

Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 2 - East Pallant House on Tuesday 5 January 2016 at 9.30 am

**Members Present:** Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr B Finch and Mrs G Keegan

**Members not present:** Mrs P Hardwick and Mrs S Taylor

**In attendance by invitation:**

**Officers present all items:** Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services) and Mr P Coleman (Member Services Manager)

111 **Minutes**

**RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 1 December 2015 be signed as a correct record.

112 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

113 **Declarations of Interests**

Mrs Shepherd and Mr Ward each declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a statutory officer in agenda item 9 (Disciplinary Action Against Statutory Officers: The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015). They withdrew to the public seating area while that item was discussed and took no part in the discussion.

114 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted.

115 **Review of the Members' Allowances Scheme: Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel**

The Cabinet considered the report, together with the appended report of the Independent Remuneration Panel circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

The Chairman welcomed the members of the Independent Remuneration Panel to the meeting and commended them on their detailed and well-researched report. He invited the Chairman of the Panel to introduce themselves and to present their report.

Mr John Pressdee introduced himself and the two other members of the Panel, Mr Michael Bevis and Mr John Thompson.

Mr Pressdee explained that the Panel had previously reported in 2003, 2007/08 and 2011, although the composition of the Panel had varied over that period.

In making their current recommendations, the Panel had taken into account: that allowances should fairly reflect the time spent and responsibilities of the various roles; the financial positions of the Council and members; comparisons with allowances paid by other authorities; the views of members expressed in questionnaires and interviews; and that there was a public service voluntary element in the work of a councillor.

The Panel's recommendations were summarised in Part 2 and set out in detail in Part 3 of their report. The Panel had been asked to consider whether the allowances should be index-linked and had concluded that in this time of low inflation the allowances should be fixed until the next review. They recommended an increase in the Basic Allowance from £4,541 to £4,725. The Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) should be paid to the same postholders as now, with some uprating for inflation, except in the case of committee chairmen, where the Panel considered that there were differentials in the workload and responsibilities involved, and the Leader of the Opposition, which the Panel felt was a less demanding role than previously. The Panel had also recommended some clarification of and additions to the official duties for which travelling allowances should be payable.

Mr Barrow asked why the mileage rate for travelling allowances was above the 45p tax free allowance allowed by HMRC. The Panel replied that the members' mileage allowance rate had for a long time been the same as that paid to staff, and there had seemed no demand for this to be changed.

Mr Barrow also commented that the proposed differential between the SRAs paid to Cabinet Members and the Deputy Leader of the Council did not seem to fully recognise the workload involved in the latter post. Mr Dignum agreed and explained that, in addition to her own portfolio responsibilities, the Deputy Leader was fully briefed and shared in the Leader's decisions and was thus ready to take over the Leader's responsibilities if needed.

Mr Finch, from his previous experience as a member of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee, did not understand the rationale for a reduction in the SRA for the Chairman of that committee.

The Panel explained that they had found it difficult to reach conclusions on the differentials between the SRAs for the committee chairmen. However, they had taken account of the workload and frequency of meetings of the committees, the public profile and the degree of professional support.

Mr Finch replied that, whilst he understood the case for differentials between committee chairmen, he felt that the workload and frequency of meetings of the

Corporate Governance and Audit Committee had increased rather than decreased since the last review.

With the Chairman's permission, Mrs Tull agreed that the workload of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee had not decreased. Like the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Committee had an important role in holding the Executive to account. Members had to undergo annual training in treasury management, and also operated through Task and Finish Groups. She was concerned that the decrease in SRA and the relative differential with other committees down-played the important role of that committee.

#### **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

That the Council receives and considers the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel and makes decisions on its recommendations, and in particular reviews the Panel's recommendations in respect of Special Responsibility Allowances for the Deputy Leader of the Council and the Chairman of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.

### **116 Adoption of the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule**

Further to minute 733 of 3 March 2015, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

In the absence of Mrs Taylor, Mr Dignum introduced the report, explaining that the Government had decided that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was the fairest way for new development to help fund the cost of infrastructure resulting from the cumulative impact of development of the area.

CIL was essentially a non-negotiable tax on the increase in the value of land that occurs when planning permission is granted. The rates to be charged were summarised in paragraph 4.4 of the report.

The draft Charging Schedule had been subject to two rounds of formal public consultation and an examination undertaken by an independent examiner from the Planning Inspectorate.

The Examiner's role was to consider whether the Council's proposed charging schedule met the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 and associated regulations. He also needed to be satisfied that the proposed rates were consistent with available viability evidence and would not threaten the delivery of planned development in the Local Plan area.

The examiner had supported the rates proposed by the Council and confirmed that the levy was justified and economically viable. This support had been given despite challenge from the development industry claiming that the rates proposed were too high. The levy would apply to residential and retail development outside of the National Park.

Adoption by the Council would mean that, after 1 February 2016, all relevant development would be subject to the levy. This would, in time, provide substantial funds for the Council to allocate to relevant infrastructure provision.

Mr Dignum concluded by asking that the Cabinet's thanks should be conveyed to Mrs Dower (Principal Planning Policy Officer (Infrastructure Planning)) for successfully seeing this important project through to conclusion.

Mrs Keegan asked why the proposed levies on convenience and comparison retail development were so different. Mr Allgrove (Planning Policy, Conservation and Design Service Manager) explained that convenience retail was mainly food shopping, whereas comparison retail related to clothes, white goods and other goods where customers would compare quality and prices. The levy took account of the viability of the two forms of retailing in the particular circumstances of Chichester.

#### **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

- (1) That the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (attached as Appendix 2) be adopted to take effect from 1 February 2016, incorporating modification EM1 (revised Charging Schedule map showing grid reference numbers) and further minor amendment (deleting B1, B2 and B8 uses so they are captured in the Standard nil charge);
- (2) That the CIL Regulation 123 list (attached as Appendix 3) be adopted;
- (3) That the CIL Payment by Instalments Policy (attached as Appendix 4) be adopted.

#### **117 Recreational Disturbance at Pagham Harbour - Joint Approach to Mitigation with Arun District Council**

This item was considered at this point in the meeting, because it was necessary for the Cabinet to make decisions on it, before recommending adoption of the Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document, which contains a reference to the Pagham Harbour mitigation measures at paragraph 4.66.

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Barrow introduced the report, explaining that Pagham Harbour was an internationally important site for wild birds.

In order to protect it whilst allowing for future development, a joint scheme of mitigation for Arun and Chichester Districts, was proposed, based around a part time warden post at RSPB Pagham to make sure that additional visitors did not disturb the birds and stop them feeding or nesting.

This was similar to the Solent-wide scheme that covered Chichester Harbour, approved by the Cabinet in February 2015. The costs would be covered by developer contributions and the report sought approval also for the Council to hold and invest

these s106 funds jointly on behalf of Arun and Chichester, and to spend these funds, initially through an agreement with the RSPB as site managers. This joint scheme would avoid duplicating bureaucracy and mean that developers were treated the same in both Districts.

Without a strategic scheme that was funded “in-perpetuity”, Natural England would object to new housing development around the Harbour. This scheme, therefore, enabled the delivery of both the Chichester Local Plan and the draft Arun Local Plan.

Mrs Lintill asked how the proposed cost per house compared with the Solent scheme. Mr Day (Environmental Co-ordinator) replied that proposed cost per house for the Pagham scheme, as set out in Appendix 2, was £1,109 rising to £1,347. This compared with £174 in the interim Solent scheme. It was expected that the cost in the Solent scheme would increase after 2017 with the introduction of additional items to meet the requirements of the Habitat Regulations. However, the Pagham scheme would always be more expensive as it was a small stand-alone scheme supported by relatively small numbers of additional houses. However, it was considered that half a full time equivalent warden post was the minimum requirement for the scheme to operate.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the joint scheme of mitigation for Pagham Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) in Appendix 1 be endorsed.
- (2) That the level of developer contributions to the joint scheme set out in Appendix 2 to this report be approved.
- (3) That the holding of s106 funds by Chichester District Council on behalf of Chichester District Council and Arun District Council jointly be approved.
- (4) That the expenditure of the joint s106 funds on the scheme of mitigation as specified in paragraph 5.5 be approved.

#### **118 Adoption of the Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document**

Further to minute 637 of 9 September 2014, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

In the absence of Mrs Taylor, Mr Dignum introduced the report, explaining that the Council had produced a supplementary planning document (SPD) to explain how planning obligations would now be used following the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The SPD also set out the Council’s approach to securing affordable housing as part of new development. The document would be a material consideration in the determination of applications and appeals, and provide useful guidance for developers preparing planning applications.

The Council had carried out public consultation on the draft SPD in the autumn of 2014. All the representations made on the draft document and a recommended response to them were attached at appendix 1 to the report. The document had been amended to take account both of the representations and also of changing

circumstances, given the time that had elapsed since the original consultation. These changes were set out at paragraph 3.1 of the report. The revised document was attached at appendix 2 to the report.

The Government was currently consulting on changes to national planning policy. In particular, as paragraph 1.9 made clear, the SPD would need amendment to take account of the Government's policy for Starter Homes in future revisions to the document, which would need to be the subject of public consultation. However, it was necessary to adopt the SPD now so that it had full weight in the determination of planning applications at the time the CIL was implemented, and not delay until the Government had finalised its policy.

#### **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

- (1) That the proposed responses to representations received during consultation on the draft *Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document* be approved as set out in appendix 1 to the report;
- (2) That the *Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document* be adopted as attached at appendix 2 to the report;
- (3) That *The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to new Development in Chichester District Supplementary Planning Guidance*, which was adopted in December 2004 to supplement the *Chichester District Local Plan First Review April 1999* be cancelled;
- (4) That the Head of Planning Services be authorised, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, to make typographical and other minor amendments prior to publication.

#### **119 Proposed approach for securing development contributions to mitigate additional traffic impacts on A27 Chichester Bypass**

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

In the absence of Mrs Taylor, Mr Dignum introduced the report, explaining that the Chichester Local Plan established the principle of seeking developer contributions to mitigate the traffic impacts on the A27 Chichester Bypass that would be generated by the housing development proposed in the Plan. Transport modelling work undertaken to support the Local Plan identified an indicative package of small scale measures for the six junctions on the Bypass. These measures were costed at £12.8 million.

The Council, in partnership with Highways England and West Sussex County Council, had commissioned Jacobs (the consultants that undertook the 2013 Chichester Transport Study) to undertake further traffic modelling work. Their resulting report set out a detailed methodology to calculate contributions from development locations towards the A27 mitigation package.

The proposed methodology apportioned the remaining cost of the A27 mitigation package between the outstanding Local Plan housing developments in direct proportion to the level of traffic impact that each development was expected to have

on the Chichester Bypass junctions. Jacobs had used transport modelling to assess the number of morning peak hour trips per day from each proposed Local Plan development that would be expected to use the A27 Chichester Bypass junctions.

The table in the appendix showed the financial contribution calculated for each of the Local Plan housing developments. The locations that were expected to have the greatest traffic impact on the Chichester Bypass junctions would make the biggest contribution. That meant the Tangmere Strategic Development Location would pay the most, followed by the strategic development at Westhampnett.

It was now considered that the use of S278 agreements provided the most appropriate mechanism for financing development contributions to the A27 improvements. This approach would require site developers to enter into legal agreements directly with Highways England.

The use of S278 agreements, rather than CIL, to fund the A27 mitigation meant that the contributions sought must meet the statutory tests applicable to planning obligations as set out in the CIL regulations – namely that contributions are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development, and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

This report sought Cabinet approval to take forward the proposed approach for seeking A27 contributions to public consultation. This would be for a 6-week period following the Council meeting on 26 January. Subject to the outcome of the consultation, the intention was to incorporate the A27 contributions as an amendment to the Council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – (which had been recommended for adoption in the previous on this agenda).

If this proposed approach for obtaining developer contributions was adopted, it would generate sufficient funding to address the direct traffic impacts of the housing developments proposed in the Local Plan over the period to 2029. Mr Dignum emphasised that the contributions raised would not be sufficient in themselves to resolve the underlying traffic problems on the A27. However, the contributions would be used either to fund small scale mitigation measures for the A27 junctions, or to contribute towards the Government funded A27 Chichester improvement scheme which Highways England was currently developing.

In answering members' questions, Mr Allgrove emphasised that the methodology was key to the mitigation scheme and challenges from landowners and developers could be expected during the consultation process. He emphasised that the mitigation scheme identified the impact of the new development proposed in the Local Plan. It did not address existing congestion on the A27 nor its expected natural growth. The scheme intended that the new housing in the Local Plan would have a neutral impact. If Highways England went ahead with a trunk road improvement scheme for the A27, then the developer contributions under the mitigation scheme would be used towards that. It might be that the traffic modelling would need to be reviewed in that event, but it was necessary to proceed with the mitigation scheme now, as planning applications had already been received for new development.

## **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

- (1) That the methodology set out in this report be agreed as the basis for seeking development contributions to mitigate the impact of proposed Local Plan development on the A27 Chichester Bypass junctions or to contribute to a wider A27 improvement scheme;
- (2) That the text in the Appendix be published as a potential modification to the Council's forthcoming Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), for consultation for a six week period from Friday 29 January to Friday 11 March.

### **120 Disciplinary Action Against Statutory Officers: The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015**

(Mrs Shepherd and Mr Ward withdrew to the public seating area for the duration of this item)

Further to minute 20 of 7 July 2015, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Finch introduced the report, and reminded the Cabinet of their discussion in July 2015 of the disciplinary procedures relating to the protected officers, i.e. the Head of Paid Service (Chief Executive), Chief Finance Officer (Head of Finance and Governance Services) and Monitoring Officer. The Council had been required by Government Regulations to amend their Standing Orders, so that only the full Council could dismiss any of these officers and before doing so must consider the advice of an Independent Panel, the conclusions of any investigation into the proposed dismissal, and any representations from the relevant officer. The Council was no longer, however, required to follow the independent advice. This replaced the previous procedure whereby the Council was required to agree with the officer on the appointment of a Designated Independent Person and to follow the advice of that person.

However, the Government had failed to consult the officers affected through the national negotiating machinery and, particularly in the case of the chief executives, the previous arrangements were incorporated in their contracts of employment. The Cabinet had, therefore, deferred updating the disciplinary procedure to allow time for national negotiations to be concluded. It was now believed that national negotiations would not be resolved for some time and the Council had now been advised by South East Employers (SEE) to proceed with the introduction of a revised disciplinary procedure.

Mr Radcliffe (Human Resources Manager) confirmed that the proposed procedure set out in the Appendix followed SEE guidance and reflected the new legal requirements.

Mr Over drew attention to the recommended changes to the Constitution to take account of the new procedure.

## **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**



- (1) That the revised Disciplinary Procedure for the Chief Executive, Head of Finance and Governance and Monitoring Officer be approved.
- (2) That the terms of reference of the Investigation and Disciplinary Committee be revised to read as follows:-  
“To consider allegations relating to the conduct or capability of the Chief Executive, the Chief Finance Officer and the Monitoring Officer and to take action in accordance with the Council’s approved Disciplinary procedure for these officers, *including negotiation of a settlement agreement and (in the case of the Chief Executive only) suspension and disciplinary action short of dismissal.*”
- (3) That the following be added to the powers of the Chairman, and in his absence the Vice-Chairman, in Article 5 of Part 2 of the Constitution:-  
“The Chairman of the Council has the power to suspend the Chief Executive in an emergency whereby his/her remaining presence at work poses a serious risk to the health and safety of others or the resources, information or reputation of the Council.”

## 121 **Public Interest Disclosures (Whistleblowing) Policy**

The Cabinet considered the report and appendices circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Finch introduced the report, explaining that the “Whistleblowing” was reviewed annually to ensure that it remained compliant with legislation and best practice. On this occasion some changes were proposed, mainly to make it clear that the policy could be used by non-employees such as councillors, contractors and members of the public. The proposed changes had been recommended by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.

Mr Finch added that it was also suggested that the Head of Business Improvement Services should be authorised to approve minor changes to Human Resources policies, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Support Services. In that capacity, he assured the Cabinet that he would ensure that any changes of significance were reported to and approved by members. The wording of the recommendation in the report had, therefore, been amended to reflect the fact that only minor legislative changes would be dealt with under this delegated power, and that significant legislative changes would be reported and approved by members, even if the Council had no choice in the matter.

### **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

- (1) That the revised Public Interest Disclosures (Whistleblowing) Policy be approved.
- (2) That the Head of Business Improvement Services be authorised to approve future minor changes to Human Resources policies, including those of a legislative nature, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Support Services.

## 122 **Chichester Place Plan**

This item was deferred for further work before consideration at a later meeting.

## 123 **West Sussex Waste Partnership Update**

The Cabinet considered the report and appendices circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Barrow introduced the report. He reminded the Cabinet of his presentation to members before the Council meeting on 15 December 2015, where his main objective had been to highlight the EU target requiring local authorities to recycle 50% of household waste by the year 2020 and the challenge that lay ahead.

The purpose of this report was to outline the various work streams of the West Sussex Waste Partnership, with the focus being on meeting this target.

Before making any decisions on future waste management within the county it was important to know exactly what was being collected now. During the autumn, the materials from both waste and recycling bins had been sampled across the county to provide a waste composition analysis. This had last been done approximately ten years ago. It had provided some very interesting data, which should enable the Council to target specific messages in future communications with residents.

For example, it was now known that up to 20% of waste in the household waste bins could have been sent for recycling. Up to 8% of waste in the recycling bins caused whole loads to be rejected, as they were not recyclable. Some 10 million disposable nappies from Chichester went into landfill each year. A major public education job was required.

Previous county waste strategies had been developed around the delivery of the two major contracts, for handling recycling and for general waste disposal. It was now proposed that a combined strategy be developed to inform the high level direction of travel towards the 2020 target, and higher targets in the future. Time scales for producing this strategy were outlined in the report.

Work had started on assessing options to improve recycling performance, under the title of the Recycling Road map. Initially this involved reviewing the services provided by high performing local authorities. From this work a short list of options had been drawn up and would be fully investigated over the coming months. In tandem with this, he proposed that a Waste Panel be set up to consider the feedback from the Waste Partnership, but also to develop a specific recycling plan for Chichester District and to report back to the Cabinet with recommendations over the next few months.

Finally, the Waste Partnership had been updating the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (Appendix 1) between the West Sussex local authorities. This covered the relationship and governance of the partnership via an operational document rather than a formal contract. Over recent years the MoU had enabled the partnership to deliver some very positive outcomes. All partners collected the same materials to the same specification and delivered to 'state of the art' facilities for both recycling and general waste. The MoU had been reviewed and updated, and the new documents would be signed off shortly. One important section of the MoU

concerned the way income was apportioned between the partners. A new formula had been agreed which would include a performance element to encourage improved recycling quantity and quality.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) That the actions and proposals of the West Sussex Waste Partnership be noted.
- (2) That the Head of Contract Services be authorised to approve the West Sussex Memorandum of Understanding and any future updates (provided the financial implications for the council do not exceed £100,000) following consultation with the Cabinet Member for the Environment and Head of Finance and Governance.
- (3) That a Panel of Members, advised by Officers, be formed to advise the Cabinet on the development of a medium term waste management strategy for the Council, and that the following members be appointed to the Panel: Mr Barrow, Mr Connor, Mr Hobbs, Mrs Plant, Mr Shaxson and Mrs Tull.
- (4) That the terms of reference attached (appendix 2) be approved.

**124 Green Infrastructure Delivery Document**

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

In the absence of Mrs Taylor, Mr Dignum introduced the report, explaining that it arose from the statement in the adopted Local Plan that the Council intended to produce a supplementary planning document (SPD) dealing with green infrastructure. At the time this had been suggested, it had been intended that this document would largely deal with the strategic development locations.

However, there was now an outline planning permission for the Shopwyke site and concept statements had been prepared for West of Chichester, Westhampnett/Northeast Chichester and Tangmere (included within the Tangmere neighbourhood plan). These would all inform masterplanning and the provision of green infrastructure, and it was therefore no longer considered necessary to produce a full SPD dealing with these matters. As an alternative, a guidance note had been prepared which would help developers to incorporate green infrastructure into their proposals and which would also signpost where other green infrastructure initiatives were taking place.

Mr Finch supported this, and suggested that some neighbourhood plans already demonstrated good practice in translating the guidance into local arrangements. He, therefore, suggested that when the document was published on the Council's website, links to relevant neighbourhood plans should be incorporated.

With the permission of the Chairman, Mrs Hamilton drew attention to the alarming decline in the population of hedgehogs, with some reports suggesting they could become extinct within five years. She suggested that ecological mapping should identify the distribution of hedgehogs and that where proposed development sites had a hedgehog population various mitigation measures should be encouraged.

Mr Barrow agreed that this was an important issue and stated that the Council was committed to the protection of wildlife and their habitats. This was built in to its planning systems and was the basis for its published biodiversity action plan. Most hedgehogs lived in gardens and the Council undertook publicity to encourage composting and wildlife gardening. Further publicity specifically on ways of protecting hedgehogs could be added to this. Hedgerows were important habitats for hedgehogs and the Council actively supported hedge growing projects to try to ensure connectivity and used ecological mapping to inform planning systems. The Council also worked with a wide variety of statutory and voluntary organisations to protect hedgehogs, and made sure that its own parks and gardens estate was friendly to wildlife.

Mrs Stephanie Evans (Environmental Co-ordinator) described how the Council's work on wildlife protection generally helped the hedgehog population, as many species had overlapping needs. She described the use of ecological mapping and the way that compensatory planting was required where hedgerows had to be removed to provide access. She agreed that it was important for the Council to give more publicity to the threat to hedgehogs and how people could help.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the *Green Infrastructure Delivery Document* (appended to this report and including links to relevant Neighbourhood Plans) be published on Chichester District Council's website.

#### **125 Authority's Monitoring Report 2015-2016**

The Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

In the absence of Mrs Taylor, Mr Dignum introduced the report. He explained that the Authority's Monitoring Report (AMR) was published annually by the Council, as required by the Localism Act. The AMR was the main mechanism for assessing the performance, implementation and effects of the Local Plan.

The draft AMR 2014-15 was appended to the report and some of the main highlights were set out in the covering report.

This AMR covered the period from 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015. Significant events occurring since 31 March 2015 were also noted. The AMR presented:

- an update on progress on preparation of the Local Plan and other related documents; and
- an assessment of planning policy performance based on output indicators.

The AMR covered the Chichester Local Plan area only – it excluded the part of the District within the National Park. However, the data for two performance indicators in the 'Environment' section of the AMR (provided by the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre) related to the whole of Chichester District (including the National Park). This was highlighted in the relevant AMR text.

**RESOLVED**

That the Authority's Monitoring Report 2014-2015 be published on Chichester District Council's website.

126 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The press and public were not excluded for any part of the meeting.

The meeting ended at 11.00 am

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date: