



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in the Committee Rooms - East Pallant House on Tuesday 23 January 2024 at 2.00 pm

Members Present: Mrs C Apel (Chair), Mr I Ballantyne, Mrs T Bangert, Mr R Bates, Mr D Betts, Mr S Boulcott, Mr B Brisbane, Mr R Briscoe, Mr J Brookes-Harmer, Mr J Brown, Ms J Brown-Fuller, Ms B Burkhart, Mx R Chant, Mr M Chilton, Ms M Corfield, Ms H Desai, Mr G Evans, Mrs E Hamilton, Mr C Hastain, Ms O Hickson, Mrs D Johnson, Mr S Johnson, Mr T Johnson, Mr A Moss, Ms E Newbery, Mr H Potter, Ms S Quail, Mr C Todhunter, Mr J Vivian, Ms V Weller and Mr T Young

Members not present: Mr J Cross, Mrs H Burton, Mr F Hobbs, Mr T O'Kelly and Mrs S Sharp

Officers present all items: Mrs L Baines (Democratic Services Manager), Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mrs K Dower (Principal Planning Officer (Infrastructure Planning)), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mrs T Murphy (Divisional Manager for Place), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

62 Minutes

Cllr Apel explained that Cllr Cross had submitted the following amendments:

Minute 56 – page 5 of the agenda pack. The first recorded vote should read 22 for, 6 against and 8 absent not 6.

Minute 56 – page 6 of the agenda pack. The second recorded vote should read 19 for, 9 against and should also say 8 absent.

Cllr Hamilton also requested the recorded vote be reviewed to show she voted against.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 28 November 2023 as amended be approved as a correct record.

63 Urgent Items

The Chair announced that there would be one late item to approve some additional dates for the Grants and Concessions Panel which would be taken under Late Items.

64 **Declarations of Interests**

Cllr Apel declared an other interest in respect of agenda item 10 as a council appointed trustee of Pallant House Gallery.

Cllr Brown-Fuller declared an other interest in respect of agenda item 10 as a council appointed trustee of Chichester Festival Theatre.

Cllr Bangert declared an other interest in respect of agenda item 10 as a council appointed trustee of Pallant House Gallery.

Cllr Donna Johnson, Cllr Tim Johnson and Cllr Weller declared other interests in agenda items 12 and 14.

65 **Chair's Announcements**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Betts who was on council business, Cllr Burton, Cllr Cross, Cllr Hobbs, Cllr O'Kelly and Cllr Sharp.

Cllr Apel also wished to note that agenda items 11 and 13 were withdrawn as they had been taken as Urgent Decisions following the last Cabinet meeting.

66 **Public Question Time**

Question from Simon Lloyd- Williams:

The Novium Museum cost the local Council taxpayers £6.9 million to build. How much of the taxpayers money has been spent since 2012 in keeping this white elephant afloat?

Response from Cllr Brown-Fuller:

Thank you for your question, Mr Lloyd – Williams.

The Novium Museum and Tourist Information Centre (TIC) opened in its new building on Tower Street in the centre of Chichester in July 2012. Through a strong vision the museum and TIC service continues to strengthen its relationship with and relevance to our local community while growing its reputation both locally and nationally.

Over the last decade, the service has taken great strides forwards in delivering its objectives across all areas of the service. The Novium museum delivers significant educational, social, and economic benefit to the local community. During the last ten years there have been over 340,000 visitors to the museum and in addition this many local schools and education settings have embraced the outreach service provided. The museum and TIC was greatly impacted by covid during this time and was only able to open for just 89 days during 2020/21, as a result of three national lockdowns, however the service is now on the way to visitor numbers recovering and the museum's free admission policy enables the heritage of Chichester District to be accessible to everyone.

Between April 2013 and March 2023, the cost to deliver the museum service averaged of £650k per annum, details of the service costs for each year are available on our website. In 2018 an economic impact assessment was completed using the Association of

Independent Museums (AIM) toolkit, based on the visitor numbers from 2015/16 of 45,433 visitors, the museum's economic benefit alone was estimated to be between £320-£455k. This does not include any social, educational or health benefits. We are currently undertaking a further economic impact assessment and a social value impact for the museum and results from this will be available later this year.

Museums increase our sense of wellbeing, help us feel proud of where we have come from, inspire, challenge and stimulate us, and make us feel healthier, the true value of a museum to a city which is steeped in its historical and cultural activities which are so important to the local community and visitors' is difficult to value.

Question from Richard Plowman:

"At the last Cabinet Meeting on 9th January in response to Reverend Canon Bruce Ruddock's question on the IPPD proposal for an Ice rink in Priory Park on page 67 of the Cabinet Papers item 2. 7 and Appendix 4, you made a promise that there would be extensive conversations including Priory Park Society.

True to your word, yourself, the Deputy Leader, Jonathan Brown and Officer, Sarah Peyman attended the meeting. Evidence and facts were presented which gave an entirely different and opposite view of the success of the Ice rink in Priory Park and its effect on the Christmas economy of Chichester and showed that the IPPD was based on spurious uncollaborated data. In fact, if you looked at the footfall figures from the published BID report, there was in 2018 a 9% drop in footfall at Christmas compared to 2017 with no Ice rink. The events strategy, which is the policy, specifically precludes an Ice rink in Priory Park for good reasons. To say that the grass is not part of the fabric of the Priory Park lacks credibility and is a farcical reason for ignoring the events strategy passed unanimously by Council. It was all about the damage to the grass and loss of amenity. Far better sites on hard standing were put forward without all these issues of Priory Park and the need to spend £125,000. My question Leader is, given your promise to consult fully and for views to be a significant part of the evaluation of the IPPD, what you are going to change because of the conversations with the Priory Park Society. Indeed, they are asking the same question but believe nothing will change. Everybody wants an Ice rink in Chichester in Christmas, it has failed once in Priory Park and alternative sites ruled out in 2018 should now be explored. There is plenty of time to do this.

Response from Cllr Brown-Fuller:

Thank you Richard for your question and for your continued scrutiny of the proposed ice rink in Priory Park. You indicate in your question there are two reasons for not having an ice rink in Priory Park which was mainly the damage to the grass and amenity. We are confident that the IPPD will enable us to reinstate the grass by either re-sowing as required or turfing, and this will be allowed for in the tenders going forward. We can also ensure that during set up and break down protection is provided to the grass to ensure minimal damage is done. Like you, we wish to ensure that the grass and open spaces are open to all as soon as possible after the ice rink is taken down and as an amenity to local residents the park is for all residents of Chichester so they should be able to enjoy it.

As for the economic value of the ice rink we know with certainty that the car parking figures for 2018 were considerably higher than that of 2017 and 2019. We have also checked with the BID who confirm that they recorded an increase in visitor numbers in 2018. We are

confident that an ice rink in Priory Park will boost the local economy, be well supported by local residents and provide a positive vibe to Chichester during the Christmas period.

With regard to alternative sites, you suggest that there are numerous alternative sites. Following an internal review, we are clear that Priory Park is the one site that we can bring forward in time for this year 2024 based on timescales and the known challenges for alternatives sites. With regard to the Events Strategy and the Events Policy they are two different documents and we have carefully reviewed both documents and are satisfied that an ice rink in Priory Park does conform to both, but I would invite the Leader attended your Priory Park Association meeting who may want to add something.

Cllr Moss added the following response:

Thank you very much. Mr Plowman you ask if we are going to consult, and we are absolutely going to consult and have been consulting. Residents will have every opportunity to express their views over the coming weeks. The views of Priory Park Society are important as are the views of the wider residents of Chichester to whom Priory Park was given as a place of recreation. The reasons we have started the process of reviewing the ice rink now is to ensure we provide the best experience for residents and safeguard the park and reduce disturbance to local residents. If we are not confident that that can be achieved it will not go ahead. We very much look forward to working with all residents over the coming weeks on the proposed ice rink. We assure you that consultation will be free and open. Thank you.

Question from Simon Oakley:

Given the ongoing scale of littering, what is CDC's current Policy regarding the installation of new litter bins where requested to do so by Parish Councils? If the Policy is not to install new litter bins, what are the reasons for not doing so?

Response from Cllr Chilton:

Thank you for your question, Mr Oakley.

With regards to fly tipping, the council's street cleaning team is currently operating at capacity; regularly servicing more than 800 litter bins across the district. Therefore the installation of additional bins would require additional resource to empty them. Litter bins can be effective in areas of high footfall where it would be considered unreasonable for people to hold onto their waste, so this is where most of our bins are positioned. Where people can reasonably take their waste home with them we would prefer to see this happen as it means the waste is much more likely to be recycled.

Our monitoring shows that litter levels in village centres is very low and that roadside litter on rural roads is the bigger problem. This said we have recently completed a districtwide inspection of our roads and found levels to be lower than we would expect at this time of year. We put this down to a couple of things; our effectiveness in litter picking highway verges with our own traffic management team and public behaviour change through promotion of the Against Litter campaign and roadside signs warning of fines if litter is thrown from a vehicle.

In summary, installing additional litter bins would require additional resource and it would not address the problem of litter being thrown from moving vehicles. However officers are

happy to discuss concerns with parish councils where there is a demonstrable need i.e. a significant litter problem in an area of high footfall, where it would be considered unreasonable for people to take their waste home with them and recycle it.

Question from Colin McKenna:

Context

We have seen the average world temperature rise in 2023 by nearly 1.5 degrees centigrade, a rise many, including a recent prime minister, were hoping to avoid before 2050 by which time net zero achievements would have stopped any further increase. The projections now are that net zero is very unlikely to be reached by 2050 so temperatures will continue to rise beyond then. It is also projected that the 2 degree rise could occur by 2050 and not 2100 as previously thought. There is an inevitability now that we will experience more and more extreme weather events such as flooding in the winter and more extreme heat in summer as well as more rapidly rising sea level rises with its consequential impact on coastal communities arriving much sooner than projected a few years ago.

The government states in its Climate Change Adaptation strategy that it is "important we all take action to address climate change. Alongside the government's leading role, councils and communities can work together to prepare for and adapt to climate change."

I am a member of the Chichester U3A Climate Change Group which sees the need for the public in this area to be given information on the increasing risks we now face and be told how the district and county councils are working together to adapt local infrastructure and services to these risks. We believe that councils should work together to provide guidance and support to local parish councils on what can be done by the public and landowners to adapt to the expected climate extremes. However, the current CDC climate plan is silent on adaptation issues. It has a focus solely on reducing carbon emissions mostly within the council's own organisation which, though laudable, regrettably will have no measurable effect on the world temperature rise.

While the Local Plan deals with new development and presumably its protection from extreme weather, the same does not apply to existing housing, businesses and other premises which remain at increasing risk.

Question for the Council

In the light of the above context what, if anything, has been done by this council to prepare an adaptation strategy for the increasing risks of extreme weather, when will it publish this and when will it publicise an action plan to meet its strategy so local communities can begin to prepare for what is on its way?

Response from Cllr Jonathan Brown:

Thank you very much for your question, and what I fear is a depressingly accurate statement on the context around the lack of progress made towards addressing climate change.

The world, the country and this council have all begun to act far, far later than we should have. Given where we are I start by saying that I believe we have been right to prioritise

reducing carbon emissions rather than adaptation. On our own, cuts to CDC's emissions will make a negligible difference to the global picture, but the principle is important – not just because we ought to be seen to be doing right thing, but to build momentum so that everyone makes their contributions. If everyone believed themselves justified in doing nothing, nothing would happen and adaptation will become more expensive and difficult to achieve. We need to play our part to encourage everyone to play their part. We have and had to start somewhere.

And on adaptation we have not been doing nothing. There is some overlap between actions taken to reduce carbon emissions and to adapt to climate change. For example, better home insulation will reduce carbon emissions and will help occupants cope with more extreme periods of hot and cold weather. We are conscious of these opportunities, but it is true that they do not sit within a dedicated climate change adaptation strategy.

That said, were we to have one, we would undoubtedly want to focus on what we could do or influence and so would be doing actions like these. We have virtually no influence over transport, health provision, etc. and an overarching strategy would need to cover these and other areas. As with the Climate Change plan, it would not make sense to dedicate a lot of resource to a policy area that we as a Council had no responsibility for or power or resource to deliver on.

In any case, as with the approach to carbon emissions, any plan of action will inevitably need to be supported by a range of schemes – large and small. Absent serious policy or financial support from national government and with finite resources at our disposal, our view is that 'big wins' should be prioritised over multiple smaller projects that even together do not add up to very much. We want to focus on policy areas where we can have real influence and to deal with the biggest threats.

In our district arguably the biggest climate change threat is flooding – particularly coastal and river flooding. We are already working on addressing these issues. On the agenda for today's Council we have a proposal for a Selsey Coastal Scheme. This is a colossal, multi-million pound project that will run over many years. It is probably the single most impactful action this Council can take – in partnership – to help our communities adapt to climate change. We will shortly – I hope by March – be ready to kick off a new Chichester Harbour Investment and Adaptation Plan too. This will look at almost the whole of the district's coast, with a view to helping all of our coastal communities adapt to climate change. If we are successful, this will be another multi-million pound, multi-year partnership project. It will be coming to the first public Environment Panel meeting on 29th January – so I would encourage you to attend if you can.

I hope that we will also be in a position to say something in the relatively near future about some work on rivers in the district too.

Apart from this, one of the other main policy areas we can influence in the district is – in theory – planning, although everyone can see the dysfunctionality of the Planning system. As you will be aware, the LP addresses new builds. However, new posts recruited to the Environment team will have some positive influence on planning applications working their way through the system. And they will help us try to maximise the taking up of govt. schemes, such as home insulation for existing properties. We are also doing a great deal of tree planting – 25,000 planted in the district since 2021 – including for shade and shelter.

We will also proactively support the efforts of other bodies, working in partnership with WSCC and the other Districts and Boroughs in West Sussex on water usage and drainage.

I do acknowledge that we haven't been able to say very much on the subject of adaptation over the last few months, not as much as I would have liked, but I hope that this goes some way to explaining what we have been doing and that you will soon start to see much more information on the schemes we have been working on.

You are right – we have all left it too late to keep the earth's temperature within sensible boundaries so we will have to adapt. To answer your question plainly, we do not have a dedicated adaptation strategy and while I don't rule out doing some more formal work on a climate adaptation framework in the future, for the time being I think we are right to prioritise work on the schemes that will make the biggest difference, even if they're going to be long, complex and expensive projects. We cannot do everything, certainly not at once and afford to delay.

As the chair is not permitting follow up questions now I am happy to follow up with you outside of this meeting.

67 Commuted Sums Spending Policy (Affordable Housing)

Cllr Moss proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Bangert. Cllr Moss then introduced the item in Cllr Bett's absence as he was attending an emergency housing meeting in Westminster.

In a vote the following resolutions were approved:

- 1. The adoption of a Commuted Sums Spending Policy (Affordable Housing) as amended at appendix 1.**
- 2. That delegated powers are given to the Director of Housing and Communities, following consultation with the Cabinet member for Housing, Revenues and Benefits, to make minor amendments to the policy.**

68 Housing Covenants policy

Cllr Moss proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Bangert. Cllr Moss then introduced the item in Cllr Bett's absence.

Cllr Briscoe gave his support to the recommendations.

Cllr Brown-Fuller also gave her support to the recommendations. She clarified that the Policy would ensure that the eligible homes are sold to local people.

In a vote the following resolution was approved:

The introduction of a policy for determining applications relating to properties subject to a restriction under Sections 37 and 157 of the Housing Act 1985, or any other restriction of this nature as attached at appendix 1 as amended.

69 Consideration of Consultation Responses Received on Chichester District Council's Draft Infrastructure Business Plan 2024-2029

Cllr Brisbane proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Moss. Cllr Brisbane then introduced the item.

Cllr Brisbane outlined some amendments:

- IBP 155 Willow Park, Terminus Road GP hub. A request for a CIL increase of £1.5 million to £1.65 million.
- IBP 726 Southbourne Surgery. The project is delayed from 2023-2024 to 2027-2028.

Cllr Hickson shared concerns at the slip of IBP 726. She explained that the surgery continued to struggle to meet the growing demand of the residents. Cllr Brisbane explained that the officers had been informed by the NHS that there were several reasons for the delay including the inflation cost increases, reviewing what can be achieved from the current budget and evidence suggesting that residents in newly built houses are registering at alternative GP surgeries. In addition the NHS is putting greater focus on IBP 155 Willow Park hub. Cllr Hickson asked that officers feedback her concerns. Cllr Bangert also queried why people are not registering at the surgery.

Cllr Moss requested an opportunity for members to review the IBP over the next few months to see if anything can be done to help move any of the projects forward.

Cllr Quail requested that the LCWIP be extended from the bottom of Centurion Way to Orchard Street. Cllr Brown explained that it is not one of the routes being prioritised by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) at this stage.

With reference to IBP 353 Cllr Potter asked why the cost had increased by £2 million. Cllr Brisbane explained it was likely to be due to inflation related increases. Mrs Dower agreed to request an update to feedback to members.

Cllr Vivian requested an update on IBP 208. He explained that City Council had passed a motion relating to issues with the city's pavements. Cllr Moss explained that last year funding had been approved for a study. A further update is due back shortly. He confirmed that he would chase it up. Cllr Brown clarified that the study and options are needed before the next steps would be known.

In a vote the following resolutions were approved:

- 1. Approves the proposed responses to the representations received and subsequent modifications to the Draft Infrastructure Business Plan 2024-2029 as set out in Appendix 1; and;**
- 2. Approves the amended IBP (Appendix 3) including the CIL Spending Plan attached as Appendix 2.**

70 Corporate Plan and Initial Project Proposals for 2024-2025

Cllr Moss proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Brown. Cllr Moss then introduced the item. It was confirmed that minor changes and amendments at Cabinet would be included in the refreshed Plan. Notably that the date be amended to Spring 2025 for the adoption of the Local Plan.

In a vote the following resolutions were approved:

RESOLVED

- 1. To approve the refreshed Corporate Plan 2022-2025 as set out in appendix 1.**
- 2. That Council sets aside a further £3,628,800 from the Council's General Fund Reserve to fund the projects identified in para 5.4(b), with release of funding being subject to future consideration by Full Council.**

71 Cultural Grants Extension

Cllr Brown-Fuller proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Bangert. Cllr Brown-Fuller then introduced the item.

Cllr Bangert commented that other cultural organisations should be encouraged. Cllr Brown-Fuller confirmed that the Events Strategy echoes that approach.

Cllr Quail commented on the level of the funding. She suggested that the amounts were small comparative to the community work undertaken. Cllr Moss thanked Cllr Quail for her comment and spoke in favour of the district's cultural offers.

Mr Bennett clarified that Cllr Brown-Fuller had an 'other interest' as she is appointed to the Chichester Festival Theatre by the Council. This meant that she was entitled to participate in the debate and vote on the item.

In a vote the following resolutions were approved:

RESOLVED

- 1. That the funding agreement for Chichester Festival Theatre is extended for a further year until 31 March 2025 to allow for the results from the social and economic impact assessment to be fully considered.**
- 2. That the funding agreement for Pallant House Gallery is extended for a further year until 31 March 2025 to allow for the results from the social and economic impact assessment to be fully considered.**

72 Public Conveniences Refurbishment

This item was withdrawn as an Urgent Decision was taken following the Cabinet meeting.

73 Review of Parking Charges

Cllr Desai moved the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Moss.

Cllr Apel confirmed that she had accepted a major amendment from Cllr Boulcott. Cllr Boulcott moved his amendment which was seconded by Cllr Weller.

Cllr Desai then provided the introduction.

Cllr Boulcott then outlined his amendment motion.

Cllr Desai responded by explaining that the increase in parking charges is based on inflation. She added that only five responses were received for the consultation. She explained that changes to parking times can often cause confusion if there are different times for different car parks. In addition 30% revenue would be lost in rural car parks and 65% revenue from evening charges if the amendment were approved. Cllr Desai added that she would like to extend the membership of the Chichester District Parking Forum to additional stakeholders.

Cllr Burkhart asked what the maximum increase as a percentage a car park could expect at any one time. Mrs Murphy clarified that some car parks will be in line with the average of 6.7% with some higher and some lower. The overall net effect will be charges in line with inflation charges. She added that there has to be a level of rounding up or down.

Cllr Donna Johnson explained that hospitality had been impacted as car park charges can impact on how long people choose to stay in an area. She added that if visitors do not want to pay the parking they will leave. For rural areas free parking on Sunday often encourages visitors. Mrs Murphy explained that the amendment to 8pm for short stay car parks helps with environmental considerations. She added that elsewhere in the south some car parks have 24 hour charges in place. She confirmed that there had not been a significant level of complaints. She added that the rural car parks would continue to have the first one or two hours free.

Cllr Briscoe commented that car park revenue provides funding for some of the council's functions. He gave his support to Cllr Boulcott's amendment.

Cllr Weller gave her support to Cllr Boulcott's amendment. She commented that charges on a Sunday would reduce the number of visitors to East Beach, Selsey.

Cllr Tim Johnson referred to Arundel and Bognor's lower prices on a Sunday. He asked if the amendments could be taken as two separate votes. Cllr Apel confirmed that she would accept two votes with each element of the amendment taken separately.

Cllr Young explained that he could not support the amendment. He added that car parking charges support services. He asked members to consider whether people are less likely to stay longer if there is a short amount of time you can park for free. Cllr Desai clarified that with MiPermit you can update your parking and stay wherever you are.

Cllr Brown explained that there has to be a balance as parking income balances over services. He explained that he could not support the amendment as the money would have to be found from elsewhere.

Cllr Chant asked if there would be an increase cost in parking enforcement and what the effect would be. Mrs Murphy explained that if any of the amendments were approved it would redirect the priority of the parking enforcement resources accordingly.

Cllr Brown-Fuller asked how the council would be advertising the changes. Mrs Murphy confirmed that there will be notices and a publication of changes to parking charges. There will then be signage in the car parks.

Cllr Hamilton commented on parking charges increases benefitting online retailers. She explained that it did not support the support local scheme.

Cllr Potter then requested a recorded vote. Cllr Briscoe, Cllr Burkart, Cllr Hamilton and Cllr Boulcott supported a recorded vote.

Mrs Shepherd then took the first vote on the amendment motion regarding charges to rural car parks on Sundays. Mrs Shepherd started to take the vote. Members sought some clarity. Mr Bennett explained that there had already been two votes for the amendment . Cllr Apel read the amendment to all members. The vote continued.

Cllr Apel – For
Cllr Ballantyne – For
Cllr Bangert – For
Cllr Bates – Against
Cllr Betts – Absent
Cllr Boulcott – For
Cllr Brisbane – Against
Cllr Briscoe – For
Cllr Brookes-Harmer – Against
Cllr Brown – Against
Cllr Brown-Fuller – Against
Cllr Burkhart – For
Cllr Burton – Absent
Cllr Chant – Abstain
Cllr Chilton – Against
Cllr Corfield – Against
Cllr Cross – Absent
Cllr Desai – Against
Cllr Evans – For
Cllr Hamilton – Abstain
Cllr Hastain – Against
Cllr Hickson – Against
Cllr Hobbs – Absent
Cllr Donna Johnson – For
Cllr Stephen Johnson – Against
Cllr Tim Johnson – For
Cllr Moss – Against
Cllr Newberry – For
Cllr O’Kelly – Absent
Cllr Potter – For
Cllr Quail – Against
Cllr Sharp – Absent
Cllr Todhunter – Against
Cllr Vivian – Against
Cllr Weller – For
Cllr Young – Against

Totals = 12 For, 16 Against, 2 Abstain, 6 Absent.

The amendment was not carried.

Cllr Apel then read the second part of the amendment. Cllr Brown asked for this to be clarified. Mrs Shepherd explained that the substantive recommendation requests evening

parking charges to go up to 8pm in the evening. The amendment motion requests evening parking charges to go up to 7pm.

Members then voted on the second amendment.

Cllr Apel – For
Cllr Ballantyne – Against
Cllr Bangert – For
Cllr Bates – Against
Cllr Betts – Absent
Cllr Boulcott – For
Cllr Brisbane – Against
Cllr Briscoe – Abstain
Cllr Brookes-Harmer – Against
Cllr Brown – Against
Cllr Brown-Fuller – Against
Cllr Burkhart – Abstain
Cllr Burton – Absent
Cllr Chant – For
Cllr Chilton – Against
Cllr Corfield – Against
Cllr Cross – Absent
Cllr Desai – Against
Cllr Evans – Against
Cllr Hamilton – Abstain
Cllr Hastain – Against
Cllr Hickson – Against
Cllr Hobbs – Absent
Cllr Donna Johnson – For
Cllr Stephen Johnson – Against
Cllr Tim Johnson – For
Cllr Moss – Against
Cllr Newberry – Against
Cllr O’Kelly – Absent
Cllr Potter – For
Cllr Quail – Against
Cllr Sharp – Absent
Cllr Todhunter – Against
Cllr Vivian – Against
Cllr Weller – For
Cllr Young – Against

Totals = 8 For, 19 Against, 3 Abstain, 6 Absent.

The second amendment was not carried.

Members then took a vote on the substantive motion. Cllr Briscoe, Cllr Potter, Cllr Burkhart and Cllr Boulcott requested a recorded vote.

Cllr Apel – Against
Cllr Ballantyne – For
Cllr Bangert – Abstain

Cllr Bates – For
Cllr Betts – Absent
Cllr Boulcott – Against
Cllr Brisbane – For
Cllr Briscoe – Against
Cllr Brookes-Harmer – For
Cllr Brown – For
Cllr Brown-Fuller – For
Cllr Burkhart – Against
Cllr Burton – Absent
Cllr Chant – Abstain
Cllr Chilton – For
Cllr Corfield – For
Cllr Cross – Absent
Cllr Desai – For
Cllr Evans – Abstain
Cllr Hamilton – Against
Cllr Hastain – For
Cllr Hickson – For
Cllr Hobbs – Absent
Cllr Donna Johnson – Against
Cllr Stephen Johnson – For
Cllr Tim Johnson – Against
Cllr Moss – For
Cllr Newberry – For
Cllr O’Kelly – Absent
Cllr Potter – Against
Cllr Quail – For
Cllr Sharp – Absent
Cllr Todhunter – For
Cllr Vivian – For
Cllr Weller – Against
Cllr Young – For

Totals = 18 For, 9 Against, 3 Abstain, 6 Absent.

The substantive motion was carried.

RESOLVED

To approve the proposal as set out in 5.1 of the Cabinet report on the increases to the car parking charges from 1 April 2024.

74 Section 106 Allocation for The Selsey Centre

This item was withdrawn as an Urgent Decision was taken following the Cabinet meeting.

75 Selsey Coastal Scheme - Next Stage Plan

Cllr Brown moved the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Moss. Cllr Brown then introduced the item.

Cllr Tim Johnson welcomed the proposal to combat the effects of climate change.

In a vote the following resolutions were approved:

RESOLVED

- 1. Approval of the Project Initiation Document (Appendix 1).**
- 2. Approval of submission of a business case to the Environment Agency for Grant in Aid (GiA) funding of the option appraisal & outline design stage of scheme development.**
- 3. Approval for undertaking the next stage of scheme development (option appraisal and outline design), if GiA funding is secured.**
- 4. To note the significant funding gap anticipated and undertake to explore funding options towards any future construction stage, including a supporting letter to the Environment Agency in order to address the funding gap and enable a scheme at Selsey. (para 5.3)**
- 5. That delegated authority is given to the Director of Planning and Environment, in consultation with the Director of Corporate Services, for the Grant in Aid funding spend and appointment of professional services for the Selsey scheme, and to agree project financial tolerances and spend with the delivery team. (Para 5.1, 5.5 & 5.6)**

Members took a 10 minute break.

Cllr Betts joined the meeting.

76 Climate Emergency Detailed Action Plan - Annual Progress Report

Cllr Brown moved the recommendation. Cllr Moss seconded. Cllr Brown then introduced the item.

In a vote the following resolution was approved:

RESOLVED

That Council notes the report and the progress on implementing the Climate Emergency Action Plan.

77 Finalised Draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) for Adoption

Cllr Brisbane moved the recommendation. Cllr Moss seconded. Cllr Brisbane then introduced the item.

Cllr Stephen Johnson asked whether anything could be done to make the comments on the planning portal more viewer friendly. He explained that it can be difficult to see comments from others in those instances where an application has a lot of comments. He confirmed that he was happy to have a response outside of the meeting. Mr Frost explained about Information Commissioner General Data Protection Regulation compliance governing what information can be shared online. Cllr Stephen Johnson clarified that he was referring to the summary page of documents. Mr Bennett confirmed that as a data protection matter it is best dealt with outside of the meeting. He suggested a meeting with Cllr Stephen Johnson and officers.

In a vote the following resolution was approved:

RESOLVED

That Council approve the finalised draft Statement of Community Involvement for adoption.

78 Urgent Decision Notice - S106 Community Facilities Contribution

On behalf of the council Cllr Apel noted the Urgent Decision Notice.

79 Questions to the Executive

Cllr Hamilton asked a question regarding East Beach Car Park, Selsey. Mr Bennett explained that this relates to a legal matter that the council had provided comment on. He added that it is up to the council to ensure that its car parks are not being used in an unauthorised way. He confirmed that the legal department were instructed to issue a notice due to lack of response to previous correspondence.

Cllr Chant spoke in favour of the local arts scene and its positive impact on the local community. Cllr Chant then asked what the council is doing to support local arts group and centres. Cllr Brown-Fuller thanked Cllr Chant for the question. She explained that Chichester has a large array of arts organisations and groups. She outlined organisations and events and festivals. She confirmed the difference the access to the arts can make to individuals. She explained that the council continues to fund the theatre and the gallery in their outreach programmes across the district. She added information about upcoming events including the upcoming laser event which is being organised by the council's events officer.

Cllr Briscoe wished to raise a matter of thanks which Mr Bennett advised he should do so out of the meeting.

Cllr Moss wished to formally welcome Cllr Betts to the meeting.

80 Late Items

Cllr Apel confirmed that she had one late item.

Following the approval of the 2024/25 Calendar of Meetings in November 2023 officers have considered the need for additional Grants and Concessions Panel meetings this year rising from two meetings to four meetings. In order to best space these meetings across the year the following dates are proposed:

26 June 2024
9 October 2024
29 January 2025
19 March 2025

In a vote the following resolution was approved:

RESOLVED

That the following dates be approved for the Grants and Concessions Panel for 2024/25:

26 June 2024
9 October 2024
29 January 2025
19 March 2025

81 Exclusion of the press and public

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

82 Urgent Decision Notice (PART II Exempt) - Public Conveniences Refurbishment

On behalf of the council Cllr Apel noted the Urgent Decision Notice.

The meeting ended at 4.38 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date: