

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Philip Coleman, Member Services Manager
Tel: 01243 534655 Email: pcoleman@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House
1 East Pallant
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1TY
Tel: 01243 785166
www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of **Cabinet** will be held in Committee Room 2 - East Pallant House on **Tuesday 8 March 2016 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr B Finch, Mrs P Hardwick, Mrs G Keegan and Mrs S Taylor

AGENDA Part 1

- 1 **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 16)
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 9 February 2016.
- 2 **Urgent Items**
Chairman to announce any urgent items which due to special circumstances are to be dealt with under agenda item 17(b).
- 3 **Declarations of Interests**
Members and officers are reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests they may have in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.
- 4 **Public Question Time**
Questions submitted by members of the public in writing by noon on the previous working day (for a period up to 15 minutes).

RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

- 5 **Timing of Council Meetings** (Pages 17 - 26)
To make recommendations to the Council about the timing of future Council meetings.
- 6 **Recommendations of the Grants Task and Finish Group** (Pages 27 - 32)
To consider the recommendations of the Grants and Concessions Panel, relating to revisions of various grants policies, priorities and funding.
- 7 **Replacement Telephone System** (Pages 33 - 35)
Further to minute 67 of 6 October 2015, to approve and award the contract for the replacement of the Council's current telephone system, subject to a recommendation to Council to release funding from the Asset Replacement Programme.
- 8 **Revised Local Development Scheme 2016-2019** (Pages 36 - 38)
To recommend the Council to approve the revised Local Development Scheme.
- 9 **Making the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan** (Pages 39 - 40)

Further to minute 101 of 1 December 2015, and in the light of a local referendum, to recommend the Council to make the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for Chichester District.

KEY DECISIONS

- 10 **Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan** (Pages 41 - 42)
To publish the Decision Statement and agree that the Wisborough Green Parish Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum.
- 11 **Enterprise Gateway Project: Plot 12, Terminus Road, Chichester** (Pages 43 - 48)
This report updates the Cabinet, following an OJEU procurement process and recommends the appointment of a contractor to construct the proposed Centre. The report further recommends approval to proceed to the next stage in which the Council will enter into a pre-construction agreement with the preferred contractor, whereby the contractor will be asked to complete a full design and provide a firm price for the building works.
- Note: The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during part of the consideration of this item.
- 12 **Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy 2016-2021** (Pages 49 - 52)
To approve the Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy 2016-2021 and adjust financial provision for it.

OTHER DECISIONS

- 13 **Update of the Housing Allocation Scheme regarding the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme** (Pages 53 - 55)
To update the Housing Allocation Scheme to allow direct allocation of homes to people arriving in the Chichester District via the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme.
- 14 **Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Local Strategic Statement Adoption (LSS2)** (Pages 56 - 58)
To approve an updated Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Local Strategic Statement.
- 15 **Support to the Community and Voluntary Sector** (Pages 59 - 66)
To extend the Council's funding of Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (VAAC) for a further year and approve arrangements for agreeing a specification of service, pending a decision by West Sussex County Council on future funding for the service.
- 16 **Financial Monitoring 2015-16** (Pages 67 - 69)
To consider the quarterly Financial Monitoring report.
- 17 **Consideration of any late items as follows:**
a) Items added to the agenda papers and made available for public inspection
b) Items which the chairman 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 Cabinet is asked to consider in respect of the following item(s) 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 **Investment Opportunity** (Pages 70 - 81)

This report proposes that the Council acquires a property in Chichester with a net return on investment that exceeds the bank deposit rate.

20 **Development of Land at Barnfield Drive, Chichester** (Pages 82 - 85)

To approve a variation to the original development agreement relating to the Council's land at Barnfield Drive, Chichester, and to authorise negotiations relating thereto.

NOTES

1. The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any item of business wherever it is likely that there would be disclosure of "exempt information" as defined in section 100A of and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972
2. The press and public may view the report appendices which are not included with their copy of the agenda on the Council's website at [Chichester District Council - Minutes, agendas and reports](#). unless they contain exempt information.
3. Subject to the provisions allowing the exclusion of the press and public, the photographing, filming or recording of this meeting from the public seating area is permitted. To assist with the management of the meeting, anyone wishing to do this is asked to inform 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)
4. A key decision means an executive decision which is likely to:
 - result in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates or
 - be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards in the Council's area or
 - incur expenditure, generate income, or produce savings greater than £100,000.

Non-Cabinet member Councillors speaking at Cabinet

Standing Order 22.3 provides that members of the Council may, with the chairman's consent, speak at a Committee meeting of which they are not a member, or temporarily sit and speak at the Committee table on a particular item but shall then return to the public seating area.

The Leader of the Council intends to apply this Standing Order at Cabinet meetings by requesting that members should normally seek his consent in writing by email in advance of the meeting. They should do this by noon on the day before the meeting, outlining the substance of the matter that they wish to raise. The word "normally" is emphasised because there may be unforeseen circumstances where a member can assist the conduct of business by his or her contribution and where he would therefore retain his discretion to allow the

contribution without notice.



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 2 - East Pallant House on Tuesday 9 February 2016 at 9.30 am

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

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)

133 **Minutes**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the special meeting of the Cabinet held on 26 January 2016 be signed as a correct record.

134 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

135 **Declarations of Interests**

Mrs Lintill declared a personal and pecuniary interest in agenda item 17 (Petworth Skatepark) (see minute 149 below). She left the meeting during consideration of this item and took no part in the discussion and did not vote.

136 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted.

137 **Budget Spending Plans 2016-17**

Further to minute 97 of 1 December 2015, the Cabinet considered the report and appendices circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Hardwick introduced the report, reminding the Cabinet that the Council had approved the financial strategy in December.

Since then the Government had announced the provisional financial settlement for 2016/17 which contained yet further, steeper and deeper funding cuts, in particular

in respect of Revenue Support Grant (RSG), and introduced unforeseen new National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR) negative tariffs by 2018/19.

This was the sixth consecutive year of funding cuts, and made balancing the Council's future financial position significantly harder to achieve. It was estimated that the Council would be £800,000 worse off by 2019/20 than had been expected at the time the financial strategy was agreed in December.

The Council had ridden the successive funding cuts whilst maintaining front line services for the community, with only limited reductions. The main burden of cuts had so far fallen on administration and support. The aims of the Corporate Plan had been pursued: improving access to housing; supporting communities; fostering the local economy; managing built and natural environments; and all the while maintaining the council's financial resilience.

The Council had pursued a more commercial approach in preparation for dealing with these Government cuts and this approach and past fiscal prudence now enabled the Council to weather the central government cuts and keep the level of the council tax amongst the lowest in West Sussex.

This low tax status provided a special opportunity this financial year. Whilst council tax freeze grants had been withdrawn, low tax councils including this Council could raise Council tax (band D) by £5 or 2%, whichever was greater, without a referendum. This reflected the special circumstances of the tough financial settlement.

She recommended that the Council should take this valuable opportunity, which would have lasting year on year effects by increasing the tax base by over £250,000 each year onwards.

This was consistent with the financial strategy which aimed to avoid the use of reserves to support the revenue budget.

She commended the draft budget, which incorporated spending plans that supported the Council's values and at the same time demonstrated financial resilience and met all the tests of financial prudence.

Mr Ward reported that the Government's final settlement had been received the previous day. This was, in a number of ways, more advantageous than the draft settlement. The Council would become eligible for additional funding through transition grant and a share of a rural funding allocation. He suggested that, as a result, the Investment Opportunities Reserve be increased further. There was no prospect of renewal of council tax freeze grant, and the Government was assuming that councils would increase council tax.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

- (1) That a net budget requirement of £15,324,900 for 2016-17 be approved.
- (2) That Council tax is increased by £5 from £140.81 to £145.81 for a band D equivalent in 2016-17.

(3) That the Investment Opportunities Reserve is increased by £1,296,400.

RESOLVED

That the following be noted:

- (a) The capital programme, including the asset renewal programme and the Infrastructure Business Plan.
- (b) The current resources position.
- (c) The position regarding the asset review (paragraph 10.2) and the requirement to keep this funding under review.
- (d) The budget variances as set out in this report (para 8.5 and 8.6) including growth items.

138 **Consideration of Representations, Proposed Responses to Representations and Associated Modifications to the Council's First Infrastructure Business Plan**

Further to minute 43 of 8 September 2015, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report, reminding the Cabinet that parish councils, neighbouring authorities, including the South Downs National Park Authority, and key infrastructure delivery commissioners had been consulted on the draft Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) from 1 October to 12 November 2015. The responses to the draft IBP had been considered by the Joint Members Liaison Group on 2 December who agreed to the recommended modifications to the IBP including the modifications to the CIL spending plan. The proposals were also supported by the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel.

Most of the representations had related to minor amendments, but Mrs Taylor drew attention to the completion of the Chichester North Ambulance Community Response Post, without requirement for Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) funding, and to the matters relating to West Sussex County Council services described in paragraphs 3.8 to 3.13 of the report.

Mrs Taylor explained that the IBP was a living document which would be rolled forward annually. The projects within the IBP would be monitored and reported on each year in the annual Authority's Monitoring Report. Parish councils would also have to publish annually their CIL spend.

The IBP would provide transparency to residents and developers and enable the Council to have more control over its spending and to ascertain what projects would be funded from CIL or other sources.

She thanked Karen Dower (Principal Planning Officer (Infrastructure Planning)) for her hard work in compiling such a detailed and informative document.

Mrs Dower answered members' questions to the effect that use of CIL funding for school places and other services outside the district (e.g. Billingshurst) would be for the benefit of residents within the district; up to 5% of levy receipts would be used for administration only if required, although it could be smoothed over a three year period; and that as parish councils became more familiar with CIL it was hoped that funding sources for projects in Table 2 would be clarified (and ward members of the District Council could assist them with this).

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

- (1) That the proposed responses to the representations received and subsequent modifications to the Infrastructure Business Plan be approved as set out in Appendix 1.
- (2) That the amended IBP including CIL Spending Plan attached as Appendix 2 be approved.

139 Surface Water and Drainage Supplementary Planning Document

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

Mrs Taylor introduced the report and the draft Surface Water and Drainage Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), explaining that in order to deliver the growth set out in the Chichester Local Plan there had to be proper management of the water environment and assessment of whether the existing infrastructure could cope with the increase in demand.

Chichester District was fortunate in having access to a special water environment, much of which was subject to national and international designations. Unfortunately, this environment was already threatened by pollution. Therefore, it was important to ensure that the quality of the water environment did not deteriorate further as a result of new development. Accordingly, particular attention had been given to the proposals for foul and surface water drainage and the capacity within existing networks to accommodate any increase in flow.

The SPD would be a material consideration when assessing planning applications or appeals and would be reviewed and updated on a regular basis. The information in the SPD would provide useful advice to developers and consultants when preparing planning applications. It would also be a useful source of information for residents. If approved, the draft SPD would go out for consultation for six weeks from 10 March 2015.

Ms Payne (Planning Policy Officer) added that, in preparing the SPD, officers had worked closely with the Environment Agency and a Task and Finish Group from the Water Quality Group, which represented all relevant agencies.

The Cabinet welcomed the draft SPD as a tool to manage problems that were of acute interest to many local residents.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

- (1) That the Surface Water and Drainage Supplementary Planning Document (set out in Appendix 1 to this report) be approved for public consultation;
- (2) That, in respect of a screening opinion for the Surface Water and Drainage Supplementary Planning Document, a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not required. The screening opinion is set out in Appendix 2 to this report.
- (3) That the Head of Planning Services be authorised to make minor editorial and typographical amendments to the document prior to its publication.

140 Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement

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

Mr Finch introduced the report, reminding the Cabinet that the Council had a legal duty to publish the Senior Staff Policy Statement in the form required by the Government in the interests of openness and transparency.

Mr Radcliffe (Human Resources Manager) added that it was necessary to include details of the ratio between the pay of the highest paid and median paid members of staff.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That the Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement be published, subject to the inclusion in paragraph 7 of the ratio between the pay of the highest paid and median paid members of staff, which is 5.8.

141 Chichester District Place Plan

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

Mr Dignum introduced the Chichester District Place plan as one of a set being produced by West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) with each Borough and District Council, and together these would comprise the West Sussex Growth Plan.

The Plan was intended to outline investment and delivery options to deliver higher Gross Value Added (GVA), jobs, homes and employment space. (GVA was the value of output in an area less the input costs, mainly materials; and was roughly equal to the sum of the wages and profits generated in the area).

The Plan had been developed by WSSCC but with comments from the District Council. It was mainly descriptive rather than rich in policy proposals but did set out the key actions that would form the basis of funding bids in the future. It noted that key infrastructure requirements were being identified through an Infrastructure Business Plan Joint Member Liaison Group.

Section 3 of the Plan provided some key statistics on demographics etc. Section 4 listed the Strategic Development Locations, described the Chichester Vision project, and described the challenges for the Manhood and other coastal and rural areas. Section 5 listed priorities, namely: delivering housing; realizing a Chichester Vision; upgrading the A27; improving both broadband and skills training; and generating business growth, partly by using productively the 27 hectares of employment land assigned in the Local Plan

The Place Plan would not have status as a statutory planning document. However it was intended to support implementation of the statutory Local Plan, relevant Economic Development strategies and key investment decisions and would support funding bids.

Mr Carvell, Mr Barratt (Strategic Manager, Economy, WSCC) and Mrs Loe (Growth Lead – Chichester, WSCC) reported a list of proposed changes and clarifications to the draft Plan and members asked for some further changes.

Mrs Lintill expressed frustration at the omission of the South Downs National Park, and Mr Barratt explained that a Rural Plan was being drawn up in conjunction with the National Park Authority and the Council would be consulted on this.

RESOLVED

That the draft Chichester District Place Plan be endorsed and the Executive Director be authorised to agree minor editorial changes.

142 Initial Project Proposals (2016/17)

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

Mrs Keegan introduced the report, explaining that part of the annual business planning cycle involved the approval of Initial Project Proposal Documents (IPPDs) in fulfilment of the objectives of the Corporate Plan.

Mr Mildred (Corporate Improvement Manager) added that, following approval of the IPPDs, a full Project Initiation Document (PID) would be brought to the Cabinet for approval for each major project. In five cases, however, some initial funding from reserves was required for consultancy advice or other start-up costs as described in paragraph 5.2 of the report.

The Cabinet then considered each of the IPPDs. In particular the following points were made:

Guildhall Improvements: The Cabinet felt that the Guildhall had great potential, not only for weddings, but also for exhibitions and performances.

The Novium Museum Options Appraisal: The Cabinet noted that a report would be made to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in March on performance against the current business plan. It was hoped to report back to the Cabinet in September on

the options appraisal. The Cabinet asked that, if practicable, this report should be earlier.

Car Parks – Review of payments options: The Cabinet noted that the review would not only encompass “pay on foot”, but also alternatives to coins, including payments by card (including contactless card) and phone. A public consultation had just been completed and had provided useful feedback. The Chairman asked that the review should look at possibly providing more spaces, with the aim that the car parking experience should be pleasant for customers and not too expensive.

Renewing Chichester Business Improvement District (BID): Mr Over pointed out that a ballot on the future of the BID would take place, whether or not the Council supported its renewal.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Initial Project Proposals for 2016/17 attached in the Appendices be approved.
- (2) That the following funding be approved from Council reserves as indicated in section 5.2 of the report:
 - (a) £40,000 - New Employment Land - Retaining and Attracting Businesses
 - (b) £25,000 - St James Industrial Estate
 - (c) £20,000 - Disposal of former public conveniences, store and depot Priory Road
 - (d) £30,000 - Guildhall Improvements
 - (e) £30,000 – Museum Option Appraisal

143 Shared Services

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

Mr Finch introduced the report, explaining that in view of the financial pressures on the Council, it was important to make support services as efficient as possible and ready for the later 21st century, through innovation and digital revolution. The proposed options appraisal was the first step in a change in the way services were delivered. The shared services model was used in both the private sector and the public sector, where Hampshire’s shared services organisation had proven effective.

Although the Council already shared some services with Arun District Council, the scope of the proposed study had been widely drawn to encompass a range of services listed in recommendation 2.1. In addition to Arun, Horsham District Council had also asked to participate in the study. If the appraisal supported the shared services model it could be implemented all together or phased on a modular basis. Each Council was being asked to contribute £20,000 and this had been supplemented by £6,000 from the Local Government Association. His special

adviser, Cllr Simon Lloyd-Williams, was available to contribute expertise on a pro bono basis. He drew attention to the governance arrangements set out in Appendix A. The study was expected to take about three months.

Mrs Dodsworth (Head of Business Improvement Services) added that the consultant would start work on 23 February. The study was not simply about converging systems and services in the interests of efficiency, but about innovation and alternative service delivery. Arun District Council was also considering the option of out-sourcing services to a third party provider.

Mr Finch added that it was important to minimise the uncertainty for staff, and that they should only go through such a review once. The Chief Executive agreed and drew attention to the need to continue to motivate staff.

Mrs Lintill asked about the implications for other partners if one Council out-sourced ICT services. Mrs Dodsworth explained that in the shared service model there would be one employing body for each service. If the employing body had outsourced its ICT systems, the staff employed would use the outsourced ICT.

Mrs Keegan supported the project and suggested that complexities such as that raised by Mrs Lintill would need to be clarified as part of the study.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the proposed options appraisal to investigate the business case for a shared service of Revenues and Benefits, ICT, Customer Services, HR, Legal, Internal Audit and transactional Financial Services with Arun and Horsham District Councils be approved.
- (2) That up to £20,000 is funded from reserves for Chichester District Council's share of consultancy costs associated with this project.
- (3) That Officers be instructed to provide the options appraisal and business case based on the principles identified in paragraph 2.3 of the Appendix to a future Cabinet for consideration.
- (4) That this options appraisal is pursued on the basis of approval from appropriate Cabinets at each authority.

144 Housing Strategy Review

Further to minute 654 of 14 October 2014, the Cabinet considered the report and appendices circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report, explaining that the Housing Strategy review had considered practical ways of assisting first time buyers into home ownership. However, the task was difficult in a district of high property values in relation to low wages. The Housing and Planning Bill 2015 referred to Starter Homes whereby discounts of a minimum of 20% would be given, with a cap of £250,000 on the value outside London. The average price of a new 2 bedroom house in Chichester was

£300,000. If sold to a couple at a discount of 20% with a 5% deposit, this would require a joint income of £50,677. The average salary of a Chichester resident was £25,739 (employee £22,865).

Whilst encouraging home ownership, there would always be a section of the community that would never be able to own their own property regardless of the government measures to encourage home ownership. There would always be a need for affordable rented property.

In last year's summer budget the government had introduced measures to reduce affordable housing rents by 1 % for the next four years. Since then most of the larger Registered Providers (RPs) had reassessed their development programmes and indicated a reluctance to develop small rural sites. This was a particular problem for a district such as Chichester with a large rural population. Furthermore, in order to supplement their funding, the RPs were showing a preference to develop a higher proportion of intermediate housing and in some cases even market housing. Some including Hyde had indicated that in future they would look to develop a split of 70% intermediate and 30% rent, whereas at present the Council usually required the reverse.

In future it was likely to become more difficult to develop affordable rented housing and some of the existing rental stock was likely to be lost through the Right to Buy. However, as a housing authority the Council still had a duty to provide housing and in order to fulfil its obligations alternative ways of meeting housing needs were being explored. A comprehensive list of delivery options either considered or under investigation was included in appendix 2 to the Cabinet report. There was no one easy solution and, in an ever changing and challenging housing environment, a flexible toolkit of delivery options was recommended so that opportunities could be taken up as they arise. These included encouraging Community Land Trusts, supporting smaller registered providers, working with partner organisations such as WSCC to deliver housing through a housing company, and extending the Council's Homefinder scheme by incentivising and retaining landlords to mitigate the effects of welfare reforms.

The Housing strategy review in appendix 1 to the report set out the issues and options in greater detail. It concluded that the current four priorities were still relevant and that the affordable housing targets should be retained. A review of the use of capital funds had also been undertaken.

The Housing Strategy Delivery Plan at appendix 3 provided details of performance to date against milestones. Generally all milestones had either been met, delayed due to circumstances beyond the Council's control or were no longer deemed relevant. New targets and actions as identified by the strategy review had been added to the delivery plan.

It was proposed to add to Priority 1, action 10 in Appendix 3 that the Council would publicise and support the DCLG initiative for small builders, the "Builders Finance Fund", in order to encourage more small-scale developments, and would investigate further the potential to support local businesses.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the review of the Housing Strategy be endorsed.
- (2) That the recommended range of options for future housing delivery as set out in section 6 of appendix 1 be approved.
- (3) That the progress achieved in delivering the existing targets in the Housing Strategy Delivery Plan at appendix 3 be noted and the new target dates be endorsed.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That the proposed changes to the capital investment programme be approved as set out in 6 below and Appendix 1 section 7.

145 Beach Management Plan 2016-2021

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

Mr Barrow introduced the report. He welcomed Dominic Henly to the meeting and congratulated him on his appointment as Senior Engineer, following the retirement of David Lowsley.

Mr Barrow pointed out that the existing phase of the Beach Management Plan (BMP) expired in March 2016, and an application should now be made to the Environment Agency (EA) for Grant in Aid for the second phase of the BMP from 2016 to 2021, funding for which was already earmarked in the EA's medium term plan. In this phase the Council was not required to continue to provide match funding of £50,000 pa, but the coastal defences were still subject to the uncertainties of future weather conditions and coastal processes.

Mr Henly added that 2016/17 was the sixth year of a 100 year shoreline management plan. Weak spots in the sea defences had already been identified and filled in, and the next phase was to improve beach levels in order to offer better protection to local residents. Although the Council had a maintenance budget, it would not be able to do so much without the grant in aid from the EA.

RESOLVED

- (1) That officers apply to the Environment Agency (EA) for £1.25m of Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) for the Beach Management Plan (BMP).
- (2) Subject to EA approval of grant, that funding be spent in line with the BMP 2016-21 Schedule of Works shown at table 1.
- (3) That the Head of Housing and Environment Services following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment be authorised to amend the BMP Schedule of Works, set out in Table 1, if required during this period.

- (4) That the Head of Housing and Environment Services be authorised to procure and award contracts for work in accordance with the BMP 2016-21 and Financial Standing Orders.

146 Birdham Parish Neighbourhood Plan

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

Mrs Taylor introduced the report, explaining that the Examiner's recommendations on the Birdham Neighbourhood Plan had been received. The Examiner had made a number of minor recommendations, which related mainly to revisions in the wording and content of policies. These had been considered and accepted by Birdham Parish Council. It was recommended that, subject to these modifications as set out in the Decision Statement, the Neighbourhood Plan proceed to referendum.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Decision Statement as set out in the appendix be published.
- (2) That the examiner's recommendation that the Neighbourhood Development Plan proceed to referendum, subject to modifications as set out in the decision statement, be approved.

147 Tangmere Parish Neighbourhood Plan

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

Mrs Taylor introduced the report, explaining that the Examiner's recommendations on the Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan had been received. The Examiner had made a number of minor recommendations, which related mainly to revisions in the wording and content of policies. These had been considered and accepted by Tangmere Parish Council. It was recommended that, subject to these modifications as set out in the Decision Statement, the Neighbourhood Plan proceed to referendum.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Decision Statement as set out in the appendix be published.
- (2) That the examiner's recommendation that the Neighbourhood Development Plan proceed to referendum, subject to modifications as set out in the decision statement, be approved.

148 **Car Parking Charges - Response to Consultation**

Further to minute 62 of 6 October 2015, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda and a supplementary report (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Keegan introduced the report, reminding the Cabinet of their decision to formally consult on proposals for revised car parking charges. During the consultation period one representation had been received from Midhurst Town Council, repeating their comments from earlier consultation. She pointed out that the cost of maintenance of car parks in Midhurst exceeded the income from charges. Furthermore, two hours free parking was still available at The Grange car park. She felt, therefore, that the concerns about the reduction to one hour of the free parking in the North Street and Post Office car parks had been mitigated.

Mrs Keegan added that, since the consultation period closed, two representations had been received from Bosham (dealt with in the supplementary report).

With the Chairman's permission, Mrs Plant addressed the Cabinet as ward councillor. She pointed out that Bosham was the only rural car park to which a 50% increase had been applied. She accepted that there was high summer demand from the public, but pointed out that the residents of Shore Road were unable to park on street because of tidal flooding, and therefore depended on the public car park. The increase of the season ticket monthly charge from £10 to £15, combined with the removal of the facility for four vehicle registrations, increased the costs to local residents from £120 pa at present to £180 pa or to £360 pa if they had two cars.

Mrs Murphy (Parking Services Manager) pointed out that even if residents used the current facility to have more than one registration number on the season ticket, they could only park one car at a time, as the ticket had to be displayed on the parked vehicle.

The Chairman pointed out that the monthly charge for season tickets in the car parks in Chichester was around £40, compared with a proposed £15 in Bosham.

After debate, the Cabinet decided to confirm the charges as proposed.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the charges set out within the Appendix, together with those considered by Cabinet at their meeting in October 2015, be implemented from 1 April 2016.
- (2) That the Head of Commercial Services be authorised to give appropriate notice of any revised charges pursuant to the Off-street Parking Places (Consolidation) Order 2015 and the Road Traffic Act 1984.

149 **Petworth Skatepark**

(Mrs Lintill declared a personal and prejudicial interest and left the room during consideration of this item)

Further to minute 359 of 5 February 2013, the Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Keegan introduced the report, and described the history of this matter, and the safety concerns that had been expressed about the provision of a skatepark at the Sylvia Beaufoy car park site. She read representations from the Sylvia Beaufoy Youth Club (referred to in paragraph 8.5 of the report), which had been received since the report was published. These opposed this location on account of safety issues due to the steep incline from the proposed site to the main road, of potential disturbance to residential properties in Downview Road, and of the potential impact on the Youth Club's staff and reputation because of the potential perception of a close association between the proposed skatepark and the Youth Club.

Some members expressed concern about the possible loss of disabled car parking spaces, but it was pointed out that there were better located facilities for the disabled elsewhere in the town.

Mrs Keegan acknowledged that a residents' survey had shown support for a skatepark, but in her view this was the wrong location because of safety considerations.

RESOLVED

That the District Council, whilst supporting the provision of a skatepark facility for Petworth, has concerns regarding the safety of the proposed facility in this location. As a result it requests Petworth Town Council to explore alternative locations for the proposed skatepark or to look at an alternative form of youth facility provision (not wheeled sports) at the identified location at Sylvia Beaufoy Car Park, subject to planning permission, full occupational terms and site management arrangements.

150 **Developer and Partner Charter**

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

Mrs Keegan introduced the report, drawing attention to the demographic factors referred to in paragraph 3.1 and explained that other councils in West Sussex had found that a Developer and Partner Charter, as an informal agreement between the Council, developers, skills and training providers and local businesses and community groups, had succeeded in improving opportunities for local people and businesses.

RESOLVED

That the Developer and Partner Charter be approved and adopted, and that developers and associated businesses be encouraged to sign-up to the principles and objectives.

151 **Access Road to Florence Park from Pound Farm Road**

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

Mrs Keegan introduced the report, reminding the Cabinet that the unsatisfactory condition of this road, which gave access to the Florence Road recreation ground, the sea cadets hut and a number of residences had been raised at the Council meeting on 15 December 2015. The report proposed that the Council should allocate £20,000 from reserves to resurface the unmade section of road.

RESOLVED

- (1) That £20,000 is allocated from reserves for the making up of the unmade section of the access road from Pound Farm Road to Florence Park, Chichester
- (2) That the Head of Commercial Services be authorised to apply to the Land Registry to register the land in the Council's ownership.

152 **The Smoke and Carbon Monoxide Alarm (England) Regulations 2015**

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

Mrs Taylor introduced the report, explaining that it was essential to ensure that rented properties were safe homes to occupy. The Smoke and Carbon Monoxide Alarm (England) Regulations 2015, made under the Energy Act 2013, had come into force on 1 October 2015. The regulations required landlords to install smoke alarms on every storey of their property and carbon monoxide alarms in any room containing a solid fuel burning appliance e.g. an open log fire. Gas appliances were already regulated under The Gas Safety (Installation and Use) Regulations 1998 which required appliances to be tested every twelve months.

Landlords had to ensure at the commencement of a tenancy that the requisite smoke and carbon monoxide alarms were installed and in good working order. During the tenancy itself it was the obligation of the tenant to ensure that they continued to be in working order and it was advisable that landlords had a clause in the tenancy agreement to this effect.

A landlord who failed to comply with the legislation would be served with a remedial notice, which had to be complied with within 28 days. Failure to comply could result in a fine of up to £5,000. The Head of Housing and Environmental Services would have discretion to issue a lower fine if satisfied that there were extenuating circumstances. Arrangements were in hand to publicise the new requirements.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the enforcement powers for the Smoke and Carbon Monoxide Alarm (England) Regulations 2015 be delegated to the Head of Housing and Environment Services.

- (2) That the statement of principles for the setting of penalty charges be approved.
- (3) That any monies received through the issuing of fines be held in reserves and used for private sector housing renewal.

153 Exclusion of the Press and Public

RESOLVED

That the public, including the press, together with councillors not on the Cabinet and officers not involved, be excluded from the meeting for the following item on the grounds that it is likely that there would be a disclosure to the public of 'exempt information' of the description specified in Paragraph 5 (legal professional privilege) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 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.

154 Westgate Leisure Centre, Carbon Trust Scheme

Further to minutes 469 of 3 September 2013 and 24 of 7 July 2015, the Cabinet considered a report, and appended advice from Counsel dated 8 December 2015, in relation to claims and the prospects of recovery of certain losses arising from the supply and subsequent failure of the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) units at the Westgate Leisure Centre. Mr Stewart (Legal Practice Manager) advised the Cabinet on the legal aspects of the report and its appendix, and Mr Bacon (Building and Facilities Services Manager) described the works that had been carried out to mitigate the problems caused by failure of the CHP units and the termination by the original suppliers of their maintenance contract and to ensure business continuity at the Westgate Leisure Centre.

The Chief Executive explained that lessons had been learned from the experience. A full audit had been carried out and scrutinised by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.

The Cabinet discussed Counsel's advice in detail. They considered whether to obtain further specialist advice as to liability and quantum of any claim. They also considered a number of possible courses of action.

RESOLVED

That the Executive Director, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Support Services and legal services, be authorised to determine future action in relation to this matter.

The meeting ended at 1.00 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

[THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY]

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Timing of Council Meetings

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Diane Shepherd, Chief Executive

Tel: 01243 534709 E-mail: dshepherd@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Cllr Philippa Hardwick, Cabinet Member for Finance and Governance

Tel: 01428 661866 E-mail: phardwick@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

2.1. To recommend to Council the proposed changes to Council meetings as listed in paragraph 5.3(a) and (b).

2.2. Cabinet to note that there was no clear majority for changing the time of Council and is invited to recommend to Council either:

(a) A morning start time of 10:30am (with briefing sessions starting at 9:30am); or

(b) An afternoon start time. If the majority of Members vote for an afternoon meeting they will subsequently be asked to vote on either:

i. A 2:00pm start time (with briefing sessions starting at 12:30pm); or

ii. A 2:30pm start time (with briefing sessions starting at 1:00pm).

3. Background

3.1. The Council's constitution sets out the procedural standing orders for the running of Council meetings. Dates and timings of meetings are agreed annually by Council, although additional meetings and changes to dates and times of meetings may be agreed with the Chairman's consent.

3.2. The majority of the Council's meetings are held at 2:30pm and many are preceded by a briefing session on a relevant topic and an open forum where Members can ask questions of the Senior Leadership Team. Council has, in the past, experimented with holding meetings at different times of the day but Members have always voted to revert back 2:30pm start times for Council meetings.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

4.1. To ensure that Council business is transacted efficiently and effectively.

- 4.2. That the timing of Council meetings is such that the majority of Members who wish to contribute to the debate have the opportunity to do so in accordance with the Council's rules on debate.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. The last two meetings were particularly long and were preceded by both an information topic and an open forum. This led to a number of Members asking if the timing of the meetings could be changed and whether the business of Council could be discharged more efficiently.
- 5.2. An email was sent by the Chief Executive to all Members asking questions on length, frequency and timing of Council meetings. Details of the email can be found in Appendix 1.
- 5.3. Appendix 2 provides a summary of the responses received. As might be expected, there was a variety of views expressed and, based on these responses, the Chief Executive recommends that the following changes should be made:

(a) The Length of meetings:

- Introductions by Cabinet Members should be limited to a maximum of 400 words, or 3 minutes, unless it is a really significant or complex topic.
- There should be no introductions by Cabinet members for items that are to be noted, such as Urgent Decisions.
- It is proposed that a Members' Task and Finish Group be set up to review the Council's Constitution and any proposed changes are reported to Cabinet and Council in July 2016. The terms of reference for the Task and Finish Group are set out in Appendix 3.
- Although, it is important to discharge Council business efficiently and effectively, it is more important that Members have an opportunity to express their views and, therefore, there should be no curtailment of the length of the meeting. The current rules of debate are clearly set out in Constitution and no changes are proposed (see Appendix 4). It is the responsibility of the Chairman to determine how long a debate should last and whether a Member is unduly monopolising the debate.
- For the reasons set out above there should be no change to the time allocated to 'Questions to the Executive' but Members should be encouraged to submit written questions in advance.
- Members should not be asked to stand when asking questions at Council.

(b) Frequency of Meetings

- As a matter of principle, there should not be more than two ordinary Cabinet meetings reporting to any one Council meeting and extra

meetings should be arranged as and when required. The Chairman already has discretion to hold additional meetings or to cancel Council meetings.

(c) Timing of Meetings

In the email sent from the Chief Executive on 5 February 2016, Members were asked to place the following options in order of preference:

Option A – A 9:30 am start time with a one hour briefing (up to one hour with either an open forum or special topic but not both) lasting until 10:30am, with an 11:00 am start for a Council meeting aiming to finish by 1:30pm, with no lunch.

Option B – A start time of 12 noon with a one hour briefing (up to one hour with either an open forum or special topic but not both) with 30 minutes for lunch at 1pm. Council would commence at 1:30pm aiming to finish by 4pm.

Option C – No change to the present arrangement of briefings before lunch and then a 2:30pm start to Council.

The results, based on responses received, are:

Option A – 12 (25%)
Option B – 8 (17%)
Option C – 9 (19%)
No preference – 4 (8%)
Two equal preferences – 2 (4%)
No response – 13 (27%)

The issue on preferred timing is not clear cut and, although Option A scored the highest number for first preference, no one Option had a clear majority. Even though Members were asked to rank their preferences, many did not and it has not been possible, therefore, to ascertain 2nd and 3rd preferences.

Four Members had no preference and 13 didn't respond. A number of Members who stated Option B or C as their preferred Option also stated they would like the meeting to start at 2pm instead of 1:30pm or 2:30pm. In addition, two Members stated two options as their equal preference. Some working Members expressed concern at their ability to attend Council meetings if they started in the morning.

Option A has the highest preference (25%), but not a clear majority. Given that there is no clear majority for any of the preferences and 18 Members either didn't respond or had no preference, this would suggest there is no clear mandate for change. It is therefore proposed that Option B is eliminated, as this is the least favoured Option and Council is asked to vote for either Option A or Option C. In addition, if the majority of the Members vote for Option C, then it is proposed that there should be the sub-option of starting the meeting either at 2pm or at 2:30pm. The thinking behind this is that a 2pm start (with any information briefings starting at 12:30, to include lunch) should allow for the majority of Council meetings to be finished by 4pm, as late finishes were a concern for some members.

6. Alternatives that have been considered

6.1. Three options were considered, as set out in the report.

7. Resource and legal implications

7.1. None

8. Consultation

8.1. All Members, whose views are reported herein.

9. Community impact and corporate risks

9.1. Whichever option is chosen, Members will need to ensure, where practical, that the Council's policies do not deter unrepresented groups from fully participating in the democratic process.

9.2. Members also need to be mindful of allowing open and transparent discussions at Council where Members who wish to comment have the opportunity to do so.

10. Other Implications

10.1. None

11. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Email to all Members from the Chief Executive.

Appendix 2 – Responses from Members

Appendix 3 – Terms of Reference for proposed Task & Finish Group on the Constitution

Appendix 4 – Extract from the Council's Constitution on rules of debate.

12. Background Papers

None

Email from Diane Shepherd, the Chief Executive, to all Members
Friday, 5 February 2016

Dear Member

Council meetings

Following the relatively long Council meetings in December and January, some members have expressed a preference for an earlier start to Council meetings.

I suggest we need to give consideration not only to the timing of meetings but also how their length might be reduced and how often they should be held.

I set out below some suggestions on length, frequency and timing of Council meetings:

Length of Council meetings

1. Introductions by Cabinet members: assume members have read the papers and limit to a maximum of 400 words or 3 minutes unless it is a really big issue like leisure
2. Items for noting like Urgent Decisions: no introduction
3. Questions to Executive: retain at 40 minutes but with encouragement of written questions in advance so answers can also be prepared in advance, allowing more questions to be handled.
4. Review of constitution: Expand the planned officer report to cabinet and council to include suggestions of matters which need not go to Council (eg consultation stage of proposed planning and other policies which would come to Council ONLY for final approval before implementation).
5. Chairman to take a list of speakers before each debate and urge each member to limit to one speech per debate but allow new points or rebuttals in a second intervention.
6. Possibly indicate a finishing time on the agenda "subject to extension if approved by a majority of councillors present".
7. Should members be asked to stand when making speeches?

Frequency of Council meetings

The Calendar of meetings should ensure that no more than two Cabinet meetings should be referring matters to any one Council meeting. We will need an extra Council meeting in late April 2017 to meet this requirement if it is agreed. This there would be 11 Cabinet meetings linking in to 7 Council meetings. However, the option remains to have additional/cancel Council meetings as necessary to meet the needs of the Council's business.

Timing of Council meetings

Considerations on timing:

- We need to ensure time for SLT open sessions and for other member briefings, preferably before Council but limit their total length to one hour to avoid too long a day.
- The start time of the pre-meetings should reflect travelling time and traffic conditions so should not be earlier than 9.30a.m.

Options for timing:

- A. Have a 9.30 am start time for up to one hour's briefing (either an open forum or special topic but not both) lasting until 10.30am, with an 11.00 am start for a Council meeting aiming to finish by 1.30pm, with no lunch.
- B. Have a start time of 12 noon for up to one hour's briefing (either an open forum or special topic but not both) with 30 minutes for lunch at 1pm. Full Council would commence at 1 30pm; this should ensure a finish by 4pm, given the measures above to reduce the length of meetings.
- C. No change in the present arrangements of briefings before lunch and then a 2 30pm start to Council.

Please indicate your preference using the table below and return to member services by Friday 12 February.

Name:

OPTION	VOTE1,2,3 in order of preference
A	
B	
C	

Please also let me have any other comments or suggestions regarding the above. Based on these preferences I intend to make recommendations to the next Council meeting on timings and the format of the meeting. We are also undertaking a full review of the Council's Constitution to ensure all Council business is done in the most efficient, effective and democratic way. The full review will be presented to the May Council for approval.

Please add any additional Comments:

Best Regards

Diane

Diane Shepherd

Chief Executive

Executive Officers

Chichester District Council

Tel: 01243 534709 | Fax: 01243 776766 | dshepherd@chichester.gov.uk |

<http://www.chichester.gov.uk>

www.facebook.com/ChichesterDistrictCouncil | www.twitter.com/ChichesterDC

Responses from Members

- A. Have a 9:30 am start time for up to one hour's briefing (either an open forum or special topic but not both) lasting until 10:30am, with an 11:00 am start for a Council meeting aiming to finish by 1:30pm, with no lunch.
- B. Have a start time of 12 noon for up to one hour's briefing (either an open forum or special topic but not both) with 30 minutes for lunch at 1pm. Full Council would commence at 1:30pm; this should ensure a finish by 4pm, given the measures above to reduce the length of meetings.
- C. No change in the present arrangements of briefings before lunch and then a 2:30pm start to Council.

Order of Votes	Comments
B with a 2pm start	Have more Council meetings – don't curtail debate
Did not specify	Open to any suggestions as has no work commitments
A B (not C)	
C but could start at 2pm	Easier for working members and public to take an afternoon off than to split the day.
A C B	
Did not specify	Start time not an issue, but no more than 2 hours
B	
A (9.30-11); B(11-1); C(11-2.30)	
A B C	
Did not specify, but prefers 9.30 start, so assume A	Concentrate on business of meeting; not what goes before.
C B A	Business requirements in am so morning Council meetings would not work for him
A	9.30 start and 1.30 finish enables a ½ day out
Did not specify	OK with any time; go with majority. Supports 1-6
C B A with 2pm start	Supports 1-6.
C B A	
C B A with 2pm start	Take into consideration the needs of working age Cllrs
Did not specify; prefers morning starts but suggests alternating 9.30 and 2.30 starts so assume equal preference A & C	Gives parents/carers perspective, to avoid school pick-up times.
Did not specify	OK with any time; prefers daylight
C A B	Working Cllrs should work first half of day. Supports better use of time suggestions.
A B C	Full time carer; not easy to get late pm cover
C	Prefers pm to get ½ day teaching first. Would like late pm or evening meetings.
A B	
A B C	
C B A – 2pm start	
C B A	
A B C	
B C A	Increasing traffic and need to make domestic and business arrangements make 9.30 start difficult. Proper debate important
B – midday start	

B C A	Would be happy to see a 10:00 start time for Full Council, followed by the questions to SLT, followed by briefings.
B & C (B preferable)	
B A C	Encourage members to settle questions and points of detail before issues get to Council meeting
B C A – 2pm start	Enable people to have their say, subject to good chairmanship.
A B C	Favours a morning start
A B C	Leans to earlier start with 4 pm cut off
B A C	

First choices, where stated or implied:-

A = 12 (25%)

B = 8 (17%)

C = 9 (19%)

Nil response = 13 (27%)

Did not specify = 4 (8%)

Two equal preferences = 2 (4%)

Terms of Reference for proposed Task & Finish Group on the
Constitution

1. Membership:

Chairman – Cabinet Member for Finance and Governance

Four other Members to be appointed by Cabinet on the recommendation of the Cabinet Member for Finance and Governance – to include at least 1 Member from the opposition groups.

2. Frequency – or number – of meetings

Two meetings to be held.

3. Reporting

Report to be taken to Cabinet and Council in July 2016.

4. Broad Objectives

- To review the Council's Constitution and advise Cabinet and Council on any changes. In particular:
 - How decisions are made; and
 - The effective operation of the Council's business

5. Advisors

John Ward, Head of Finance and Governance
Philip Coleman, Member Services Manager

APPENDIX 4

Extract (Section 4.8 – Rules of Debate) from the Council’s Constitution

Rules of Debate

- 8.1 A proposal may only be discussed after it has been **moved** by one Member and **seconded** by another.
- 8.2 A member when speaking shall address the chairman of the meeting.
- 8.3 The Chairman will decide the **order of speeches** by Members and (at a Council meeting).whether a Member will be permitted to speak more than once.
- 8.4 Speeches by Members shall normally last not more than **5 minutes** unless the chairman approves a longer period.
- 8.5 **Amendments** to motions shall be moved and seconded before they are discussed and the chairman has discretion to allow more than one amendment to be discussed at the same time.
- 8.6 A Member may raise, without notice, any matter relating to the **procedure** of the meeting (for example rules of debate, reference of an item to a committee, appointing a new committee, sub-committee or task and finish group etc., or a point of order – that is, an alleged breach of a statutory provision or a Standing Order).
- 8.7 During a debate a Member may move a “**closure motion**” that is, that the motion being discussed be voted upon, or that the Meeting should proceed to the next business, or that the Meeting should be adjourned.
- 8.8 If a “**closure motion**” is seconded, the chairman shall decide if the matter has been discussed sufficiently and he may then ask the Member who moved the original motion for his comments and the meeting shall then vote on the “closure motion”.
- 8.9 A meeting shall not discuss any personal matter relating to a **member of staff** (for example, his appointment, promotion, salary or conduct) until it has excluded the public and the press.

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Recommendations of the Grants Task and Finish Group

1. Contacts

Cabinet Member:

Eileen Lintill, Cabinet Member for Community Services
Tel: 01243 538585 E-mail: elintill@chichester.gov.uk

Report Author:

Dave Hyland, Communities and Partnership Support Manager
Tel: 01243 534864 E-mail: dhyland@chichester.gov.uk

2. Executive Summary

This report summarises the findings of a Task and Finish Group that reviewed the allocations of New Homes Bonus and Discretionary Grants. The recommendations look to sustain both forms of funding, but propose changes that ensure these funds continue to be used to best effect.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1. **That the unspent balance of the Low Carbon Chichester District Fund be transferred to the Private Sector Renewal Budget for the Chichester Warm Homes Initiative.**
- 3.2. **That the revisions to the New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Policy as set out in Appendix 2 be recommended to Council for approval**
- 3.3. **That the revisions to the Grants and Concessions Policy as set out in Appendix 4 of the report be approved**
- 3.4. **That the draft “Priorities and Principles for Funding” for the financial year 2016-17 (Appendix 6) be approved**
- 3.5. **That Cabinet give consideration, at the appropriate time, to including the funding of the grants programme within the base budget once these funds have been exhausted; currently forecasted to be from 2020-21**

4. Background

- 4.1. At its October 2015 meeting, the Grants and Concessions Panel established a Task and Finish Group to consider the future of various discretionary funding sources made available by this Council.
- 4.2. The Low Carbon Chichester District Fund was created utilising historic Home Energy Conservation Act (HECA) monies received from the Energy Savings Trust. The fund facilitated projects that had significant carbon savings to

community groups or groups of residential properties in the District. Subsequent changes to the eligibility criteria for “Feed in Tariffs” have significantly reduced the interest in the Fund for renewable energy measures (e.g. Solar Panels) and there have been no bids received in over a year.

- 4.3. The New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Scheme (NHB) has run successfully for three years, with £400,000 available annually for Parishes to apply to. The Scheme utilises New Homes Bonus monies received from Government, but with increasing uncertainty regarding future receipts it was felt appropriate to review.
- 4.4. In addition, the Council has a single Grants pot of £250,000 per annum. Predominantly funded from reserves (£36,800 per annum is in base budget), the fund, if fully allocated, will last until mid 2017. Mindful of the significant value in achieving the objectives of this Council through the initiatives of local businesses, community or voluntary groups, ways of sustaining this offer in the longer term have been explored.

5. Outcomes to be achieved

- 5.1. The purpose of the review undertaken by the Task and Finish Group was to:
 - (i) consider the effectiveness of grant giving in the last 3 years,
 - (ii) reflect on the current needs for financial support,
 - (iii) consider the future provision of Business Loans,
 - (iv) propose revisions to the Priorities and Principles of funding, and
 - (v) to review and make recommendations to Cabinet for changes to Policy and to the Grants and Concessions Panel guidance.

6. Proposal

- 6.1. In respect of the Low Carbon Chichester District fund, it is proposed that the unexpended balance (£95,221 at the time of writing – this varies from the amount reported in Appendix 1 as subsequent to that report being written, an historic award has expired without being spent) is transferred to the Private Sector Renewal Budget for the Chichester Warm Homes Initiative. The Grants and Concessions Panel received a report from the Environmental Housing Manager (Appendix 1) and concurred that this reallocation of monies would be more successful in implementing projects and, if approved, would be in line with its original objectives from Government.
- 6.2. In respect of the NHB scheme, it is proposed that the annual allocation is reduced from £400,000 to £250,000 and the amount will be subject to annual confirmation by Cabinet. Allocations in the first three years of operating the scheme have been:
 - 2013/14 £346,142.50
 - 2014/15 £297,637.50
 - 2015/16 £271,755.39

- 6.3. To ensure that the funding scheme remains effective, it is proposed that there is a cap of a maximum allocation per Parish of £100,000 (which in effect is a cap on Chichester City Council) and a collar whereby Parishes which have had less than 5 houses built in the preceding 3 years will no longer be eligible. Applications in respect of projects that have already been highlighted by Parishes in the annual refreshment of the Infrastructure Business Plan would have a shortened application form, but other projects would remain eligible.
- 6.4. Accordingly a revised NHB (Parish Allocations) Policy has been drafted for Cabinet to approve and recommend to Council (Appendix 2). As some of the implications are within the detailed guidance, the Grants and Concessions Panel has already developed and agreed revised guidance which is appended (Appendix 3) to aid decision making here.
- 6.5. In respect of the general Grants Pot, it is proposed that the annual budget is reduced from £250,000 to £175,000, to ensure the longevity of the scheme. Allocations in previous years are detailed in the Panel's Annual Report and in the last 3 years have totalled:
- 2013/14 £197,944
 - 2014/15 £215,813
 - 2015/16 £159,556 (allocated to date with bids totalling £48,498 to be considered at Panel on 24th March 2016)
- 6.6. Typically the maximum grant will now be £15,000 (reduced from £25,000). To manage the demand, the Task and Finish Group expressed the need for the Council's priorities to be more specific in order to communicate what the Council would like to fund in any one year and by omission what it will not. The Task and Finish Group has therefore approved revised "Priorities and Principles for Funding 2016/17" (Appendix 6) for consideration by the Cabinet. It is intended that these priorities will be reviewed on an annual basis.
- 6.7. Revisions to the Grants and Concessions Policy have been drafted for Cabinet to approve (Appendix 4). As some of the implications are within the detailed guidance, the Grants and Concessions Panel has already developed and agreed revised guidance which is further appended (Appendix 5).
- 6.8. With Cabinet approval, changes to the NHB (Parishes Allocation) Scheme will be shared with parishes as soon as possible with a view to maintaining the annual programme of applications (submissions by end of July 2016) for consideration in September 2016.
- 6.9. The scope of the Task and Finish Group included consideration of how proposed Business Loans might be determined alongside Grant giving. The development of such loans are yet to be considered by Cabinet and as a result the Grants and Concessions Panel will revisit this issue in the future.

7. Alternatives that have been considered

- 7.1. In respect of the Low Carbon Chichester District fund, the Grants and Concessions Panel had previously considered, at its meeting on 21 October

2014, allocating the remaining balance to then proposed “Your Energy Sussex” residential work programmes. The Panel has been awaiting further clarity on this work programme, but national changes to the “Green Deal” led to delays and there remains no clear way forward for “able to pay” households. The proposal to facilitate the Warm Homes Initiative is considered to be implementable and complementary (but not duplicative) to what is now proposed under the County wide scheme to address fuel poverty.

- 7.2. In respect of the NHB (Parish Allocations) there was consideration given to ceasing the scheme in the light of continued uncertainty regarding Government funding. However, funds have been received from Government for 2015/16 along with confirmation of a 2016/17 allocation of £3.66m, which justifies running the scheme in 2016/17 and making provision for the opportunity in subsequent years.
- 7.3. In terms of the “indicative allocation” to parishes, consideration was given to a number of different models of distribution with caps and collars of varying amounts. One model considered allocations considering the level of development proportional to the size of the existing parish, which produced a model so markedly different that it was not supported by the Task and Finish Group. The introduction of a collar was recommended as this was consistent with the Government’s objective to reward communities that have taken development, and 4 or fewer new houses over 3 years was not felt by members of the Task and Finish Group to constitute “development” (in its scale and therefore its local impact) for the purpose of NHB allocation. Parishes not eligible for NHB would still be able to make an application under the general pot.
- 7.4. In respect of the Grants pot, recommendations were informed by the level and type of applications received over the last 3 years. Consideration was given to creating dedicated pots for specific objectives, but this has not worked well in the past and it was felt that refined priorities could achieve the same outcome.
- 7.5. Looking at options for future funding, Members did consider requesting that the grants funding be built into the base budget from 2017/18 (given that the 2016/17 budget has already been debated at Cabinet) and return any unspent reserve allocation at March 2017.

8. Resource and legal implications

- 8.1. The reduction of discretionary funding budgets will have little staff resource implications, as the level of demand for funding will probably remain consistent with previous years. Therefore the funding advice and the processing of applications undertaken by staff will remain. However, more explicit priorities may help manage what applications we receive and filter out some potential applications at the point of enquiry. Applications will not be progressed if there has been no prior dialogue with Funding Advisers.
- 8.2. Echoing the use of a “Funding Agreement” for NHB monies, a similar arrangement will be used for all Grant offers. While this would be an additional stage to the current grant giving process, it would reduce subsequent disputes about the use of grant awards which would compensate. Signed agreement of

grant recipients to general and any specific conditions of the award would be more transparent.

- 8.3. If provision in the base budget for a grants pot of £175,000 from 2020/21 is made then there will be an implication for the revenue budget, and need to be built into the deficit reduction programme to be reported to a future Cabinet meeting.
- 8.4. The uncommitted general grants budget that has accrued from financial years 2010-11 to 2015-16 and the Grants and Contributions Reserve are ring-fenced and can therefore be used to fund the grants programme from 2016-17

9. Consultation

- 9.1. Officers have spent some time tracking the potential for the Your Energy Sussex work programmes, with regular dialogue with WSCC officers and colleagues from neighbouring Districts and Boroughs. The proposal for Warm Homes Initiative and the reallocation of these monies has been endorsed by both Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Grants and Concessions Panel, independent of the considerations of the Task and Finish Group.
- 9.2. Draft proposals regarding changes to the NHB (Parish Allocations) Scheme were shared with all Parish Councils (and all District Councillors) and feedback sought. Only one Parish replied in time to feed back to the Grants and Concessions Panel, and they were supportive of the changes. Subsequent representation from a further Parish was asking to be considered as a special case as they are unlikely to receive any significant housing development. They will be advised of other, more appropriate, funding sources.
- 9.3. Consultation with potential applicants during previous Grants Reviews had proven to be inconclusive and predictable, and not provided any useful information to aid decision making. The proposals have been discussed in general terms with Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (VAAC) who are disappointed that funding opportunities to the Voluntary and Community sector are further diminished but supportive of what support can be maintained. It remains of some value that the Council has a transparent mechanism for endorsing projects which can be helpful (and sometimes essential) in gaining the support of larger funders.

10. Community impact and corporate risks

- 10.1. Even with reducing budgets, sustaining these forms of discretionary funding demonstrates strong commitment to:
 - (i) improve the standard of housing stock in the District,
 - (ii) see the benefits that new development brings are realised within the communities most affected, and
 - (iii) valuing the contributions of businesses, and other local organisations in achieving the aims of this Council and its communities.

- 10.2. Sustaining the NHB (Parish Allocations) Scheme is both a continued endorsement of the Parish Council role, and hopefully an encouragement to residents to take a greater interest in their local Council.
- 10.3. There remains uncertainty over the future with many factors that may impact on the Council and change the financial forecast. While the caveat of annual confirmation of the allocation ensures this Council is not overcommitted, having to withdraw key funding routes in future years could have reputational damage.

11. Other Implications

Crime & Disorder:	While the projects that could be funded by these monies cannot be anticipated, it is likely that many of them will have positive outcomes in some or all of these impact areas.
Climate Change:	
Human Rights and Equality Impact:	
Safeguarding:	

12. Appendices

- 12.1. Appendix 1 – Warm Homes Initiative.
- 12.2. Appendix 2 – New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Policy (proposed changes underlined)
- 12.3. Appendix 3 – NHB Guidance
- 12.4. Appendix 4 – Grants and Concessions Policy
- 12.5. Appendix 5 – Grants Guidance
- 12.6. Appendix 6 – Priorities and Principles for Funding

13. Background Papers

- 13.1. None

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Replacement Telephone System

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Jane Ryan

Tel: 01243 585166 ext 4770 E-mail: jryan@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Cllr Bruce Finch, Cabinet Member for Support Services

Tel: 01243 351903

E-mail: bfinch@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. That Cabinet approve the replacement of the current telephone system**
- 2.2. That Council is recommended to release up to £175,000 (including contingency) from the Asset Replacement Programme in order to allow a contract be awarded to the preferred contractor.**
- 2.3. That the Head of Business Improvement Services be authorised to conclude a contract with the preferred contractor.**

3. Background

- 3.1 In October 2015, Cabinet considered a Project Initiation Document (PID) providing replacement options for the Council's telephone system which is approaching end of life. Cabinet approved the option to procure an on-site solution, as opposed to a hosted or "in-the-cloud" solution. Officers were instructed to report tender evaluations back to Cabinet.
- 3.2 The project proposal set out to tender in partnership with Arun District Council. Arun District Council also needs to replace their telephone system which provided opportunities to undertake a joint procurement exercise and to potentially share a solution.
- 3.3 In total 14 submissions were received. After a detailed evaluation process with Arun District Council, both authorities have been able to identify a preferred supplier.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. The replacement of the Council's telephone system.
- 4.2. Improved ability for staff to work flexibly on-site and remotely.

- 4.3. The opportunity to implement a joint telephone system with Arun District Council to share resources and support shared services in the future

5. Proposal

- 5.1 To award the tender of an on-site telephone system to the preferred tenderer at the cost set out in Appendix 1 plus contingency.
- 5.2 To undertake a profiling exercise to determine which users need which devices and licences for users, working either remotely, mobile or fixed at office sites.
- 5.3 To work in partnership with Arun District Council during the procurement process to deliver a shared system or if this is not possible to proceed alone. Arun District Council will consider this matter at their Cabinet meeting on the 21 March 2016.
- 5.4 The Head of Business Improvement Services will bring back a further report identifying integration requirements and associated costs and savings should a shared solution with Arun District Council be progressed.

6. Alternatives that have been considered

- 6.1 The PID considered by Cabinet on 6 October 2015 detailed five alternatives that were considered. Cabinet approved the option of an on-site solution.

7. Resource and legal implications

- 7.1 These are detailed within the PID.
- 7.2 Capital provision of £300,000 is made within the Asset Replacement Fund for this project. Existing revenue commitment for the Council's telephone system is £23,300. Following the tender evaluation the preferred bidder solution would incur a capital cost of £149,849 and a revenue cost of £15,945. Once it is clear what the costs of integration with Arun are, the final revenue costs can be determined and any saving made will contribute towards the deficit reduction programme.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 This project is primarily an asset replacement project. However, due to the opportunities for a shared solution, external consultants have been engaged to advise both authorities on the specification of requirements. Officers from both authorities have worked closely in the development of the specification of requirements, the evaluation and procurement process.
- 8.2 Once tenders were received both parties undertook a detailed consultation at senior level with Arun District Council to agree a recommended solution.

9. Community impact and corporate risks

- 9.1 Risks associated with this project are detailed within the PID.

10. Other Implications

Crime & Disorder:	None
Climate Change:	None
Human Rights and Equality Impact:	None
Safeguarding and Early Help:	None

11. Appendix

11.1. Tender Evaluation Analysis

12. Background Papers

None

Agenda Item 8

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Revised Local Development Scheme 2016-2019

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Anna Miller,
Tel: 01243 531031

Planning Policy Officer,
E-mail: amiller@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Susan Taylor,
Tel: 01243 514034

Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning,
E-mail: sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the Council be recommended to approve the revised Local Development Scheme.**

3. Background

- 3.1. The Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) was updated and approved by Council for publication in July 2015.
- 3.2. The LDS is kept under review and updates are published on the Council's website so that the local community and developers are kept informed of the current timetable for producing planning policy documents during the rolling three year timeframe. It is necessary to amend the LDS to take account of the Local Plan Review and to set out the key milestones in the production of that document. The updated LDS covering the period 2016–2019 is attached as the Appendix.
- 3.3. The LDS contains information about the current Development Plan for the Chichester Local Plan area. It provides a profile for each of the Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) to be prepared, and a timetable for each main stage of documentation production, including public consultation stages. The LDS also contains information on other documents including Neighbourhood Plans and the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 3.4. Each DPD and SPD must be prepared in accordance with the LDS. It is intended to help manage workloads, resource requirements and enable the public and other interested parties to know when they are able to take part in the planning policy process.
- 3.5. The LDS will be used to monitor the Council's progress in producing planning policy documents as part of the annual Authority's Monitoring Report.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. That the revised LDS, which covers the period 2016-2019 and details the current Development Plan and proposals for new documents for the Chichester Local Plan area, be approved and published on the Council's website.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. The Inspector recommended that, to make the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 sound, the Council review the Chichester Local Plan within five years. This updated version of the LDS therefore sets out the timetable for the Chichester Local Plan Review.
- 5.2. On 31 August 2015 the Government published changes to the document Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). In particular the planning definition of "travellers", including Gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople, was amended to exclude those who have permanently ceased travelling. This means that where someone has given up travelling permanently then they should be treated no differently from the settled community. Given the changes to the PPTS, the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAA), which provides the background evidence, will need to be updated.
- 5.3. The work on the production of the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocation DPD has therefore halted in light of government changes to the PPTS and the subsequent need for the GTAA to be updated in order to provide background evidence which will be robust. The LDS has been amended by deleting reference to the production of the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocation DPD. Due to the fact that the changes to the definition of a traveller are likely to reduce the overall need from previous estimates and also that following recent planning permissions there is an increased supply of sites, the need for sites to be allocated through a dedicated document has diminished. Given the resource requirements to deliver the review of the Local Plan it is now more appropriate that the policy approach to allocating sites for travellers is addressed as part of that review when the evidence base has been updated.
- 5.4. The timetable for the Chichester Harbour SPD has been revised to take account of the continued joint working and collaboration with the Chichester Harbour Conservancy and Havant Borough Council.
- 5.5. Section 4 of the LDS refers to the Development Plan and the fact that neighbourhood plans form part of the Development Plan. More specifically paragraphs 4.1 and 4.5 set out that Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan and Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan were 'made' in December 2015 and May 2016, respectively, and therefore form part of the Development Plan.
- 5.6. Section 7 of the LDS refers to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and its role and coverage. It details that the CIL Charging Schedule and Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD were adopted in January 2016 and came into force on 1 February 2016.

6. Alternatives that have been considered

- 6.1. The Local Plan Review could be delivered with an adoption date of 2020 and still meet the previous Inspector's required timescale. The Local Plan Review could have an end date sooner than 2036, although this would remove potential contingency should there be any delays.

7. Resource and legal implications

- 7.1. The review of the Chichester Local Plan was set out in an Initial Project Proposal Document which included the proposed timetable and was approved by Cabinet on 9 February 2016. This will need to be developed further with a full Project Initiation Document which will also be reported to Cabinet

8. Consultation

- 8.1. The Local Development Scheme itself is not subject to consultation, but it sets out the timetables for when consultation on different planning documents can be expected.

9. Community impact and corporate risks

- 9.1. It can be argued that the "Traveller" community is disadvantaged through the delay in the production of the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations DPD. However, there remains an opportunity to submit planning applications, which would be assessed against Local Plan Policy 36 (Planning for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople), for the provision of sites. The impact on the traveller community is considered, therefore, neutral. Furthermore, were the Council to proceed with the document whilst relying on an out of date evidence base it is highly likely that this would be challenged by any party wishing to object to the sites allocated.

10. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime & Disorder		✓
Climate Change		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact The impact on the traveller community is neutral (see paragraph 9.1).	✓	✓
Safeguarding		✓

11. Appendices

Appendix – Revised LDS covering the period 2016–2019

12. Background Papers

None

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Making the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan

1. Contacts

Report Author

Valerie Dobson - Neighbourhood Planning Officer

Telephone: 01243 534594 E-mail: vdobson@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning

Telephone: 01243 514034 E-mail: sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the Council be recommended to make the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).**

3. Background

- 3.1. At its meeting on 1 December 2015 Cabinet approved the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's recommendation to proceed to referendum subject to modifications and approved the Decision Statement. The Plan has subsequently proceeded to referendum. The referendum held on Thursday 11 February 2016 met the requirements of the *Localism Act 2011* and the *Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012*. More than 50% of those who voted were in favour of the plan being used to help decide planning applications in the plan area. The turn-out was 30.2% and of those who voted 93.8% were in favour of the Plan.
- 3.2. Accordingly it is recommended that the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan is made part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park). A copy of the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan has been placed in the Members' Room and is available on the Council's website.
- 3.3. Chichester District Council will publish a formal decision statement as required under the *Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012*.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. The making of the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan so that it becomes part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

5. Proposal

- 5.1. That the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan be made so that it forms part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

6. Alternatives that have been considered

- 6.1. Paragraph 38A (4) (a) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* requires that Chichester District Council must make the neighbourhood plan if more than half of those voting have voted in favour of the plan being used to help decide planning applications in the plan area. Chichester District Council is not subject to this duty if (and only if) the making of the plan would breach or would otherwise be incompatible with any EU obligation or any of the Convention rights (within the meaning of the *Human Rights Act 1998*).

7. Resource and legal implications

- 7.1. None.

8. Consultation

- 8.1. Fishbourne Parish Council, the community and local members have been involved throughout the process of preparation of the neighbourhood plan.

9. Community impact and corporate risks

- 9.1. There has been strong community involvement through the development of the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan. There are no additional corporate risks to making the plan.

10. Other Implications

Crime & Disorder:	None
Climate Change:	None
Human Rights and Equality Impact:	None
Safeguarding:	None

11. Background Papers

- 12.1 None

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Valerie Dobson - Neighbourhood Planning Officer

Telephone: 01243 534594 E-mail: vdobson@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning

Telephone: 01243 514034 E-mail: staylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

2.1. That the Decision Statement as set out in the Appendix be published.

2.2. That the examiner's recommendation that the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan proceed to referendum, subject to modifications as set out in the Decision Statement, be approved.

3. Background

3.1. The examination into the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan Submission Plan has now been completed and the examiner's report published. The examiner's summary is of particular note as it clearly sets out the examiner's general findings.

3.2. The examiner has carefully considered the contents of the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan in relation to the requirements of the Basic Conditions. In order to ensure the Neighbourhood Plan meets these requirements the examiner recommends a number of modifications that should be made to the Plan. Subject to the inclusion of these modifications (which relate principally to revisions to the wording and content of policies), he finds that the Plan would meet the basic conditions.

3.3. On the basis that the Plan is amended to accommodate the identified modifications, the examiner then goes on to recommend that the draft Plan as modified should be submitted for referendum.

3.4. The Decision Statement (attached as an appendix to this report) sets out the examiner's recommended modifications along with the justification for each of them. This Decision Statement has been produced jointly with Wisborough Green Parish Council.

3.5. It is also the examiner's role to consider the referendum area and whether or not it is appropriate if the Plan is to proceed to referendum. In this respect the examiner considers that the referendum area should extend to the Plan area, comprising the parish boundary in accordance with the designated area as confirmed on 6 November 2012.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. That the Decision Statement for the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan is agreed for publication and that the Plan, subject to the modifications set out in the Decision Statement, proceeds to referendum.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. In the light of the examiner's recommendation, it is proposed that the Decision Statement is agreed for publication. It is further proposed that the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan should be modified as set out in the Decision Statement and should then proceed to referendum.

6. Alternatives that have been considered

- 6.1. That the Council does not agree the Decision Statement for publication and the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan cannot proceed to referendum.

7. Resource and legal implications

- 7.1. The referendum will incur appropriate costs in line with the Council's duties and procedures. These costs will be met through existing budgets.

8. Consultation

- 8.1. Wisborough Green Parish Council and the local member have been involved in the completion of the Decision Statement and have agreed its contents. The South Downs National Park Authority has been informed and agrees.

9. Community impact and corporate risks

- 9.1. There may be a negative community impact if the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan is not agreed to proceed to referendum. The Parish and community may lose confidence in the neighbourhood planning process.

10. Other Implications

Crime & Disorder:	None
Climate Change:	None
Human Rights and Equality Impact:	None
Safeguarding:	None

11. Appendix

- 11.1 Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement.

12. Background Papers

- 12.1. None

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Enterprise Gateway Project:

Plot 12, Terminus Road, Chichester

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Patrick Harrison, Strategic Asset Management Surveyor
Tel: 01243 534720 email: pharrison@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Mrs Gillian Keegan, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services
Tel: 01798 344084 email: gkeegan@chichester.gov.uk

2. Executive Summary

This report updates the Cabinet following an OJEU procurement process and recommends the appointment of a contractor to construct the proposed Centre. The report further recommends approval to proceed to the next stage in which the Council will enter into a pre-construction agreement with the preferred contractor, whereby the contractor will be asked to complete a full design and provide a firm price for the building works.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That, having regard to the revised Return on Investment, £140,000 be released from the approved budget to allow the project to proceed to the next stage**
- 3.2 That a pre-construction agreement be entered into with the preferred contractor, contractor A, to complete the design and provide a fixed price for construction**
- 3.3 Following the contractor providing the Council with a detailed fixed price, and subject to the total project costs being within the budget approved by Council, that the Head of Commercial Services be authorised, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services, to conclude a design & build contract with contractor A.**

4. Background

- 4.1 On 7 July 2015 Cabinet considered the options available for the Enterprise Gateway project and resolved:
 - (1) That the Enterprise Gateway Project be approved in principle.

- (2) That a total budget of £6,245,860 was allocated from capital reserves to fund this project.
 - (3) That £88,500 of the allocated budget was released to appoint an architect and design team to the planning permission stage.
- 4.2 Officers have appointed an Employer's Agent to ensure that the design of the Enterprise Gateway meets both the requirement of a future operator and the Council's objectives for the project and to ensure the Council's appointed design team and building contractor provides good value for the Council.
- 4.3 An EU compliant tender identified the preferred Gateway operator as Basepoint. This was reported to and approved by Cabinet on 7 July 2015.
- 4.5 A two stage Design and Build EU procurement process has now been concluded. This enables the Council to consider appointing a contractor on a pre-construction agreement to complete the final design works.
- 4.6 The Council received nine responses to the tender advert, the results of which are set in the Appendix (Exempt). The preferred tenderer was interviewed on 15 January 2016 by Council officers, the Employers Agent, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and her special advisor.
- 4.7 Planning permission for the scheme was obtained on 3 February 2016.

5 Outcomes to be achieved

- 5.1. The delivery of the Enterprise Gateway and the outcomes to be delivered are detailed in the Project Initiation Document (PID) approved by the Cabinet in November 2010.
- 5.2. A key driver behind building the Gateway is to encourage a growth in innovation leading to more new businesses being established. This will not only create employment but also increase the survival rate of those businesses and the salaries associated with those jobs. Enterprise Gateways provide additional support to businesses and the flexible accommodation assists the business in controlling its expenditure as it grows or reduces. Based on an analysis of similar schemes it is estimated that between 250 and 275 new jobs will be created every three years.
- 5.3. Once occupied, the Gateway will also generate revenue income for the Council. In this regard it is also essential that the project achieves an acceptable level of return on the investment (ROI). The ROI both on the guaranteed income and projected profit share based on the operators business plan were reported to Cabinet on 7 July 2015. They are reported again in the Appendix to this report (Exempt). The ROI will be reviewed following the final fixed price being received from the preferred contractor and prior to entering into a contract to build.

6. Proposal

- 6.1. It is recommended that the development should continue to be delivered by way of a two stage Design and Build (D&B) Contract. This will require the appointment of the contractor and design team to develop the detailed design and report a fixed build price. If this final build cost and expenditure to date is within the approved budget it is recommended that the Council will enter a Design & Build contract with the preferred contractor.
- 6.2 The total estimated build cost from the preferred contractor and the design team is detailed in the Appendix (Exempt). It is recommended that Cabinet approves the next stage to enter into a pre-construction agreement with the preferred contractor, contractor A, to complete the design and provide a fixed price construction cost.
- 6.3 Cabinet is requested to release £140,000 from the approved budget to progress the project to a detailed design and fixed cost stage of the construction. Following the preferred contractor providing a detailed cost for the final design then, providing the total project cost is within the authorised budget, the Council will enter into a Design & Build Contract to construct the Enterprise Gateway.

7. Alternatives that have been considered

- 7.1 Various options for developing Plot 12, Terminus Road, including the Enterprise Gateway Proposal were considered by Cabinet at their meeting on 3 September 2013.

8. Resource and legal implications

- 8.1. The guaranteed income offered by the appointed operator and the profit share potential will provide the Council with an acceptable ROI (see Appendix Exempt). In addition, if the Enterprise Gateway ceases to operate at the end of the 10-year operating contract for any reason, the Council would retain the capital value of the completed building. In that event the Council could either:
 - 8.1.1. sell the building
 - 8.1.2. let it under the terms of standard occupational leases at market rents or
 - 8.1.3. find a new operator.
- 8.2. External solicitors will be appointed to prepare the management agreement between the Council and the Gateway operator Basepoint.
- 8.3. Expenditure to date for site feasibility work and to obtain planning permission is shown in the Appendix (Exempt).

9. Consultation

- 9.1. Consultation was undertaken as part of the planning application process.
- 9.2. Internal consultation with the Economic Development Service has been undertaken and the service remains fully supportive of the project.

10. Community impact and corporate risks

- 10.1 The tender price indicated in the Exempt Appendix by contractor A is an estimated price and not a fixed tender. The final fixed price will be calculated following detailed design work to be undertaken as part of the next stage.
- 10.2 To take the project to the next stage, as recommended in section 6.2 above, would put the Council at risk of incurring potential abortive costs of up to £140,000. However, these costs would only be abortive if the Council decided not to continue with the project after the detailed fixed design and build construction costs have been returned by the preferred contractor.
- 10.3 Whilst there are risks to the Council in funding the project, the guaranteed minimum return from the selected preferred operator for the first 10 years of the operation of the business, reduces the risk in respect of ROI.

11 Other Implications

Crime & Disorder:	None
Climate Change:	None
Human Rights and Equality Impact:	None
Safeguarding and Early Help:	None

12 Appendix

- 12.1 Appendix - Financial information (Exempt information)

13 Background papers

None

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy 2016-2021

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Liz Reed, Environmental Housing Manager,
Tel: 01243 534816 E-mail: lreed@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Susan Taylor, Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning,
Tel: 01243 514034 E-mail: staylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy 2016-2021 be approved, together with accompanying financial assistance options for implementation commencing on 1 April 2016.**
- 2.2. That the repurposing of the Care and Repair Home Improvement Agency grant funding of £20,168 be approved to be used for the provision of heating and insulation for vulnerable members of the community as part of the Chichester Warm Homes Initiative.**

3. Background

- 3.1. The Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England and Wales) Order 2002 empowers local housing authorities to provide a wide range of assistance for housing renewal. In order to use this power the Council is required to adopt a policy on housing renewal and the policy tools it is proposing to use.
- 3.2. The Council approved the last Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy on 17 October 2006 and it set out the assistance it was going to make available to homeowners and landlords.
- 3.3. A house condition stock modelling exercise was carried out in March 2015 and it identified that an estimated 22% of dwellings in the private rented sector in the Chichester District have a category 1 Housing Health and Safety Rating System hazard and indicated that the levels of excess cold in the private sector stock in Chichester District are double that of the national average.
- 3.4. This report seeks to update the Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy to take into account the outcomes from the house condition stock modelling exercise and the draft strategy forms the appendix to this report.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. To adopt a strategy that makes the best use of limited financial resources so that assistance is targeted at the most vulnerable households in the District in order to improve the health and safety of their homes and in particular to tackle fuel poverty and reduce the number of category 1 hazards relating to excess cold from 14% to below the national average of 7%.
- 4.2. All applications for funding will be assessed to ensure that applicants meet the qualifying criteria and expenditure will be monitored on a monthly basis. All works carried out will be inspected prior to payment to ensure that they are carried out to a satisfactory standard.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 The proposed Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy, which forms the appendix to this report, is to ensure that limited resources are targeted at the most vulnerable households and to improve conditions in the private rented sector where the poorest housing conditions are encountered. The strategy includes a work plan, which will be regularly monitored to evaluate progress. Provided approval is granted implementation of the strategy will commence on 1 April 2016.
- 5.2 Two key changes are proposed in the strategy. The first is the introduction of a Chichester Warm Homes Initiative to assist vulnerable home owners and landlords to improve the heating provision and energy efficiency of their homes in order to reduce fuel poverty and minimise the health impacts of cold homes.
- 5.3 The second change dispenses with the home loans provided to owner occupiers in partnership with the Parity Trust. The loans are no longer considered effective because of the low uptake. It is proposed instead that we provide Home Repair Assistance to vulnerable owner occupiers in the form of interest free loans that are repayable upon the sale of the property.

6 Alternatives that have been considered

- 6.1 The Council must have an adopted strategy if it wishes to provide financial assistance for housing renewal. The existing policy does not fully meet the need because there are no policy tools to adequately address the hazard of excess cold and the issue of fuel poverty.
- 6.2 Consideration was given to dispensing with housing renewal assistance but that would be contrary to one of the key objectives within the Council's Corporate Plan i.e. "to improve the provision of and access to suitable housing". The draft strategy seeks to improve access to suitable housing.

7 Resource and legal implications

- 7.1 The strategy sets out the financial resources required over its five year life. The majority of the funding has already been secured. However an additional sum of approximately £325,000 over five years for the Chichester Warm Homes Initiative is sought. Cabinet approval is sought to repurpose £20,168 of grant

funding previously received by the Council in respect of the ceased Care & Repair Home Improvement Agency. The original purpose of the funding was to assist vulnerable people to repair and improve their homes, which is consistent with the objectives of the Chichester Warm Homes Initiative. A further £208,000 has been identified and this is subject to Council approval in March 2016 as part of the Housing Strategy review. Cabinet will also be asked to approve the transfer of £95,221 of funding from the Low Carbon Chichester Fund to the Private Sector Renewal Housing budget as part of the Grants Task and Finish Group report.

- 7.2 Aside from the work undertaken by officers within the environmental housing team, the Chichester Warm Homes Initiative element of the draft strategy will be reliant on the funding for the Home Energy Visiting Officers being continued by West Sussex County Council. These officers are crucial in identifying vulnerable households lacking suitable heating and at risk of fuel poverty.

8 Consultation

- 8.1 During the strategy development process the Community Wellbeing Manager including the Home Energy Efficiency Officers the Council's Environmental Co-ordinator were consulted.
- 8.2 The draft Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in November 2015 when all comments were noted and amendments made as necessary.
- 8.3 Following consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee consultation was undertaken with our partners including private sector landlords, Hyde, higher educational establishments, West Sussex Fire and Rescue, Citizens Advice Bureau, West Sussex County Council, Your Energy Sussex, rural estate landlords, Arun District Council, health professionals and letting agents. Their comments were generally supportive and have been taken into account in the final drafting of the strategy.

9 Community impact and corporate risks

- 9.1 When the strategy is adopted it will have the potential to have a positive impact on the community by improving the quality of the poorest housing stock and reducing fuel poverty.

10 Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime & Disorder:		No
Climate Change: The introduction of the Chichester Warm Homes Initiative has the potential to have a positive but small impact on climate change by improving energy efficiency.	Yes	
Human Rights and Equality Impact: The strategy is likely to have a positive impact on human rights and equality because financial resource will be targeted at improving housing conditions for the most vulnerable people including people of retirement age, disabled people and low income families.	Yes	
Safeguarding:		No

<p>Public Health: The strategy has the potential to improve the health of the community. The strategy identifies research carried out by BRE (Building Research Establishment) that estimates that significant health and safety hazards in homes in England costs the National Health Service £2 billion per annum. This suggests that poor quality housing has a similar impact on health as smoking or alcohol.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
---	------------	--

11 Appendix

11.1 Draft Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy

12 Background Papers

12.1 Chichester Stock Modelling Report 2015

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Update of the Housing Allocation Scheme regarding the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Louise Rudziak, Head of Housing & Environment Services,
Tel: 01243 521064 E-mail: lrudziak@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Susan Taylor, Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning,
Tel: 01243 514034 E-mail: sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

2.1. That the Housing Allocation Scheme is updated to include the statement at paragraph 5.1 below to allow direct allocation of homes to people arriving in the Chichester District via the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme.

3. Background

3.1. The Government has committed to relocating 20,000 Syrian refugees through the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme (SVPRS). The scheme will bring people directly from refugee camps in and around the Syrian border to the UK.

3.2. People qualifying for the SVPRS are initially vetted by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and recommended for relocation. The Home Office then carries out further checks on identity and background before accepting people for relocation to the UK.

3.3. People are selected for the scheme on the basis of 7 criteria;-

- Women and girls at risk
- Survivors of violence and/or torture
- Legal and/or physical protection needs
- Medical needs or disabilities
- Children and adolescents at risk
- Persons at risk due to sexuality or gender identity
- Family links in resettlement countries

3.4. West Sussex County Council, in consultation with the districts and borough councils within West Sussex, has committed to accepting one family of four Syrian refugees per month for the notified duration of the scheme, currently 5 years. This totals 60 families or 240 people for the whole of West Sussex. This will equate to around 2 families per year for the Chichester District.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. That the allocation scheme is amended to enable the Council to provide homes to people relocated to the Chichester District via the SVPRS.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. That the statement below is inserted into the Housing Allocation Scheme.

“Section 17 Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme

17.1 Where an individual or family is to be relocated to the Chichester District through the Government’s Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme they will be directly allocated a home without the need to provide a local connection or to be placed on the Housing Register.”

6. Alternatives that have been considered

- 6.1. The other alternative to placing people coming to the Chichester District in housing association homes is the private rented sector; however, the scheme requires that housing must be sustainable and affordable. Private rent levels in the district may make this unaffordable for people coming through this scheme who will be unemployed when they arrive and dependent on welfare benefits to pay their rent. It is also usual that tenancies in the private rented sector are for a period of six months and Government has indicated that in order to be sustainable a property should be available for a minimum of two years.

7. Resource and legal implications

- 7.1. None identified, however, see 9.1 below for community resource impact.

8. Consultation

- 8.1. Consultation has been carried out with Cabinet Members, West Sussex County Council, Hyde Group and various local voluntary groups who are supportive of this approach.
- 8.2. A presentation was given to members prior to full Council in January 2016.

9. Community impact and corporate risks

- 9.1. The allocation of homes to people coming to Chichester District will impact on the local population who may also be seeking homes in the social rented sector. However, the numbers will be small and the Council has committed to assisting the Government meet its stated aims.

10. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime & Disorder:		x

Climate Change:		X
Human Rights and Equality Impact:	X	
Safeguarding and Early Help:	X	

11. Appendices

11.1. None

12. Background Papers

12.1. Equalities and safeguarding impact assessment

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Local Strategic Statement Update (LSS2)

1. Contacts

Report Author Robert Davidson - Principal Planning Officer
Telephone: 01243 534715
Email: rdavidson@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member Susan Taylor – Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning
Telephone: 01243 514034
E-mail: sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the updated Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Local Strategic Statement (LSS2) including Annexes 1-3 be approved.

2.2 That Annex 4, the Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Monitoring and Delivery Framework (Update January 2016), be noted.

3. Background

- 3.1** The Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton (CWS&GB) Local Strategic Statement (LSS) is a non-statutory strategic planning document prepared by the local planning authorities (LPAs) in the sub-region to provide the context for delivering sustainable growth over the period 2013-2031. It focuses on strategic issues that are shared across CWS&GB or that will impact on the long term sustainability of the area, providing an overlay for local plans and the business priorities of key stakeholders. It is the main vehicle for taking forward the Strategic Planning Board's (SPB) work on behalf of the LPAs.
- 3.2** The initial version of the LSS was agreed by the SPB in October 2013 and subsequently accepted by CDC's Cabinet in January 2014. In July 2015, the SPB agreed to undertake an update ('Refresh') of the LSS in order to reflect the change in strategic area covered, which now includes Horsham and Mid Sussex, and to take account of local plan progress and implementation of the Greater Brighton City Deal which was at an early stage when the LSS was initially prepared.
- 3.3** The updated LSS (LSS 2) was formally agreed by the SPB on 18 January 2016 and is appended to this report. However, it should be noted that LSS2 has been prepared as an interim strategic policy position, as the strategic context (government policy, outcome of devolution proposals) and priorities

are likely to change and a full review will be needed. This will need to address the continuing gap between objectively assessed housing needs and housing delivery in the sub-region and the continuing challenges around supporting sustainable economic growth and infrastructure investment. A report setting out the options for taking this work forward will be presented to the SPB in April with a further report to DPIIP in due course.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1 LSS2 was formally agreed by the SPB on 18 January 2016, and it is now intended that it is agreed by the individual member authorities within the CWS&GB. This will assist all constituent authorities in meeting the Duty to Cooperate. The current LSS has already proven to be an important mechanism for LPAs in CWS&GB to manage strategic issues, and forms key evidence to demonstrate that strategic cooperation has been an integral part of local plan-making across the area, and that this is being managed on an on-going basis.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 That LSS2 be approved by Cabinet.
- 5.2 The main changes resulting from the update are as follows:
- (i) New Spatial Priorities relating to Brighton - Seafront and Brighton City Centre (SP6), Burgess Hill.(SP7), Newhaven (SP8) and Rural Sussex (SP9).
 - (ii) Added emphasis on implementation with new implementation sections under each Strategic Objective and Spatial Priority.
 - (iii) A new (draft) Monitoring and Delivery Framework (Annex 4 of LSS2). Members are asked just to note, rather than agree, this part of the document, since the monitoring framework is a living document that will be subject to change and update. This approach was agreed by the SPB.
- 5.3 The additions and amendments in LSS2 have a relatively limited impact on the Chichester Local Plan area. The addition of a new Spatial Priority for Rural Sussex is helpful and provides support for delivery of affordable housing, boosting the rural economy, and improving access and connectivity in rural areas. The new sections on implementing the Strategic Objectives and Spatial Priorities also strengthen the LSS.
- 5.4 It should also be noted that Strategic Objective 2: Meeting Strategic Housing Needs (SO2) now includes a commitment to developing a long term strategy for the sub-region that considers all sustainable and deliverable spatial options for meeting housing needs. In implementing SO2, there is a commitment to develop a strategy for narrowing the gap between housing delivery and the longer term (post 2025) housing needs of the sub-region, with the results of this work to feed into a full review of the LSS (i.e. LSS3).

6. Alternatives that have been considered

6.1 No alternatives are proposed as the SPB has already agreed LSS2.

7. Resource and legal implications

7.1 LSS2 will help the Council to demonstrate that it has met the legal 'Duty to Cooperate' as set out in the Localism Act 2011.

8. Consultation

8.1 No formal consultation has been undertaken in preparing LSS2. Inputs have been provided mainly by officers from the CWS&GB local authorities. A stakeholder workshop was held in November 2015, which was attended by planning and economic development portfolio holders, council officers and representatives from other key strategic organisations.

9. Community impact and corporate risks

9.1 There are no community impacts or corporate risks as a result of this report.

10. Other Implications

Crime & Disorder:	None
Climate Change:	None
Human Rights and Equality Impact:	None
Safeguarding and Early Help:	None

11. Appendix

Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Local Strategic Statement (Updated January 2016): Delivering Sustainable Growth 2015-31

12. Background Papers

None

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Support to the Community and Voluntary Sector

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Dave Hyland, Community and Partnerships Support Manager

Tel: 01243 534864

email: dhyland@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Mrs E Lintill, Cabinet Member for Community Services

Tel: 01798 342948

email: elintill@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

- 1) That the existing funding provided by Chichester District Council for a support service for the voluntary and community sector in Chichester is extended, by allocating base budget funding of £44,000 to Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (VAAC) for one year from 1 April 2016.**
- 2) That a specification for expected outcomes of a support service for the voluntary and community sector is agreed by officers once Partner funding is known.**
- 3) That the Head of Community Services, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, is authorised to enter into a contract from WSCC for local provision of support for the voluntary and community sector, if it is offered.**

3. Background

- 3.1 At its meeting on 11 March 2013, Cabinet agreed to enter into an agreement with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) to receive their contributions to commission a support service for the Voluntary and Community Sector for 2013/14 – 2015/16.
- 3.2 At its meeting on 7 January 2014, Cabinet received a report from an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Task and Finish Group that had reviewed the Council's historic funding relationship with Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (VAAC). VAAC are the existing local provider of infrastructure support to the Voluntary Sector in the District. Cabinet resolved to continue support via a funding agreement for the period to 31 March 2016.
- 3.3 The Grants and Concessions Panel has monitored performance against the specifications of the Funding Agreement in place, most recently at its meeting of 21 January 2016 (appendix). It was satisfied with performance over and above the Agreement, and recommend extending this Council's contribution of £42,200.

- 3.4 The Funding Agreement has, for the last two years, also included funding received from WSCC for this service. As the existing WSCC contract ceases at the end of March 2016, officers have, over the last 12 months, been seeking confirmation of their funding intentions. While WSCC state they would like to continue to support the voluntary and community sector, the level of funding available from April 2016 remains dependent on the outcome of a review of Public Health funding, which is unknown at the time of writing.
- 3.5 VAAC also receive funding from Arun District Council in respect of similar services they provide to the Voluntary and Community Sector in Arun District. While they remain supportive of the sector and the service provided by VAAC they are in the same position as this Council, and await a decision regarding funding from WSCC before committing their own funds to the continuance of the service.
- 3.6 The Council is obliged, under the commitments given in signing the West Sussex Compact (a voluntary Code of Practice which guides how the Council will work with the Voluntary and Community Sector), to provide 6 months notice of changes to the funding it provides. In the absence of a decision regarding WSCCs funding intentions, the Council wrote to VAAC in October 2015 to confirm that funding under the joint agreement could not be confirmed beyond March 2016.
- 3.7 The funding agreement negotiated in 2014 was developed following a review which included significant consultation with representatives across the voluntary and community sector. The specification included actions under the following headings: Advice and Enablement, Information and Communication, Training, Volunteering, Financial Matters, The Compact, and Quality and Good Practice. The content of the specification drew on the National Association for Voluntary and Community Action's performance standards and was endorsed by WSCC at that time.
- 3.8 In renewal periods, the Grants and Concessions Panel would make recommendations regarding the continuance of funding and the terms of any new Funding Agreement. Monitoring meetings have been able to consider and evidence performance over the last 12 months, but the uncertainty of funding into next year has hampered discussions about a new specification.
- 3.9 VAAC remains committed to the purpose of this Council's funding (to support the voluntary and community sector in Chichester District) and will deliver the best service possible with the resources available. However, a significant reduction in funding may require revisions to specific types of support. As soon as there is confirmation regarding what funding is to be provided, then officers will agree a specification with VAAC, but this may need to be after 1 April 2016.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1 Over the last two years, in providing funding to an external organisation to support the wider voluntary and community sector, the Council has secured a range of outcomes, as detailed at the start of the Appendix.
- 4.2 It is hoped that the funding intentions of partner agencies will shortly be clarified and these outcomes can be sustained in the coming financial year. However, some proportional reduction in the level of service (or prioritisation of outcomes) will need to be agreed if the funding is significantly reduced. In the interim, it is important to

this Council to provide VAAC, as a valued partner organisation, with some level of reassurance to ensure continuity in the service they provide and to retain staff.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 As an immediate action, it is proposed that the Council confirms to VAAC the continuance of funding (£44,000 for 2016/17 as provided for in the Council's budget) through an extension to the existing Funding Agreement. At the time of writing, it seems inevitable that this will have to relate to this Council's funding only.
- 5.2 Informally, WSCC remains committed to continue funding. However, until WSCC releases details of what funding is available for infrastructure support within Chichester District, conversations between VAAC and this Council, Arun District Council and if appropriate WSCC will determine what level of service can be provided. This will result in a replacement Funding Agreement being agreed retrospectively between this Council and VAAC.
- 5.3 If WSCC does agree to fund for a further year, it has been assumed that the only practical arrangement in the time available is for them to offer a contract to this Council for a further year to commission locally appropriate services (in line with a contract which ran from April 2013 to March 2016). It is therefore recommended that the Head of Community Services, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, be authorised to conclude such a contract.
- 5.4 It is anticipated that if funding is agreed it will be for 2016/17 only, and as a result there will need to be negotiation regarding funding available in future years. The focus on negotiations must be to ensure a way forward is determined within the first half of the coming year, in order to make more timely communications to VAAC.

6.0 Alternatives that have been considered

- 6.1 As notice has already been served to VAAC in October 2015, the Council could choose not fund VAAC at this time, deferring a decision about future funding until the intentions of other funders is known. While VAAC could meet its obligations to employees from limited reserves, this could result in staff losses. A valued partner organisation would effectively become lost, which would prove significantly harder to re-establish or replace if a decision to fund were subsequently taken.
- 6.2 The Council could choose to underwrite or replace the funding provided by WSCC (£33,815 in 2015/16) in order to sustain the current service provided by VAAC in Chichester District. Replacing WSCC funding would be challenging given the Council's reducing capacity to support discretionary activity, but critically would still not guarantee continuance of the current service. As VAAC operates across two District areas, they are also dependent on funding from Arun District Council.

7.0 Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 Entering into a Funding Agreement for the year 2016-17 without a detailed specification runs the risk that the level of service may not be maintained to the current level, or sustained throughout the coming financial year. While offering funding remains the best chance of securing a longer term solution, it will require

careful monitoring by officers. A report back to the Grants and Concessions Panel will be made as soon as a way forward is clear.

- 7.2 It has been anticipated that the only pragmatic means of securing WSCC funds is to enter into contract to receive funds and fund local services on their behalf. Assuming an extension of existing arrangements, this would have minimal implications. Were WSCC to offer a contract on different terms, this could provide some challenges in negotiating acceptable terms while seeking funding for VAAC as an urgent priority. Alternatively WSCC could choose to fund VAAC and other Councils for Voluntary Service directly, which would have no legal implications for this Council but could complicate our existing relationship with VAAC.

8.0 Consultation

- 8.1 The ongoing dialogue regarding future funding has involved colleagues at District and Borough Councils across West Sussex, different departments within WSCC, and both the Chief Officer and Board Members of VAAC.
- 8.2 A Review Report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee (17 November 2015) provided reassurance that the Grants and Concessions Panel would be reviewing the funding agreement, but the Committee expressed concern about the lack of notice regarding WSCC's funding intentions, and asked that the Leader write to the Leader of WSCC outlining their concerns. A response was received that acknowledged those concerns, but outlined that until there was greater clarity about funding from the Department for Health, they could provide no greater commitment to future funding at that time.
- 8.3 It is hoped that a decision regarding funding will be shared with this Council prior to the Cabinet meeting. Officers will provide an oral update of any decisions.

9.0 Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1 There would be significant impact to the community and small community groups if the services provided by VAAC were to cease. There are no corporate risks as the Council currently undertakes a monitoring role to ensure outcomes are being met and this would continue. However there could be reputational risk and a demand for services should the council cease to fund such a service.

10.0 Other implications

	Yes	No
Crime & Disorder:		x
Climate Change:		x
Human Rights and Equality Impact:		x
Safeguarding and Early Help - positive - provision of advice to VCS groups	x	

11 Appendix

11.1 Annual Monitoring reports to Grants and Concessions Panel Jan 15 and Jan 16

12 Background Papers

12.1 None

Appendix

Outcomes to be achieved through funding of VAAC

Headings from the Service specification negotiated for April 2014 – March 2016

- To provide support, training and advice to member and non-member groups and organisations that has the potential to succeed and grow.
- To strengthen voluntary and community representation in the district and to promote other formal and informal relationships
- To provide better mechanisms for user involvement in planning services and improved awareness to policy makers of gaps in services
- To provide, broker and signpost appropriate training and development opportunities to member and non-member organisations
- To coordinate volunteering opportunities matching opportunities with those looking to volunteer
- To provide organisations with advice and support on financial management, procedures and increasing their financial sustainability, by providing support and advice on good governance, business planning and fundraising
- To play an active part in the development and operation of local working agreements in particular the promotion and awareness raising of the West Sussex Compact
- To develop, implement, and evidence good practice models on a range of issues including equalities, quality assurance and service models and business practices which could be promoted and shared across the sector

Annual Monitoring Report to Grants and Concessions Panel January 2015

Organisation	Summary purpose	Funding type	Value 2014/15
Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (VAAC)	Towards the “voluntary sector support” service which is available to advise and support any community group in the district on fundraising, governance, promotion and other issues.	Grant – 2 year agreement (Yr1 of 2) Joint agreement with WSCC	£42,400 for a period of two years from 1 April 2014

The service provided to voluntary and community sector organisations by VAAC under the above agreement was considered by a Task and Finish Group of Overview and Scrutiny Committee concluding with a report to Cabinet in January 2014. Following the review a Service Specification and monitoring agreement was negotiated with VAAC. Negotiation was carried out collaboratively with partner funders Arun DC and WSCC (who have agreed for their funding for voluntary sector support to be dispersed by the relevant lower tier authorities for this period). Quarterly monitoring format was agreed.

A formal review meeting (jointly with Arun and WSCC) was held on the 8th December. Reporting covered all areas of activity against the Service Specification, which determined that voluntary and community sector organisations from Chichester District continue to receive the desired level of support. Changes to the service, as agreed during the review process are being implemented. Service performance is considered by the VAAC Board on a quarterly basis, but this was the first formal review with funding partners and as a result, a streamlining of reporting formats and summaries was agreed.

Monitoring highlights included:

- Significant levels of activity by the Development team providing advice and support directly to charities.
- Fundraising advice continues to be the most sought after support requested although staff often need to give governance support as part of their fundraising input. Since the closing of the Fundraising Hub, the development team filled in this role and are able to identify that recipients of support submitted bids requesting a total of £1,524,414 – with confirmed grants of £627,193 (with 5 waiting to hear and 9 no response).

- A Funding E-bulletin and Fundraiser network has been established with both proving popular with Chichester area groups. A renewed focus on reaching out to smaller groups was evidenced (Midhurst event)
- Monitoring has been improved to enable VAAC to track the impact of their courses.
- Under quality and good practice, VAAC anticipate starting quality standard accreditation in the new year.

Next Steps:

Continued attendance at quarterly monitoring meetings. It is hoped that in 2015 we will have information from WSCC regarding their funding intentions for Voluntary Sector Support for 2016 and beyond, and can begin discussions regarding funding requirements and arrangements for April 2016 and beyond.

Annual Monitoring Report to Grants and Concessions Panel January 2016

Organisation	Summary purpose	Funding type	Value 2015/16
Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester	Towards the “voluntary sector support” service which is available to advise and support any community group in the district on fundraising, governance, promotion and other issues.	Grant – 2 year agreement (Yr2 of 2) Joint agreement with WSCC	£42,400 for a period of two years from 1 April 2014

A formal review meeting (jointly with Arun and WSCC) was held on the 15th December. Reporting covered all areas of activity against the Service Specification, which determined that voluntary and community sector organisations from Chichester District continue to receive the desired level of support. Changes to the service, as agreed during the review process are being implemented. Service performance is considered by the VAAC Board on a quarterly basis.

Monitoring highlights included:

- Significant levels of activity by the Development team providing advice and support directly to charities. 31 Chichester based organisations have received 86 1:1 support sessions from the development team. An additional 24 organisations covering both Chichester and Arun Districts also received 1:1 support.
- Fundraising advice continues to be the most sought after support requested although staff often need to give governance support as part of their fundraising input. Groups who provided feedback on the outcomes bids they had received support with reported raising a total of £336,279 (research sample across both districts).
- A Funding E-bulletin and Fundraiser network has been established with both proving popular with Chichester area groups. A renewed focus on reaching out to smaller groups was evidenced (Midhurst and Selsey events)
- Monitoring has been improved to enable VAAC to track the impact of their training and courses. Evidence of networking to prevent duplication of offers and response to feedback.
- Under quality and good practice VAAC successfully achieved PQASSO Level 2 Quality Mark the recognised standard for the sector.
- Volunteering – 41 additional opportunities added, 90 volunteers recruited for Chichester district area groups (plus 59 both districts).
- Membership has been reviewed and renewed providing an accurate indication of active numbers, VAAC now also differentiate between a ‘member’ that is a local group likely to use services and ‘partner/affiliate’ organisation. 135 member organisations serve Chichester District, 115 serve both Arun and Chichester.

VAAC has used this year to focus on governance and trustee recruitment as well working to achieve the PQASSO quality mark. The mark looks at all aspects of management and governance of a charity and is the quality standard for voluntary organisations endorsed by the Charity Commission. The assessment process culminated in a site visit by a reviewer in October who was very positive in

her feedback.

In line with the Council's recommendations, VAAC has supported a range of profile raising events including: the Chichester in Partnership 'Showcase' event in January 2015 at the Novium, which provided an opportunity for members and keyworkers from partner organisations to find out about different projects supporting local people. They presented to the 'All Parishes' meeting and have run a series of community events. VAAC has been building peer support opportunities in key areas of support: Fundraiser Network and Volunteer management- the former is often fully booked.

Contacts with VAAC during the latter part of 2015 have been dominated by discussions about future funding of the service. The current Agreement between CDC and VAAC includes WSCC's grant contribution to the service. Anticipating the end of the current funding agreement, officers had been seeking early engagement with WSCC regarding their funding intentions beyond March 2016. While the agreement was only until that date, it was anticipated that a service would be necessary beyond that time and that timely discussions about the level of funding available would be essential. Despite initial meetings with officers, and some reference to wider reductions in funding for Health services, no specific information has been given about WSCC's funding intentions. In honouring commitments made in our Funding Agreement, we have formally notified VAAC that the current agreement will cease in March 2015 and no current commitment can be made to funding beyond that time.

It is hoped that some clarity from WSCC will be available soon, but at this time it has been impossible to discuss meaningfully with VAAC about service delivery beyond March 2015. The service they provide is dependent on both the joint monies that are paid through our own Funding Agreement, but also similar arrangements through Arun District Council. Officers have had discussions with District and Borough colleagues (who all have the same joint agreements funding their equivalent Voluntary Sector Support organisations) to establish a common approach and have expressed concerns about timescales to WSCC. Following an update report to OSC, a letter has also been sent from the Leader of Chichester District Council to the West Sussex County Council Leader, expressing concerns about this agreement.

Next Steps:

Continued attendance at quarterly monitoring meetings, regular liaison with VAAC and Arun District contacts. Officers will verbally update the meeting as to the latest position from WSCC regarding their funding for this service.

VAAC has demonstrated that they have successfully delivered against our Agreement and continue to offer a service valued by local groups. At this time, in order to support the stability of this organisation, it is proposed that the Panel recommend to Cabinet a 1-year extension to the current Agreement to the same value, with some acknowledgement that the level of service may be affected by the currently unresolved issue of WSCC funding.

Chichester District Council

CABINET

8 March 2016

Financial Monitoring 2015-16

1. Contacts

Report Author:

David Cooper, Group Accountant,

Tel: 01243 534733 E-mail: dcooper@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Philippa Hardwick, Cabinet for Finance

Tel: 01428 6618664 E-mail: phardwick@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the Cabinet notes the 2015-16 forecast revenue outturn position on the Council's General Fund (Appendix 1) and progress made to date on the 2015-16 capital projects (Appendix 2).**

3. Background

- 3.1. The financial position of the Council will now be reported on a regular basis to Cabinet. In the past this information was made available to council members via the Knowledge Hub.
- 3.2. As a result of the introduction of a new financial management system and the review of services provided by the council's accountancy team, budget managers are now responsible for examining their own budgets and investigating and reporting on variations.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. The purpose of this report is to assist the Cabinet in monitoring its 2015-16 revenue and capital budgets, and to take any necessary action in order to comply with the Council's Financial Regulations.

5. Financial Monitoring

5.1. Revenue Monitoring

- 5.1.1 At its meeting in February 2015, the Cabinet considered its budget spending plans for 2015-16. In order to monitor the Council's base revenue budget, the accountants provide Heads of Service with a schedule of variations that is investigated by their service managers. If a variation is forecast to have a significant impact on the outturn position for the current financial year, the service manager is required to provide members with a succinct explanation of the reason for the difference.


5.1.2 The major variations contained in the Revenue Monitoring Statement (Appendix 1) have been detected during the course of these investigations as at 31 December 2015 (the end of quarter 3). The statement currently identifies a potential underspend/additional income on the 2015-16 revenue budget of £1,701,000.


5.2. Capital Monitoring


5.2.1 Appendix 2 to this report is produced using the Covalent Performance Management software that tracks the progress and status of Performance Indicators and projects. The use of Covalent ensures that all performance information is available in one place to all CDC officers, managers and members and eliminates the duplication of effort. Covalent provides a straightforward analysis and reporting mechanism that is reflected in appendix 2.


5.2.2 The information held by Covalent is reviewed on a regular basis by service managers and project leaders. All major projects are monitored by the Senior Leadership Team and Programme Boards on an exception basis.


5.2.3 To enable members to monitor these schemes more effectively, scheme progress is reflected using a traffic light status given to each project. The status of a project can be:

 GREEN (project in progress) - The scheme is likely to be completed on time, within budget, and deliver its anticipated outcomes.

 YELLOW (check progress, milestone approaching or past its due date) - The scheme may be delayed, or delivered over budget but within the tolerances contained within the Council's Financial Regulations. There may also be a significant risk that the anticipated outcomes will not be achieved.

 RED (project overdue) - There is a high risk that the scheme may not be completed on time or possibly stopped. Anticipated outcomes may not be achieved. Scheme is likely to be overspent by more than the tolerances contained within the Council's Financial Regulations.

 COMPLETED - The scheme has been implemented. The appendix offers comments on the success of the scheme in delivering its objectives.

 CANCELLED – The scheme has been aborted.

5.2.4 To maintain the integrity of the information held on Covalent, lead project officers and the accountants are required to record on the system, on at least a monthly basis, an update regarding a project's progress and financial status.

5.2.5 To enable members to monitor these schemes effectively, Appendix 2 has an index grouped into individual cabinet responsibility area that highlights the scheme title and the status of each project.

- 5.2.6 Where a scheme has been identified as having a status of either amber, red or completed, further information including comments from the service manager responsible for the scheme is provided to members on the schedules included within the relevant appendix.
- 5.2.7 The Capital Monitoring Statement in Appendix 2 considers the progress being made on capital schemes within the current approved capital programme. The financial information provided represents the position as at 31 January 2016.

6. Resource and legal implications

- 6.1. Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972 requires every authority in England and Wales to "... make arrangements for the proper administration of their financial affairs and shall secure that one of their Officers has responsibility for the administration of those affairs". For Chichester, the Head of Finance and Governance Services acts as the Council's 'Responsible Financial Officer' (also referred to as the Section 151 officer) in order to meet the requirements of this legislation.
- 6.2. Each of the Council's budgets is delegated to a designated budget manager. All budget managers must comply with the requirements of the Financial Regulations contained within the Council's Constitution.

7. Community impact and corporate risks

- 7.1. It is essential that the Council has a robust process for managing and monitoring its financial resources. At the end of the financial year, as part of its audit of the Council's financial statements, external auditors Ernst & Young are required to provide a conclusion on the Council's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of its resources.

8. Other Implications

Crime & Disorder:	None
Climate Change:	None
Human Rights and Equality Impact:	None
Safeguarding and Early Help:	None

9. Appendices

- 9.1. Appendix 1 Revenue Monitoring Statement
- 9.2. Appendix 2 Projects and Capital Schemes Index
- 9.3. Appendix 2a Projects and Capital Schemes (Amber Status)
- 9.4. Appendix 2b Projects and Capital Schemes (Red Status)
- 9.5. Appendix 2c Projects and Capital Schemes (Completed Status)

10. Background Papers

None

Agenda Item 19

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Agenda Item 20

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted