was held:

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

For = 29

Against = 1

Abstain = 3

Absent = 3

RESOLVED

To employ a full time Growth & Sustainability Officer to promote economic growth in the District by supporting local businesses and the creation of local apprenticeships and jobs - all in the context of supporting the Climate Emergency Action Plan.

3. Full Time, Two Year role (reviewed in year 2 to determine whether or not to incorporate into the base budget)
4. Working in the Economic Development Team (working closely with the Environment Team)

Funding for this temporary position to be drawn from reserves:

- Up to a maximum of £60,000 per year for two years

That the job specification for the position is presented to the Economic Development Panel meeting scheduled for July 2022 (to be rescheduled to May 2022) for approval to support the targets within the agreed corporate plan and to provide support to businesses in the sectors of renewable, retrofitting and the circular economy.

Cllr Moss then outlined his amendment seconded by Cllr Brown which incorporated suggested changes by Cllr Taylor as follows:

To employ a full time Landscape Officer to provide specialist landscape design advice on development management matters and to monitor and manage the discharge of conditions on development sites.

1. *Full Time Two Year role (reviewed in year 2 to determine whether or not to incorporate into the base budget)*
2. *Working in the Planning Team*

Funding for this temporary position to be drawn from reserves:

- *“Up to a maximum of £56,000.00 per year for two years. (total £112,000)”*
- *“That the job specification for this position is delegated to the Director for Planning and the Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services”*

Cllr Taylor confirmed she would support the amendment motion subject to the inclusions of her suggestions above.

Cllr Potter asked how much power the officer would have or would they need to refer to the enforcement team. Cllr Taylor explained that the role would aim to assist the enforcement team.

Cllr Duncton spoke in support of the amendment.

Cllr Brown spoke in favour of the amendment and highlighted the work the council had already done for wildlife corridors.

Cllr Purnell explained that she felt that this amendment motion should have come from officers not members. She added that she felt the role was more than one officer could do.

Cllr Bangert spoke in favour in the amendment.

Cllr Oakley asked how the role would be permanently funded and whether this would help encourage more candidates.

Cllr Page wished to note his agreement of Cllr Purnell and Cllr Oakley's comments.

Cllr Brisbane addressed the question of funding and whether the role could be permanent. He suggested some of the cost could be recouped from planning fees and Section 106 monies.

Cllr Sutton gave his support for the role but explained that he understood the views of Cllr Purnell, Cllr Oakley and Cllr Page.

Cllr O'Kelly agreed with Cllr Brisbane that there could be ways to address the funding of the role permanently.

Cllr Bell asked whether the title of the role could be reconsidered before taking it out to advert in order to best describe the role. Cllr Lintill responded by explaining that the key information will be in the job description.

Cllr Barrett, Cllr Apel, Cllr Sharp, Cllr Plowman and Cllr Graves spoke in favour of the role.

A recorded vote was held:

Cllr Apel – For
Cllr Bangert – For
Cllr Barrett – For
Cllr Barrie – For
Cllr Bell – For
Cllr Bowden – For
Cllr Brisbane – For
Cllr Briscoe – For
Cllr Brown – For
Cllr Dignum – For
Cllr Duncton - For
Cllr Elliott – Absent
Cllr Evans - For
Cllr Fowler – Absent
Cllr Graves – For
Cllr Hamilton – For
Cllr Hobbs - For
Cllr Donna Johnson – For
Cllr Tim Johnson – For
Cllr Lintill – For
Cllr Lishman – Absent
Cllr McAra – For
Cllr Moss – For
Cllr Oakley – Abstain
Cllr O'Kelly – For
Cllr Page – For
Cllr Palmer – For

Cllr Plant – For
Cllr Plowman - For
Cllr Potter – For
Cllr Purnell – Abstain
Cllr Rodgers – For
Cllr Sharp – For
Cllr Sutton – For
Cllr Taylor – For
Cllr Wilding – For

For = 31
Against = 0
Abstain = 2
Absent = 3

RESOLVED

To employ a full time Landscape Officer to provide specialist landscape design advice on development management matters and to monitor and manage the discharge of conditions on development sites.

1. Full Time Two Year role (reviewed in year 2 to determine whether or not to incorporate into the base budget)
2. Working in the Planning Team

Funding for this temporary position to be drawn from reserves:

- “Up to a maximum of £56,000.00 per year for two years. (total £112,000)”
- “That the job specification for this position is delegated to the Director for Planning and the Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services”

Mr Ward explained that following the agreement of the above amendments the substantive recommendations would read as follows:

- a) *That a net budget requirement of £15,015,600 for 2022-23 be approved.*
- b) *That Council Tax be increased by £5.00 from £170.81 to £175.81 for a Band D equivalent in 2022-23.*
- c) *That a contribution from the General Fund Reserve of £808,100 be approved to help fund the 2022-23 budget.*
- d) *The capital programme, including the asset renewal programme (appendix 1c and 1d of the agenda report) be approved.*
- e) *That a local Council Tax Hardship Reliefs Scheme for 2022-23 giving an additional £150 deduction on council tax bills for relevant taxpayers in receipt of CTR as set out in paragraph 6.7 of this report, using the £159,916 grant received in 2021-22.*

The revised recommendations were moved by Cllr Wilding and seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Bowden questioned whether there had been a reduction in the planning budget. This was clarified by Cllr Lintill, Mr Ward and Cllr Taylor to explain why that was not the case.

Cllr O’Kelly and Cllr Sharp provided comments.

A recorded vote was held:

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

For = 32

Against = 0

Abstain = 0

Absent = 4

RESOLVED

- a) That a net budget requirement of £15,015,600 for 2022-23 be approved.
- b) That Council Tax be increased by £5.00 from £170.81 to £175.81 for a Band D equivalent in 2022-23.

- c) That a contribution from the General Fund Reserve of £808,100 be approved to help fund the 2022-23 budget.
- d) The capital programme, including the asset renewal programme (appendix 1c and 1d of the agenda report) be approved.
- e) That a local Council Tax Hardship Reliefs Scheme for 2022-23 giving an additional £150 deduction on council tax bills for relevant taxpayers in receipt of CTR as set out in paragraph 6.7 of this report, using the £159,916 grant received in 2021-22.

98 Council Tax Resolution

Cllr Wilding moved the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Mr Ward explained that as a result of the previous item the following amendments would be required:

In the supplement to the agenda item page 5, section 3a and section 3b needed to be amended by £116,000 each.

Cllr Wilding introduced the item.

Cllr Apel asked whether the rise in Council Tax impact would be monitored. Mr Ward outlined the Council Tax support the council would be offering.

A recorded vote was held:

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 – Absent
Cllr Evans - For
Cllr Fowler – Absent
Cllr Graves – For
Cllr Hamilton – For
Cllr Hobbs - For
Cllr Donna Johnson – For
Cllr Tim Johnson – For
Cllr Lintill – For
Cllr Lishman – Absent
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 – Absent
Cllr Sutton – For
Cllr Taylor – For
Cllr Wilding – For

For = 30
Against = 0
Abstain = 0
Absent = 6

RESOLVED

That having considered the Cabinet's budget proposals from their meeting of 1 March 2022 Council approve the Council Tax Resolutions as set out in Appendix A.

99 **Exclusion of the press and public**

There was no requirement to exclude the public or press.

The meeting ended at 4.25 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in the Committee Rooms - East Pallant House on Tuesday 15 March 2022 at 2.00 pm

Members Present: Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mr H Potter (Vice-Chairman), 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, Mrs J Fowler, Mrs N Graves, Mr F Hobbs, Mrs D Johnson, Mr T Johnson, Mrs E Lintill, 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, Mr A Sutton, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

Members not present: Mrs C Apel, Mrs T Bangert, Miss H Barrie, Mr J Elliott, Mr G Evans and Mrs S Lishman

Officers present all items: Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services) and Mrs E Thomas (Wellbeing Manager)

100 **Minutes**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 25 January 2022 be approved.

101 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

102 **Declarations of Interests**

Declarations of interest were declared as follows:

Items 9 and 11 – Cllr Duncton declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Items 9 and 11 – Cllr Donna Johnson declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Items 9 and 11 – Cllr Kate O'Kelly declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Items 9 and 11 – Cllr Oakley declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Item 9 – Cllr Oakley declared a personal interest as a member of Tangmere Parish Council.

Item 6 – Cllr Purnell declared a personal interest as a member of Selsey Town Council.

Items 6, 9 and 11 – Cllr Sharp declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Items 9 and 11 – Cllr Sharp declared a personal interest as a member of Chichester City Council.

103 **Chair's Announcements**

Apologies were received from Cllr Apel, Cllr Bangert, Cllr Barrie, Cllr Elliot, Cllr Evans and Cllr Lishman.

104 **Public Question Time**

The following question and answer were heard at the meeting.

Question from Robin Kidd:

An item (IBP/877) in the IBP allocates £420,000 to “Extensions to Chichester City GP surgeries: Langley House.” This GP practice, which provides excellent healthcare to local residents, is being expanded to meet “Housing increase and directly associated GP registration”, as the NHS, with Council support, has decided that a GP practice will not be permitted in the new medical facility, authorised by the Council two weeks ago, at Minerva Heights (the Whitehouse Farm development).

Is this a sound investment of public money by the Council?

1. The practice is based in a Grade-II Listed Building in a conservation area. Even with the extension, I understand that there is some question as to whether the facility will be fully fit-for-purpose, in line with NHS standards (including Health Building Notes (HBNs) and Health Technical Memorandums (HTMs)). The building and the planned extension are understandably constrained by the cramped old building and the site. I note that fitness-for-purpose is in no way a planning question. However it is most certainly a consideration for investment of public money. Why use public money to invest in something which may not be fit for purpose?
2. The Council has declared a Climate Emergency. This investment pays for a scheme whereby those who are ill and need to see a doctor, instead of being seen locally within Minerva Heights, will have to travel into the city centre. Being unwell, it is less likely that patients will be able to walk or cycle to the surgery – instead they will drive or be driven into the crowded and congested city

Answer from Cllr Susan Taylor:

Thank you for your questions.

The main purpose of collecting CIL is to spend it on infrastructure to support the growth identified in the adopted Local Plan in a timely manner. Health facilities are prioritised as essential items of infrastructure. The patient list for Langley House Surgery is full, and all of the other GP practices within Chichester City are close to capacity as a result of the growth of the area. There is thus an urgent need to provide enhanced capacity in order to serve the needs of patients in Chichester City.

Although the West Sussex Coastal Commissioning Group (the CCG) originally identified a need for a new medical centre at Minerva Heights (i.e., West of Chichester), after discussions between the CCG and local GP's, it was clear that there was no interest from them in relocating. So, in 2020 the CCG changed its strategy towards expanding GP's existing practices (subject to obtaining planning permission) as this would be a faster way of meeting the urgent need. Expansions of existing GP surgeries also represent better value for money than the provision of completely new surgeries. The original proposals for a new surgery at Minerva Heights was estimated to cost £4.5m of which £1.75m was requested to be funded from CIL, whereas the CCG has requested a considerably lower sum (£420,000) from CIL to fund the extension of Langley House Surgery. The CCG also currently intends to expand the surgery at Southbourne and to relocate the Cathedral Practice into a new health hub within the Southern Gateway, so delivering a range of improved health facilities.

In terms of your comments regarding the merits of the specific development proposals for Langley House, the matters raised are primarily planning issues for the Council as Local Planning Authority (including the Planning Committee) to consider and not Council in respect of its consideration of the IBP today. I should also emphasise that it is the role of the CCG to decide whether a practice is fit for purpose and how it intends to serve existing and future patients in the Chichester City locality given the level of growth.

In terms of the climate emergency and your comments regarding the need for patients from Minerva Heights to travel, the CCG asked local GP's if they were interested in operating from a new medical centre at the Whitehouse Farm development and none of them expressed interest. GP practices are private businesses who contract their services to the NHS and cannot be forced to operate in a particular location regardless of how sustainable that might be. A practice cannot be built that would stand empty because there is no GP interest in it. In addition, Langley House Surgery is in a sustainable location to serve residents living to the west side of the city and this surgery being located in the city itself is served by a regular bus service.

105 **Recommendation from the Boundary Review Panel - 1 March 2022**

Cllr Oakley proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Purnell.

Cllr Oakley then introduced the report as Chair of the Boundary Review Panel.

Cllr Purnell agreed with the need for a member of the council to attend upcoming hearings as stated in recommendation 4.

Cllr Donna Johnson spoke in favour of the recommendations in particular maintaining the Manhood Peninsula in one parliamentary constituency.

Cllr Hobbs requested clarification of the alternatives.

Mr Mildred explained that the alternative kept the peninsula together but split the Easebourne ward along Lodsworth to another constituency.

Cllr Brown spoke in favour of the recommendations.

Cllr Sutton asked members to consider all wards within the district.

Cllr Sharp supported Cllr Donna Johnson's comments relating to the Manhood Peninsula.

Cllr Purnell explained that there is no direct road connection between Selsey and Bognor.

Cllr Plowman asked whether the local MP has provided comment. Mr Mildred confirmed that there was no submission from Gillian Keegan in the last round.

In summing up Cllr Oakley on behalf of the Boundary Review Panel wished to thank Mr Mildred for the work he put into supporting the Panel.

Cllr Hamilton proposed Cllr Donna Johnson to represent the council as per recommendation 4. This was seconded by Cllr Plowman. In a vote this nomination was carried.

In a vote the following resolutions were carried:

1. The Council notes that the Boundary Review Panel have considered the next round of the consultation on the proposed changes to the Parliamentary boundaries and after reviewing the responses published on the Boundary Commission for England (BCE) website it recommends that Council agree the following additional response is submitted to the BCE for this round of consultation.
2. Chichester District Council have reviewed the responses to the first round of the consultation published on the BCE website and strongly maintains the points raised in its original submission. In particular we would like to re-iterate importance of not splitting the Manhood Peninsula as per the proposed boundaries to avoid the damage that this would do to the local communities and their existing connections and sense of place. The whole of the peninsula shares many consistent issues and works together as a cohesive area and community, the whole of the peninsula also has strong links to Chichester as its major settlement. To split the peninsula would negatively impact its communities, local economy, local common environmental issues and adversely affect the representation of its common issues in Parliament. An example of this is would be the splitting of Primary and Secondary school catchments. The travel links within the proposed Bognor Regis ward would mean Public Document Pack that the areas within that ward on the Manhood Peninsula would need to travel to Chichester to access the rest of the Constituency, again highlighting the lack of the proposed boundary being a coherent area. We note the strength of feeling in the responses from local people and Parish Councils that reflect this whilst other responses from more centralised organisations show an absence in understanding of the local issues.
3. Our alternative worked up proposal in our last response protects the completeness of the Manhood Peninsula and its community whilst maintaining the areas of the Chichester District with the closest relations to the City of Chichester and the A27 Chichester by-pass within the Chichester constituency. The ongoing debate on the future of the A27 and a potential Chichester by-pass is an example of a current

issue that affects the whole of the Manhood Peninsula in its common areas of housing development, local transport links and community cohesion. It also removes the orphan Ward in your original proposal. As a result it ensures that the objectives of your review are met within the Chichester District. We acknowledge that our proposal may cause some knock on effects in constituencies to the east of Chichester but feel that the BCE should work to resolve these issues whilst maintaining the Manhood Peninsula within a single constituency.

4. The Council having considered the Boundary Review Panel recommendation that a representative of the Panel makes representation at one of the upcoming hearings associated with this round of the consultation have appointed Cllr Donna Johnson as above.

106 **Allocation of Commuted Sums to Deliver Affordable Housing**

Cllr Sutton proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Sutton then introduced the report.

Cllr Sharp spoke in favour of the scheme. She explained the issue that remained for the residents is crossing the Bognor Road. Cllr Plowman agreed with Cllr Sharp's comments.

Cllr Moss commended officers for their close work with Greyfriars. He asked how much funding is left. Mrs Rudziak agreed to circulate the information.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

That the allocation of £50,000 commuted sum monies to Chichester Greyfriars Housing Association to fund the delivery of 5 social rented flats at Royal Close, Chichester be agreed.

107 **Chichester Wellbeing**

Cllr Briscoe proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Briscoe then introduced the report.

Cllr Bowden supported the service. He asked regarding page 181 about whether the targets could be made more ambitious. Cllr Briscoe explained that the targets are realistic for the timespan of the course. Mrs Thomas clarified that the targets are in line with NICE guidelines.

Cllr O'Kelly supported the service. With reference to page 181 she asked for more Park Runs and use of apps across the district.

In a vote the following resolutions were carried:

1. To enter into a partnership agreement with West Sussex County Council for 2022/23 – 2026/27 and receive funding annually to deliver the Wellbeing service in line with the agreed business plan.
2. To approve the delegated authority for the Director for Housing and Communities to finalise sign and enter into the Wellbeing partnership agreement with West Sussex County Council.

108 **Consideration of responses and changes following consultation and approval of the Infrastructure Business Plan 2022 for approval and publication**

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

Cllr Taylor then introduced the report.

Cllr O'Kelly spoke against the Langley House Surgery expansion spend favouring spend on newer purpose-built facilities.

Cllr Bell spoke in favour of a new medical facility at White House Farm instead of the Langley House Surgery expansion. He explained that he had wanted to amend the recommendation but had been advised that his amendment would be a major amendment and had missed the amendment deadline and so was therefore declined. Cllr Page and Cllr Bowden agreed with Cllr Bell's comments. Cllr Bowden explained that Cllr Apel wished to note that although she could not be at the meeting she wished members to know that she does not support the project either. Cllr Moss also gave his support to the comments.

Cllr Oakley asked if it is possible to have a condition that if the building were sold the CIL funding could be recovered. He asked the council to monitor the spend of CIL funds allocated to the parishes. Mr Frost explained that once the CIL funds are used for a project the council would not be able to claim that funding back if the building were to be sold.

Cllr Purnell asked if the CIL regulations give an option. Mrs Shepherd explained that members should only take into account three things when making a decision on CIL allocation: was the request for infrastructure; was it related to development growth in the area; and was the infrastructure a priority, as set out in the CIL Policy. The request for CIL funding to expand Langley House Surgery clearly accorded with the CIL Regulations and Council policy. Taken into account other factors were likely to be considered unreasonable. She quoted the Wednesbury Principle. Mrs Shepherd asked members to set out their justifiable reasons if they wished to object in line with the CIL regulations. Mr Bennett explained that if Wednesbury Principles are breached it is maladministration and would be subject to challenge.

Cllr Briscoe asked members to submit the arguments to the CCG who spend the funding. Cllr Plowman explained that he would be taking the matter up with the CCG.

Cllr Hobbs asked for clarification of whether the funding is committed to the building extension of Langley House Surgery. Mr Frost confirmed that is the case. A full business case would be submitted to Mrs Dower.

Mrs Shepherd clarified that members could choose to vote against but needed to consider reasons for objections as the current reasons expressed by some members could be subject to legal challenge.

Cllr Sharp asked whether it is possible for projects to move in and out of the IBP. Cllr Taylor explained that projects that are changed are at the request of the organisations providing the projects.

Cllr Brown explained that he would make his vote based on the Southbourne project.

A recorded vote was held:

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

For = 22

Against = 1

Abstain = 7

Absent = 6

The following resolutions were carried:

1. That Council approves the proposed responses to the representations received and subsequent modifications to the Draft Infrastructure Business Plan 2022- 2027 as set out in Appendix 1.
2. That Council approves the amended IBP including the CIL Spending Plan attached as Appendix 2.

Members took a 10 minute break.

109 **Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement 2022-2023**

Cllr Wilding proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Wilding then introduced the report.

Cllr Oakley asked whether the salaries quoted in the report included employers pension contribution and what was the percentage rate that each employer paid for pension costs. Mrs Shepherd explained that they did not include employers pension costs. Mr Ward advised that he believed the pension rate for the employer was 18.3% but would confirm outside the meeting. *Following the meeting Mr Ward confirmed that the pension rate was 18.4%.*

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

That the Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement 2022-2023 as amended be agreed for publication.

110 **Motion from Cllr Bill Brisbane**

Cllr Brisbane proposed his motion. This was seconded by Cllr Sharp. The Motion was as follows:

This Council believes that enhanced active travel combined with road safety measures are of importance and this Council resolves to:

Support WSCC's review of Road Safety, which will include consideration of speed limits, Quiet Lane and road marking Policies;

Consider specific proposals for new 20mph limits and Quiet Lanes when they are open for public consultation, taking into account all relevant factors such as safety, practicality, promotion of active travel, National Policies, needs of vulnerable users and air quality impacts, noting this Council's Climate Emergency Declaration; and

Encourage Residents and Councillors to report to WSCC worn road markings, damaged/defective road signs (including existing 20mph signage) and other Highway defects and safety issues.

Cllr Plowman spoke in favour of the Motion bringing down the average speed in the area.

Cllr O'Kelly spoke in favour of the Motion in particular the inclusion of Quiet Lanes and the benefits of speed reduction to road safety.

Cllr Sutton spoke in favour of the Motion and explained the work that is ongoing in the district to address the points in the Motion.

Cllr Moss spoke in favour of the Motion and explained the importance of getting parish and town council support to take forward to the county council.

Cllr Bell spoke in favour of the Motion and agreed that the parish and town council support is also required.

Cllr Duncton spoke in favour of the Motion in particular the inclusion of roads outside of the city centre.

Cllr Brown spoke in favour of the Motion in particular the steer towards reduction in fossil fuel dependency.

Cllr Oakley asked members to consider the practicalities and wording of Motions.

Cllr Sharp spoke in favour of the Motion. She asked members to consider the appropriate speeds for roads in the district.

Cllr Brisbane in summing up welcomed the general consensus to his Motion.

In a vote the Motion was carried as follows:

This Council believes that enhanced active travel combined with road safety measures are of importance and this Council resolves to:

Support WSCC's review of Road Safety, which will include consideration of speed limits, Quiet Lane and road marking Policies;

Consider specific proposals for new 20mph limits and Quiet Lanes when they are open for public consultation, taking into account all relevant factors such as safety, practicality, promotion of active travel, National Policies, needs of vulnerable users and air quality impacts, noting this Council's Climate Emergency Declaration; and

Encourage Residents and Councillors to report to WSCC worn road markings, damaged/defective road signs (including existing 20mph signage) and other Highway defects and safety issues.

111 **Outside Body Appointments**

The Chairman explained that the Council is requested to agree the appointment of Mrs Sarah Peyman to the Bourne Community College Governing Body and the Bourne Trust Board and; to appoint Mrs Jane Hotchkiss as a Director on the Culture Spark Limited Board for the duration of the Culture Spark Project.

Mr Bennett outlined the reason for the proposed changes.

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

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

1. The Council agrees the appointment of Sarah Peyman to Bourne Community College Governing Body and Bourne Trust Board.
2. The Council agrees the appointment of Jane Hotchkiss to sit as a Director on the Culture Spark Limited Board for the duration of the Culture Spark Project.

**Cllr Bowden left the meeting at 16.49*

**Cllr McAra left the meeting at 16.52*

**Cllr Donna Johnson & Cllr Tim Johnson left the meeting at 16.53*

**Cllr Palmer left the meeting at 16.54*

Cllr Hobbs explained that the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee had discussed *Questions to the Executive*. Cllr O'Kelly had suggested that the Chair asks the room if there are any similar questions and if there are increase the time on that question to five minutes to cover off the similar points. This is the approach of the County Council. Cllr Hobbs added that the Committee had also discussed reducing the time to 30 minutes. He explained that Cllr Brown had also suggested that where a full answer cannot be provided that an acceptable response would be to come back after the meeting with the full response. The Committee had also agreed to respect the time allowed by the Chair.

Cllr Bell asked the Leader and the Chief Executive if they were aware of the company Wellbeck Strategic Land LLP which sites its main business is in the south of England with a main partner of Nottingham County Council. Mrs Shepherd explained that it is linked to the County Council's pension fund and is not unique in its approach to get the best result for its members. Mr Ward explained that the West Sussex County Council fund is managed by an external source.

Cllr Plowman asked for clarification of the graffiti policy and whether the council still has contractors to deal with graffiti. He also asked for information on the status of the House of Fraser building. Cllr Dignum explained that he had been made aware that a company was looking into the building but there is no further information at this time. Cllr Lintill explained that there is a small budget for graffiti. SLT were due to consider a report to then pass to Cabinet for further discussion. Cllr Oakley asked what is done about graffiti on private property. Mrs Shepherd said that point will be covered by the report to Cabinet.

Cllr Sharp asked what the council could do to support Ukraine and whether members could all consider using the bus. Cllr Lintill explained that not everyone could travel on the bus but some members travelled using electric vehicles.

Cllr Hobbs asked about the council's requirement from central government to support the Ukraine refugees and if the council had any spare accommodation to help Ukraine refugees. Cllr Sutton explained that further detail is needed from central government but the council was already looking at what could be done. Mrs Rudziak explained that the council has not been asked to provide housing. The County Council would be responsible for support provision to refugees. She added that the council may be asked to review housing standards before refugees are placed but this was yet to be confirmed. The council's website had been updated with all the latest information. Cllr Plowman added that the Chichester Community Network would be meeting to see what they could do to help. Members echoed their thanks to community groups across the district who had been working to support the Ukraine refugees.

Cllr Oakley asked how many bags of waste were collected this year on the annual litter pick of the A27 and what the cost of that was. He also asked what was being done to find those who litter. Cllr Plant confirmed that the works took place at night for safety over 15 nights costing £47,000 collecting a total of 420 bags litter and 16 van loads of miscellaneous items. This is a 12% reduction on the previous year. The council works with National Highways. Identifying those is difficult as the resource is not currently available.

Cllr O’Kelly asked about whether the district would be able to get County Council public realm funding as Littlehampton has. Cllr Dignum explained that the Gigabit project and pavements project would be put forward.

113 **Late Items**

There were no late items.

114 **Exclusion of the press and public**

There was no requirement to exclude the public or the press.

The meeting ended at 5.30 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

Annual Council

17 May 2022

Review of Political Balance

1. Contact

Report Author

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

2. Recommendation

2.1. **That the review of political balance arrangements set out below be noted.**

3. Background

3.1. The council has a duty, under Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 to maintain the representation of different political groups in line with the political balance rules set out in the Act and subordinate regulations. This provides the framework for the appointments to committees.

3.2. The framework is a starting point, members will note that a number of “gifts” of entitlement from one group to another have taken place previously and group leaders have indicated that they continue to wish to have the seats appointed other than exactly in accordance with the statutory framework. For example, whilst technically the Labour Councillor is not in a group and has no entitlement, members have allocated her seats.

4. Proposal - the rules and their application

4.1. The composition of the Council by Group is as follows:

Conservatives = 17 (48.57%)
Liberal Democrats = 11 (31.43%)
Green = 2 (5.71%)
Labour = 1 (0%) as not a group
Local Alliance = 2 (5.71%)
Independent Group = 3 (8.57%)

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

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

d) Subject to (c) each political group is entitled to its proportion of the number of seats on each individual committee.

4.3. If more than one minority group are the same size where their entitlement to seats on a committee is less than one, one or other group should take its entitlement. This means the minority groups may wish to reach agreement between themselves as to which group should take each seat. If they both put forward a nomination the Full Council will determine which nomination should be granted the seat. Additionally as Labour have only one seat, they do not form a group for the purposes of these calculations.

4.4. The four ordinary committees concerned are:

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

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

Conservatives	38 x composition 48.57% = 18.46 seats (19)
Liberal Democrats	38 x composition 31.43% = 11.94 seats (12)
Green Party	38 x composition 5.71% = 2.17 seats (2)
Labour (Not a Group)	38 x composition 0 % = No seats (0)
Local Alliance	38 x composition 5.71% = 2.17 seats (2)
Independent Group	38 x composition 8.57% = 3.26 seats (3)

4.6. If these proportions are applied to individual committees the initial position under the statutory framework are as indicated in Table 1:

Table 1	Con	LD	Green	Labour	Local Alliance	Independent Group
Corporate Governance and Audit Committee (8)	4	3	0*	0	0*	1
Planning Committee (13)	6	4	1*	0	1*	1
Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee and General Licensing Committee (10)	5	3	0* (1)	0	0*	1
Standards Committee (7)	4	2	0	0	0* (1)	0
Total	18	12	2	0	2	(3)

4.7. The equal entitlement of the Green and Local Alliance parties means that Council needs to decide upon which of those parties has a seat on the Alcohol and Licensing Committee. Each of these parties is entitled to two seats across the four committees shown above.

4.8. The Independent Group have seats as of right as a proportion of each committee, but this results in them holding four seats so Council needs to decide which Committee they do not hold a position though additionally the

Conservatives have gifted a seat in their entitlement to the Licensing Committee to the Independent Group member and nominated Chairman, Cllr McAra.

4.9. The Conservatives have an entitlement to 18 seats as a proportion of each committee, but they are entitled to 19 seats in total, so Council needs to decide which additional seat they should have.

4.10. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is not included in the list above but the seats on it still need to be allocated to parties in the proportion of seats that they have on the whole Council as indicated in Table 2 below. In this case there are 2 remaining seats that need to be allocated between the three minority groups. By agreement between the groups these will now be held by the independent and labour parties. It is intended that the Local Alliance party will seek to have an observing position in that Committee as was done last year for the Green Party (which in turn reversed the position in 2020).

4.11. Final membership informally agreed for Overview and Scrutiny is as follows in table 2. Additionally it has been agreed at this committee that a rotating non voting seat with right of attendance be granted as set out in the appendix.

Table 2	Con	LD	Green	Labour	Local Alliance	Independent Group
Overview and Scrutiny Committee (11)	5	3	1	1	Non Voting Rep	1

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

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

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

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

- a) a political group does not use up its allocation (regulations 13 to 15).

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

5. Alternatives Considered

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

6. Resource and Legal Implications

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

7. Consultation

7.1. The Leader has discussed the above with all Group Leaders.

8. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

8.1. None.

9. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
If you tick "Yes", list your impact assessment as a background paper in paragraph 13 and explain any major risks in paragraph 9		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder The Council has a duty "to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area". Do the proposals in the report have any implications for increasing or reducing crime and disorder?		✓
Climate Change and Biodiversity Are there any implications for the mitigation of/adaptation to climate change or biodiversity issues? If in doubt, seek advice from the Environmental Strategy Unit (ESU).		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact You should complete an Equality Impact Assessment when developing new services, policies or projects or significantly changing existing ones. For more information, see Equalities FAQs and guidance on the intranet or contact Corporate Policy.		✓
Safeguarding and Early Help The Council has a duty to cooperate with others to safeguard children and adults at risk. Do these proposals have any implication for either increasing or reducing the levels of risk to children or adults at risk? The Council has committed to dealing with issues at the earliest opportunity, do these proposals have any implication in reducing or increasing demand on Council		✓

services?		
<p>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) Does the subject of the report have significant implications for processing data likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of individuals? Processing that is likely to result in a high risk includes (but is not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • systematic and extensive processing activities and where decisions that have legal effects – or similarly significant effects – on individuals. • large scale processing of special categories of data or personal data relation to criminal convictions or offences. • Any larger scale processing of personal data that affects a large number of individuals; and involves a high risk to rights and freedoms eg based on the sensitivity of the processing activity. • large scale, systematic monitoring of public areas (including by CCTV). <p>Note - If a high risk is identified a Privacy Impact Assessment must be provided to the Data Protection Officer.</p>		✓
<p>Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>The Council has made a commitment to ‘help our communities be healthy and active’. You should consider both the positive and negative impacts of your proposal on the health and wellbeing of communities and individuals living and working in the district. Is your proposal likely to impact positively or negatively on certain groups and their ability to make healthy choices, for example low income families, carers, older people/children and young people. Are there implications that impact on areas of the district differently? eg the rural areas or those wards where health inequalities exist. If in doubt ask for advice from the Health and Wellbeing team.</p>		✓
Other (please specify)		✓

10. Appendices

10.1. None.

11. Background Papers

11.1. None.

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

Annual Council

17 May 2022

Appointment to Committees

1. Contact

Lisa Higenbottam – Democratic Services Manager
 Telephone: 01243 534684 e-mail: lhigenbottam@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

2.1. That the Council agrees the Committee memberships as set out in the appendix to the report.

3. Background

3.1 The Council is required to appoint Committee memberships at its annual meeting.

4. Alternatives Considered

4.1. Appointments are required for the effective running of the Council’s committees.

5. Resource and Legal Implications

5.1. This is a statutory requirement.

6. Consultation

6.1. Appointments are discussed with the Group Leaders.

7. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

7.1. Appointments are made in line with Political Balance requirements.

8. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder The Council has a duty “to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area”. Do the proposals in the report have any implications for increasing or reducing crime and disorder?		✓
Climate Change and Biodiversity Are there any implications for the mitigation of/adaptation to climate change or biodiversity issues? If in doubt, seek advice from the Environmental Strategy Unit (ESU).		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact You should complete an Equality Impact Assessment when developing new services, policies or projects or significantly changing existing ones. For more		✓

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

9. Appendices

9.1. List of Committee Memberships 2022/23

10. Background Papers

10.1. None.

Annual Council

17 May 2022

List of Committee Memberships 2022/23

Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee and General Licensing Committee

Membership = 4 Conservatives, 3 Liberal Democrats, 2 Independent (1 gifted from Conservatives), 1 Green

2021/22 Membership	Proposed 2022/23 Membership
Chair – Cllr Gordon McAra (Indep)	Chair – Cllr Gordon McAra (Indep)
Vice-Chair – Cllr Adrian Moss (Lib Dem)	Vice-Chair – Cllr Adrian Moss (Lib Dem)
Cllr Tracie Bangert (Lib Dem)	Cllr Tracie Bangert (Lib Dem)
Cllr Heather Barrie (Green)	Cllr Heather Barrie (Green)
Cllr John Elliott (Cons)	Cllr John Elliott (Cons)
Cllr Gareth Evans (Lib Dem)	Cllr Gareth Evans (Lib Dem)
Cllr Christopher Page (Indep)	Cllr Christopher Page (Indep)
Cllr Henry Potter (Cons)	Cllr Henry Potter (Cons)
Cllr Alan Sutton (Cons)	Cllr Alan Sutton (Cons)
Cllr Susan Taylor (Cons)	Cllr Susan Taylor (Cons)

Appeals Committee

Membership = 4 Conservatives, 2 Liberal Democrats, 1 Labour Party

2021/22 Membership	Proposed 2022/23 Membership
Chair – Cllr Peter Wilding (Cons)	Chair – Cllr Peter Wilding (Cons)
Vice-Chair – Cllr Sarah Lishman (Lab)	Vice-Chair – Cllr Sarah Lishman (Lab)
Cllr Francis Hobbs (Cons)	Cllr Francis Hobbs (Cons)
Cllr Adrian Moss (Lib Dem)	Cllr Adrian Moss (Lib Dem)
Cllr Penny Plant (Cons)	Cllr Penny Plant (Cons)
Cllr Clare Apel (Lib Dem) (Reserve)	Cllr Clare Apel (Lib Dem) (Reserve)
Cllr Susan Taylor (Cons) (Reserve)	Cllr Susan Taylor (Cons) (Reserve)

Corporate Governance and Audit Committee

Membership = 4 Conservatives, 3 Liberal Democrats, 1 Independent

2022/22 Membership	Proposed 2022/23 Membership
Chair – Cllr Francis Hobbs (Cons)	Chair – Cllr Francis Hobbs (Cons)
Vice-Chair – Cllr Kate O’Kelly (Lib Dem)	Vice-Chair – Cllr Jonathan Brown (Lib Dem)
Cllr Heather Barrie (Green)	Cllr Kate O’Kelly (Lib Dem)
Cllr Jonathan Brown (Lib Dem)	Cllr Lib Dem choice
Cllr Tony Dignum (Cons)	Cllr Tony Dignum (Cons)
Cllr Timothy Johnson (Local Alliance)	Independent Choice
Cllr David Palmer (Cons)	Cllr David Palmer (Cons)
Cllr Peter Wilding (Cons)	Cllr Peter Wilding (Cons)

Investigation and Disciplinary Committee

Membership = 4 Conservatives, 2 Liberal Democrats, 1 Green Party

2021/22 Membership	Proposed 2022/23 Membership
Chair – Cllr Clare Apel (Lib Dem)	Chair – Cllr Clare Apel (Lib Dem)
Vice-Chair – Cllr Susan Taylor (Cons)	Vice-Chair – Cllr Susan Taylor (Cons)
Cllr Gareth Evans (Lib Dem)	Cllr Gareth Evans (Lib Dem)
Cllr Carol Purnell (Cons)	Cllr Carol Purnell (Cons)
Cllr Alan Sutton (Cons)	Cllr Alan Sutton (Cons)
Cllr Heather Barrie (Green) (Substitute)	Cllr Heather Barrie (Green) (Substitute)
Cllr Peter Wilding (Cons) (Substitute)	Cllr Peter Wilding (Cons) (Substitute)

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Membership 2022/23 – 5 Conservatives, 3 Liberal Democrats, 1 Independent, 1 Labour, 1 Local Alliance and 1 Green (non-voting member from a minority party)

2021/22 Membership	Proposed 2022/23 Membership
Chair – Cllr Clare Apel (Lib Dem)	Chair – Cllr Clare Apel (Lib Dem)
Vice-Chair – Cllr Tracie Bangert (Lib Dem)	Vice-Chair – Cllr Tracie Bangert (Lib Dem)
Cllr Graeme Barrett (Cons)	Cllr Graeme Barrett (Cons)
Cllr Norma Graves (Cons)	Cllr Norma Graves (Cons)
Cllr Timothy Johnson (Local Alliance)	Cllr Timothy Johnson (Local Alliance)
Cllr Adrian Moss (Lib Dem)	Cllr Sarah Lishman (Lab)
Cllr David Palmer (Cons)	Cllr Adrian Moss (Lib Dem)
Cllr Christopher Page (Indep)	Cllr David Palmer (Cons)
Cllr Henry Potter (Cons)	Cllr Christopher Page (Indep)
Cllr Carol Purnell (Cons)	Cllr Henry Potter (Cons)
Cllr Sarah Sharp (Green)	Cllr Carol Purnell (Cons)
Non-Voting - Cllr Sarah Lishman (Lab)	Non-Voting - Cllr Sarah Sharp (Green)

Planning Committee

Membership = 6 Conservatives, 4 Liberal Democrats, 1 Green Party, 1 Independent, 1 Local Alliance

2021/22 Membership	Proposed 2022/23 Membership
Chair – Cllr Carol Purnell (Cons)	Chair – Cllr Carol Purnell (Cons)
Vice-Chair – Cllr John-Henry Bowden (Lib Dem)	Vice-Chair – Cllr John-Henry Bowden (Lib Dem)
Cllr Graeme Barrett (Cons)	Cllr Graeme Barrett (Cons)
Cllr Roy Briscoe (Cons)	Cllr Bill Brisbane (Lib Dem)
Cllr Judy Fowler (Lib Dem)	Cllr Roy Briscoe (Cons)
Cllr Donna Johnson (Local Alliance)	Cllr Judy Fowler (Lib Dem)
Cllr Gordon McAra (Indep)	Cllr Donna Johnson (Local Alliance)
Cllr Simon Oakley (Cons)	Cllr Simon Oakley (Cons)
Cllr Richard Plowman (Lib Dem) then Cllr Bill Brisbane (Lib Dem)	Cllr Gordon McAra (Indep)

Cllr Henry Potter (Cons)	Cllr Henry Potter (Cons)
Cllr David Rodgers (Lib Dem)	Cllr David Rodgers (Lib Dem)
Cllr Sarah Sharp (Green)	Cllr Sarah Sharp (Green)
Cllr Peter Wilding (Cons)	Cllr Peter Wilding (Cons)

Standards Committee

Membership = 4 Conservatives, 2 Liberal Democrats, 1 Local Alliance

2021/22 Membership	Proposed 2022/23 Membership
Chair – Cllr Richard Plowman (Lib Dem)	Chair – Cllr Richard Plowman (Lib Dem)
Vice-Chair – Cllr Susan Taylor (Cons)	Vice-Chair – Cllr Susan Taylor (Cons)
Cllr Clare Apel (Lib Dem)	Cllr Clare Apel (Lib Dem)
Cllr Norma Graves (Cons)	Cllr Norma Graves (Cons)
Cllr Tim Johnson (Local Alliance)	Cllr Tim Johnson (Local Alliance)
Cllr Carol Purnell (Cons)	Cllr Carol Purnell (Cons)
Cllr Alan Sutton (Cons)	Cllr Alan Sutton (Cons)

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

Annual Council

17 May 2022

Appointment to External Bodies

1. Contact

Lisa Higenbottam – Democratic Services Manager
Telephone: 01243 534684 e-mail: lhigenbottam@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

2.1. That the Council agrees by vote the following contested External Organisation appointments as detailed in the appendix to the report:

- a) Chichester Community Development Trust – nominations are Cllr Tony Dignum (current appointment) and Cllr Jonathan Brown
- b) Chichester College Group – Corporation Board of Governors – nominations are Cllr Susan Taylor (current appointment) and Cllr Richard Plowman

2.2. That the Council agrees all remaining appointments to the external bodies as set out in the appendix to the report.

3. Background

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

4. Alternatives Considered

4.1. There are no alternatives as the Council makes its appointments at its annual meeting each year.

5. Resource and Legal Implications

5.1. A position as an appointed representative of the Council is dealt with differently to a normal position with another body as the appointees are present on behalf of council and not personal interests.

6. Consultation

6.1. Appointments are discussed with the Group Leaders.

7. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

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

8. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following? If you tick "Yes", list your impact assessment as a background paper in paragraph 13 and explain any major risks in paragraph 9		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder The Council has a duty "to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area". Do the proposals in the report have any implications for increasing or reducing crime and disorder?		✓
Climate Change and Biodiversity Are there any implications for the mitigation of/adaptation to climate change or biodiversity issues? If in doubt, seek advice from the Environmental Strategy Unit (ESU).		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact You should complete an Equality Impact Assessment when developing new services, policies or projects or significantly changing existing ones. For more information, see Equalities FAQs and guidance on the intranet or contact Corporate Policy.		✓
Safeguarding and Early Help The Council has a duty to cooperate with others to safeguard children and adults at risk. Do these proposals have any implication for either increasing or reducing the levels of risk to children or adults at risk? The Council has committed to dealing with issues at the earliest opportunity, do these proposals have any implication in reducing or increasing demand on Council services?		✓
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) Does the subject of the report have significant implications for processing data likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of individuals? Processing that is likely to result in a high risk includes (but is not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • systematic and extensive processing activities and where decisions that have legal effects – or similarly significant effects – on individuals. • large scale processing of special categories of data or personal data relation to criminal convictions or offences. • Any larger scale processing of personal data that affects a large number of individuals; and involves a high risk to rights and freedoms eg based on the sensitivity of the processing activity. • large scale, systematic monitoring of public areas (including by CCTV). Note - If a high risk is identified a Privacy Impact Assessment must be provided to the Data Protection Officer.		✓
Health and Wellbeing The Council has made a commitment to 'help our communities be healthy and active'. You should consider both the positive and negative impacts of your proposal on the health and wellbeing of communities and individuals living and working in the district. Is your proposal likely to impact positively or negatively on certain groups and their ability to make healthy choices, for example low income families, carers, older people/children and young people. Are there implications that impact on areas of the district differently? eg the		✓

rural areas or those wards where health inequalities exist. If in doubt ask for advice from the Health and Wellbeing team.		
Other (please specify)		✓

9. **Appendices**

9.1. List of Appointments to External Bodies 2022/23.

10. **Background Papers**

10.1. None.

This page is intentionally left blank

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

APPOINTMENTS TO EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS 2022/23

(Number of representatives shown in brackets)

ORGANISATION	CURRENT REPRESENTATIVES 2021-2022	PROPOSED REPRESENTATIVES 2022-2023
1. Action in Rural Sussex (1)	Kate O'Kelly (LD)	Kate O'Kelly (LD)
2. Brandy Hole and East Broyle Copse – Local Nature Reserve Management Board (1)	Clare Apel (LD)	Clare Apel (LD)
3. Chichester Business Improvement District Board (1 + alternative director)	Tony Dignum (C) <i>Alternative Director – Clare Apel (LD)</i>	Tony Dignum (C) <i>Alternative Director – Clare Apel (LD)</i>
4. Chichester Community Development Trust (1)	Tony Dignum (C)	*Tony Dignum (C) or Jonathan Brown (LD) (a vote will be required)
5. Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee (1)	Richard Plowman (LD)	Bill Brisbane (LD)
6. Chichester Festival Theatre (1)	Judy Fowler (LD)	Judy Fowler (LD)
7. Chichester Ship Canal Restoration Project Board (1)	No appointment made 2019	
8. Chichester Vision Delivery Steering Group (1)	Martyn Bell (IND)	Martyn Bell (IND)
9. Coastal West Sussex Partnership (1+ substitute)	Adrian Moss (LD) <i>Substitute – Eileen Lintill (C)</i>	Adrian Moss (LD) <i>Substitute – Eileen Lintill (C)</i>
10. Coast to Capital Joint Committee (2)	Eileen Lintill (C) Adrian Moss (LD)	Eileen Lintill (C) Adrian Moss (LD)
11. Community Safety Partnership (1)	Roy Briscoe (C)	Roy Briscoe (C)
12. District Councils' Network (1)	Eileen Lintill (C)	Eileen Lintill (C)
13. Goodwood Aerodrome Consultative Committee (1)	John-Henry Bowden (LD)	John-Henry Bowden (LD)
14. Goodwood Motor Circuit Consultative Committee (1)	Richard Plowman (LD)	Richard Plowman (LD)
15. iESE Transformation Limited (1)	Peter Wilding (C)	Peter Wilding (C)
16. Local Government Association – Coastal Issues Special Interest Group (1)	Penny Plant (C)	Penny Plant (C)
17. Local Government Association – General Assembly (1)	Eileen Lintill (C)	Eileen Lintill (C)
18. Local Government Association – Sparsity Partnership for Delivering Rural Services (1)	Kate O'Kelly (LD)	Kate O'Kelly (LD)
19. Manhood Peninsula Partnership (1)	Graeme Barrett (C)	Graeme Barrett (C)
20. Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) (a) PUSH Joint Committee (2)	(a) Susan Taylor, Diane Shepherd, Chief Executive	(a) Susan Taylor, Diane Shepherd, Chief Executive

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

Longer Term Appointments

ORGANISATION	CURRENT REPRESENTATIVE	PROPOSED REPRESENTATIVE 2022-2023
40. Bourne Community College Governing Body (1)	(4 year appointment until 2021) Diane Shepherd – Chief Executive	Sarah Peyman
41. Bourne Trust Board (1)	(4 year appointment until 2021) Diane Shepherd – Chief Executive	Sarah Peyman
42. Chichester College Group Corporation Board of Governors (1)	(4 year appointment until 2021) Cllr Susan Taylor will proceed as Council representative	* Susan Taylor (C) or Richard Plowman (LD) A vote will be required
43. Chichester Harbour Conservancy (2 + 2 deputies)	(3 year appointment until 2022) Adrian Moss (LD) Graeme Barrett (C) Reserve: Penny Plant (C)	Adrian Moss (LD) Graeme Barrett (C) Reserve Penny Plant (C)
44. Pallant House Gallery – Trust and Company (1)	(Up to 4 year appointment expiring on any 30 September) Clare Apel (LD) Note that Cllr Apels position was reconfirmed during the year to match PHG membership cycle.	Clare Apel (LD)
45. Pallant House Gallery - Public Programmes Advisory Group	Tracie Bangert (LD)	Tracie Bangert (LD)
46. South Downs National Park Authority (1)	(Appointment is for councillor's term of office) Henry Potter (C)	Henry Potter (C)

Notes:

Sussex Downs and Coastal Plain LEADER Local Action Group – No longer required but Jonathan Brown (LD) to maintain the link for information purposes.

Water Neutrality Board – No formal appointment required but Eileen Lintill (C) or Susan Taylor (C) to maintain the link for information purposes.

This page is intentionally left blank

Chichester District Council

Council

17 May 2022

Levelling Up – Round Two Application for funding

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Diane Shepherd – Chief Executive

Tel: 01243 534710 Email: dshepherd@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Eileen Lintill – Leader of the Council

Tel: 01798 342948 Email: elintill@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Council approves that an application to the Levelling Up Round two (LUF(2)) is submitted and that delegated authority is approved for Chief Executive, Director for Corporate Services and the Director for Growth and Place to submit the application in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition.**
- 2.2 Council approves that a UK Shared Prosperity Investment Plan is submitted, and that delegated authority is approved for Chief Executive, Director for Corporate Services and the Director for Growth and Place to submit the Investment Plan in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition.**

3. Background

Levelling up Fund Round Two

- 3.1** The Levelling Up Fund is a £4.8 billion fund to contribute to the levelling up agenda by investing in infrastructure that improves everyday life across the UK. The fund is distributed through a competitive bidding process. A first round of funding was launched last year, with successful projects announced in October 2021. Out of 305 bids, 105 projects were awarded funding totalling £1.7 billion. The prospectus for the second round of Levelling Up Fund money was published in March and the full details of the funding can be found at www.gov.uk
- 3.2** All Local Authorities have been assigned a priority category based on an index assessing their need for economic recovery and growth, improved transport connectivity and/or regeneration, with Priority Category 1 indicating the highest

need. The index has been updated for the second round of funding and Chichester has been moved up from Priority Category 3 to Priority Category 2.

3.3. District Councils are eligible to submit as many bids as they have whole and partial constituencies within their boundaries. Consequently, CDC would be eligible to submit 2 bids, however for the Arundel and Southdowns constituency, Horsham District Council will be the lead authority this means that CDC will be focusing on a bid for the Chichester constituency. There is no commitment that there will be funding rounds beyond this one, and instead Local Authorities are encouraged to bid in this round.

3.4 Bids can be for any of the investment priorities set out in the guidance, the funding priorities are:

- **Transport** – projects that would sit under this priority would be delivered by Transport Authorities and include improvements to public transport, active travel, and roads. Projects to reduce carbon emissions, improve air quality, cut congestion, support economic growth and/or improve the safety/security and overall experience of users will be considered.
- **Regeneration and Town Centre Investment** – projects that:
 - upgrade eyesore buildings and dated infrastructure or remove them to make way for new development,
 - regenerate existing leisure or retail sites to improve security and connectivity and encourage new businesses or public services to locate there,
 - acquire and/or regenerate brownfield sites for commercial or residential use
 - improve the public realm, including high streets, parks, and green spaces, designing out opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour and increasing accessibility for people with disabilities
- **Cultural and Heritage Investment** - This relates to cultural, creative, heritage or sporting assets or any asset that supports the visitor economy. Community hubs, spaces and assets are also included. Projects could include acquiring, maintaining, upgrading, regenerating, or repurposing these assets, or creating new ones. Accessibility improvements or protecting assets from crime and anti-social behaviour.

3.5 The deadline for funding applications is 12 noon on Wednesday 6 July 2022. Full bids with all required supporting documentation must be submitted via an online application portal by that date. Successful projects must be able to demonstrate spend from the fund in 2022/23 and the Government expects, with limited exceptions, all funding will be spent by 31 March 2025. The fund will focus on smaller scale local interventions requiring £20m or less in funding. Levelling Up funding can be used in conjunction with other sources of funding.

3.5 Bids should focus on high priority and high impact interventions. Up to 3 projects may sit under one bid, if they represent a coherent set of interventions. The bid

should be clear which investment priority the intervention is targeted towards but projects that cross priorities are allowed if this is a genuine reflection of local needs and priorities. Bids should be aligned to other relevant Government targets and strategies as well as local ones and comply with all relevant UK legislation and Local stakeholders and MPs should be engaged when developing proposals.

3.6 Bids will first have to pass a gateway assessment and then be further assessed against 4 criteria:

- **Characteristics of Place** – As determined by the Priority Category assigned to a Local Authority.
- **Strategic Fit** – How well the bid fits with local and national priorities (including published plans and strategies) and how far it is supported by relevant local stakeholders
- **Economic Case** – How well the intended outcomes of the bid represent value to society and value for money, in terms of both quantitative and qualitative benefits
- **Deliverability** – How well the bid demonstrates robust management and delivery plans.

Assessment and moderation on these criteria will result in a shortlist of bids, which will then be submitted to Ministers for funding decisions. Ministers will aim to ensure a balance of projects across the funding priorities and across the UK with a decision on any funding allocations due in the Autumn 2022

UK Shared Prosperity Funding

3.7 The £2.6bn UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF), is intended to replace EU structural funds following the UK's exit from the EU. It aligns with the objectives set out in Levelling Up White Paper, with the primary goal being to build pride of place and increase life chances, the funding priorities are:

- **Communities and Place** – enabling investment in restoring community spaces and relationships and creating foundations for economic development at a neighbourhood-level. Outputs under this theme should strengthen the social fabric of communities and support building pride in place.
- **Support for Local Businesses** – interventions that support local businesses to thrive, innovate and grow.
- **People and Skills** – reducing barriers to employment some people face and supporting them to move towards employment and education. Can also include targeting of funding towards skills to support employment and local growth. This theme will not be prioritised under 2024/25

3.8 Funding for the UKSPF is allocated rather than applied for and CDC's allocation is £1m over the 3 years of the fund broken down as 22/23 £105,750, 23/24 £211,500 and 24/25 £682,750. This is the minimum allocation and is in line with other similar Districts locally.

3.9 Access to the funding is dependent on production of an Investment Plan for the area, setting out measurable outcomes the Local Authority (LA) is looking to deliver and what interventions they are prioritising to do this. Investment Plans will be reviewed and approved by the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC). Where a Plan is not signed off on first submission, the LA will receive feedback and the opportunity to resubmit. The deadline for the submission of the Investment Plan and all supporting documentation is the 1 August 2022 with the first payment expected from October 2022.

3.10 Investment Plans should reflect the balance of local needs and priorities. Match funding is encouraged but not required to access the UKSPF, acceptable uses of the UKSPF funding include:

- issuing of grants to public or private organisations
- commissioning of third-party organisations
- procurement of service provision
- funding of in-house provision
- issuing of loans (this will require specific expertise and closer scrutiny)

Investment Plans need to be developed in partnership with other local organisations such as local businesses, relevant sectoral representatives e.g. tourism bodies, community groups and the local MP should have the opportunity to review an Investment Plan before it is submitted.

4. Proposal

4.1 It is proposed that an application is submitted to the LUF(2) for up to three projects. A long list of projects have been discussed with leaders of the Groups and a draft short list of proposed projects has been agreed. In order to meet the timeframe these projects need to be largely in our control in order to meet the deliverability criteria.

4.2 Due to the scale and complexity of the process plus the short time frame an urgent decision was approved by the Leader of the Council and the Chair of Overview and scrutiny in consultation with the Leader of the opposition on the 4 May 2022, to approve a budget of up to £125,000 to appoint consultants to assist with the process. The figure of £125,000 was used as this is the figure that the Government allocates to Local Authorities in category one to assist them in making an application.

4.3 This short list of projects will be discussed with the consultants and assessed against the criteria before a final shortlist is produced to work on for the final detailed submission before the 6 July 2022.

4.4 Due to the tight timescales it is proposed that the Chief Executive, Director of Corporate Services and Director of Growth and Place, under delegated authority, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition party agree the final submission.

4.5 It is proposed that a UKSPF investment Plan is submitted to (DLUHC) which covers projects from across the district which already have some form of partnership or stakeholder involvement and/or are supported by a strategic plan and meet the criteria set out by Government for the release of the £1m allocation to CDC.

4.6 As with the levelling up process due to the tight timescales it is proposed that the Chief Executive, Director of Corporate Services and Director of Growth and Place, under delegated authority, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition party agree the final Investment Plan to be submitted.

5. Resource and Legal Implications

5.1 Due to the scale and complexity of the LUF(2) application process plus the short time frame to submission an urgent decision was approved by the Leader of the Council and the Chair of Overview and scrutiny in consultation with the Leader of the Opposition on the 4 May 202, to approve a budget of up to £125,000 to appoint consultants as indicated in section 4.2, this is the figure that the Government allocates to Local Authorities in category one to assist them in making an application.

5.2 As part of the application process 10% match funding is required, this match funding can be CDC funding ie ARP, partnership funding or external grant funding. The resources required to deliver the projects will be included in the total cost of the submission. If CDC is successful in being allocated funding a further report will be brought to Council to approve the release of this funding and approval to spend the grant allocation.

5.3 For the UKSPF match funding is encouraged but not required. On approval of an Investment Plan, the UKSPF allocation will be given to an LA to manage. This will include assessing and approving applications for a share of the fund to other organisations, processing payments, day-to-day monitoring, contracting, evaluation, and ongoing stakeholder engagement. LA's can use up to 4% of their allocation to cover resources required to assist this process, if LA's require more than 4% the case can be made in the Investment Plan.

5.4 An additional £20k, over and above our allocation, is being made available to support production of Investment Plans. This will be paid on sign-off of the Plan.

6. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

6.1 For LUF(2) all eligible local authorities have been encouraged to apply as there is no certainty of any further rounds of Levelling up funding. The Levelling up application process is highly competitive, in the first round of LUF funding only 26% of category 2 local authorities were successful, therefore there is no certainty that we will be successful in securing LUF(2) funding.

6.2 Other Implications

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

7. Appendices

7.1 None

8. Background Papers

8.1 None