

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Bambi Jones on 01243 534685

Email: bjones@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of **Overview & Scrutiny Committee** will be held in Committee Room 2, East Pallant House on **Tuesday 15 November 2016 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mrs C Apel (Chairman), Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mr P Budge, Mr M Cullen, Mrs P Dignum, Mr N Galloway, Mr G Hicks, Mr S Lloyd-Williams, Caroline Neville, Mrs P Plant, Mr H Potter, Mr J Ransley, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs J Tassell and Mr N Thomas

AGENDA

- 1 **Chairman's announcements**
Any apologies for absence that have been received will be noted at this point.
- 2 **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 10)
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 13 September 2016. To consider progress against the recommendations to Cabinet and Council.
- 3 **Urgent Items**
The Chairman will announce any urgent items that due to special circumstances are to be dealt with under the agenda item below relating to Late Items.
- 4 **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.
- 5 **Public Question Time**
The committee will consider any questions from members of the public submitted in writing by no later than noon the day before the meeting.
- 6 **Late Items**
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 reported at the meeting.
- 7 **Cabinet Member for Finance & Governance Services address**
The Finance & Governance Services Cabinet portfolio holder is invited to present her priorities and areas of focus over the next year and to answer questions from the committee on progress towards achieving the aims and targets of the Council's Corporate Plan priorities.
- 8 **Corporate Plan Task and Finish Group final report** (Pages 11 - 15)
The committee is requested to note this report from the Corporate Plan Task and Finish Group and to confirm that it is satisfied that the Council is achieving satisfactory levels of performance against the targets and activities in the 2016/17 Corporate Plan mid-year progress report.

- 9 **Leisure Contract monitoring**
Mr Cullen, the committee's representative on the group which monitors the Leisure Contract, will present a verbal report of performance to date.
- 10 **Budget Task and Finish Group Terms of Reference** (Page 16)
The committee is requested to consider and agree the Terms of Reference for this task and finish group and to agree its membership.
- 11 **Forward Plan** (Pages 17 - 37)
Members are asked to consider the latest Forward Plan (attached) and to consider whether it wishes to enquire into any of the forthcoming decisions.
- 12 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**
The Committee 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 Overview and Scrutiny Committee and senior officers only (salmon paper).**
- 13 **Cultural Grants - review of arrangements** (Pages 38 - 62)
The committee is requested to consider the findings of the Cultural Grants review, including the proposals for funding for the period 2018–2022, and to make any comments or recommendations to Cabinet at their meeting of 6 December 2016.

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 report appendices which are not included with their copy of the agenda on the Council's website unless these are exempt items.
3. Restrictions have been introduced on the distribution of paper copies of supplementary information circulated separately from the agenda as follows:
 - a) Members of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, the Cabinet and Senior Officers receive paper copies of the supplements (including appendices). Other members may request a copy of the supplementary information or a copy is available in the Members' Room, East Pallant House.
 - b) The press and public may view this information on the Council's website at [Chichester District Council - Minutes, agendas and reports](#) unless they contain exempt information.
4. The open proceedings of this meeting will be audio recorded and the recording will be held for one year by the town council. A copy of the recording will also be retained in accordance with the council's information and data policies. If members of the public make a representation to the meeting, they will be deemed to have consented to being audio recorded. By entering the committee room they are also consenting to being audio recorded. If members of the public have any queries regarding the audio recording of this meeting, please contact the contact for this meeting at the front of this agenda.
5. 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)



Minutes of the meeting of the **Overview & Scrutiny Committee** held in Committee Room 2, East Pallant House on Tuesday 13 September 2016 at 9.30 am

Members Present: Mrs C Apel (Chairman), Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mr P Budge, Mr M Cullen, Mrs P Dignum, Mr N Galloway, Mr S Lloyd-Williams, Mrs P Plant, Mr H Potter, Mr J Ransley, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs J Tassell and Mr N Thomas

Members not present: Mr G Hicks and Caroline Neville

In attendance by invitation: Ms E Quarm (West Sussex County Council), Mrs B Rhead (Southern Water), Mr P Kent (Southern Water) and Mr G Edwards (Job Centre Plus)

Officers present: Mr A Frost (Head of Planning Services), Mr M Allgrove (Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager), Mr T Whitty (Development Management Service Manager), Mr S Hill (ChooseWork Coordinator), Mr S Oates (Economic Development Manager), Mrs L Rudziak (Head of Housing and Environment Services), Miss A Loaring (Partnerships Officer), Mr R Dunmall (Housing Operations Manager), Mr S Hansford (Head of Community Services), Mr J Bacon (Building & Facility Services Manager) and Mrs B Jones (Principal Scrutiny Officer)

101 **Chairman's announcements**

The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting. Apologies had been received from Mr Graham Hicks and Caroline Neville.

102 **Minutes**

The minutes of the last meetings held on 14 June 2016 and 5 July 2016 were discussed. Mrs Jones provided an update on the recommendations made at the meetings.

- Minute 85 Housing and Planning Portfolio - Mr Ransley raised three bullet points where information had been promised but not yet provided to the committee. Mrs Jones undertook to follow up on this. Mr Shaxson requested that information on the South Downs National Park meetings be circulated to members.
- Minute 86 Chichester in Partnership Plan 2016-17 – Council agreed that a £10k funding reserve be made available in order to attract match funding to support

new or existing projects with proven benefits to vulnerable residents that would otherwise fail for lack of short term funding.

- Minute 95 Chichester BID – a report on the council's future support for the BID would be brought to a future meeting of the committee; this is dependent upon the outcome of the vote for its continuation.
- Minute 96 Chichester Vision – Mr Oates will raise the issue of access to and from the city and speed of the rail journey from London to Chichester in communications with a number of stakeholders in discussion about the Vision.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of 14 June 2016 and 5 July 2016 be approved as a correct record.

103 Urgent Items

There were no urgent items.

104 Declarations of Interests

Mrs C Apel declared a personal interest in respect item 9 due to her position as Trustee of Stonepillow.

105 Public Question Time

One public question had been received but it was agreed this would be taken under the next item as it related to Southern Water.

106 Southern Water

The committee considered a report by Mr M Allgrove and Mr T Whitty (copy attached to the official minutes) which included at Appendix 1 Southern Water's (SW) response to questions set by the committee.

Mr P Kent, Environment & Wastewater Strategy Manager, and Mrs B Rhead, Stakeholder Engagement Manager (Sussex), both of SW, attended to answer questions.

A number of questions had been received in advance of the meeting (copy attached to the official minutes). Mr R Seabrook, a member of the public, was asked to read his questions and officers and SW representatives responded as follows:

- Queried the formula for averaging headroom – Work on assessing dry weather flow is undertaken on a three year average; sometimes SW may use a four year average if the weather has been particularly wet. The Chichester Water Quality Group which involves the council, Environment Agency (EA), Natural England and SW has taken a view that because of the region and its weather patterns it is probably fairer to take a seven year average to calculate headroom. SW doesn't want to operate a treatment works which is under capacity and which will not produce high quality effluent which would subsequently put SW at risk of prosecution. When there is a storm event the excess flow goes into the storm

tanks; when the storm abates this flow will go into the treatment works and out with the effluent.

- Delays in discharge notification - On release of discharge into the harbour SW notifies the Harbour Board and they have a system for disseminating the information. SW are looking at producing the data in a user-friendly format to be made available to the Harbour Board to load onto their website for all to access. Users would not necessarily look at the SW website for this information.
- Discrepancies in discharge notification – An amendment was suggested to the question to reflect a 346 'minute' (not hour) discharge. On this particular occasion there was no release into the harbour and therefore it doesn't appear on the records. The data has been passed on to EA and they are satisfied.
- Is telemetry unreliable? SW try to work in real-time as much as possible; it is better to notify in error than not at all.

Mr Oakley had put forward to the committee a number of questions to give an idea of the incidents around the Tangmere area:

- Queried the framework SW use to enter into agreements with developers which is separate to the planning process - The developer may gather background data and approach SW to ask if there is capacity in system to build houses. SW, through contractors, would do a desktop exercise to say yes or no, with conditions attached, so the developer has some evidence that he can discharge to the sewerage system. SW then seeks a restriction on any planning approval to the effect that the developer can't build or occupy the first tranche of properties until it agrees a discharge route for the waste water. As the developer progresses he then requests to connect to SW's sewerage system and SW undertakes a Section 98 Agreement where a more detailed survey of the sewerage system is undertaken with the nearest point of capacity that the developer can connect to without risk. There would be nothing stopping the developer applying for the S98 Agreement earlier on except that if he doesn't get planning approval that would be money lost. There is separate legislation for both SW and the planning authority to deal with. The issue that can arise is that the developer deals with SW directly but still has to address the planning process. The developer needs to ensure that it is meeting any planning conditions imposed.
- The issue of communicating that both the S98 and planning conditions have both to be complied with – The S98 Agreement and the planning conditions imposed by the planning authority are parallel processes and it is up to the developer to ensure that it is not only addressing the water conditions set by SW but also meeting the planning conditions imposed by the planning authority. SW normally follow up with the planning authority to confirm that successful connection has taken place to the point SW had suggested.
- The other issues raised by Mr Oakley which are site specific will be dealt with separately.

Mr G Barrett had requested to ask a question to SW as follows:

- Over many years the western peninsula has faced major sewage incidents due to the inadequacies of the system and the causes have now been identified as a total inadequacy of the pipework/network. A year ago it was agreed between

officers, members and SW to set up a focus group to meet every three months. The first meeting of the Manhood Drainage Partnership was held in early May 2016, delayed due to SW's undertaking to produce an action plan. No further meeting has been scheduled. More development is taking place on the peninsula and nothing further has been done to the existing inadequate network. There is talk of further sewage surcharges again. Queried what could be done to expedite this issue – **Mr Kent undertook to liaise directly with Mr Barrett to address the issue.**

The committee made the following comments which were answered by SW and officers:

- Queried SW funding sources – As a regulated industry the customer pays for SW's activities to cover both operating and capital expenditure. A case is put forward say for the expansion of wastewater treatment works and the regulator, Ofwat, looks at SW's business plan and decide the commitments and the amount customers pay.
- Concerned that the timing of development is more important to SW than the location and that new capacity follows delivery of a development - SW is committed to their five year business plan but this may require adjustment when new development requires further work. The developer pays for sewer capacity, SW for treatment capacity. By collecting information and statistics this allows SW to see the capacity shortfall before the developer starts work. SW will have discussed this with the developer who will be aware of those constraints.
- Constraints in development going ahead due to lack of headroom capacity – SW collects information to allow them to see the capacity shortfall ahead of development work and to raise the funding. Sometimes development work will start without the necessary infrastructure in place but that will be caught up later. However it is rare that a development doesn't go ahead because of lack of headroom capacity.
- Delivery of the Local Plan is critical – queried whether the need for further SW infrastructure was constraining permitted development being built- Planning applications for major development are progressed 12-18 months before a development starts. Westhampnett and West of Chichester have both been the subject of recent outline planning applications with permission granted at Westhampnett and there is no adverse impact on housing coming forward. Officers are working with Environment Agency and SW to ensure that there is an understanding of when that capacity is available and that it doesn't inhibit development coming on stream. There has been no adverse impact on housing coming forward. It is different for Apuldram as there is no possibility to increase the headroom due to environmental constraints on sewage there and the deposition of the harbour.
- Queried whether planning conditions imposed put impossible actions in front of SW and whether the council should be enforcing conditions more thoroughly – SW doesn't consider that there are draconian requirements within planning approval e.g. developer can't start construction or occupy first houses until they have reached agreement with SW about how the site can be drained. If the council imposes a condition and the developer doesn't comply then we should expect to have the backup of SW to enforce that condition. If the developer

subsequently proposes an alternative solution then he needs to come back to the council and agree this through the planning process.

- Queried SW plans when the Local Plan expires in 13 years' time – A total of 3266 properties are reliant on an upgrade of the Tangmere Waste Water Treatment Works, which is slightly more than the overall capacity of the upgrade. However, there is capacity to accommodate the proposed development set out in the local plan. The way SW construct treatment works today is in modular format. In 13 years time if Tangmere needs more development it can be added on.
- Queried how SW would manage the discharge into the river at Aldingbourne - All treatment works have a permit to discharge. When SW are looking to put more treatment works in it needs to satisfy a 'no detriment' quality permit, i.e. it will have the same load on the water course. There is a need to meet tighter standards the more SW put through.
- SW has published a route for a new rising main in the north ward of Chichester. Queried whether this would help problems in places like Lavant and Boxgrove – SW advised that it would stop it getting worse as it is taking the flow to a different treatment works. A survey of the sewerage system has been completed and marginal improvements have been made. SW needs to agree with EA to go ahead and then develop an action plan which will be shared with members. Mr Kent advised that it is an issue which SW is committed to addressing but it is not a quick fix and may take many years to fix. **He promised to chase this up.**
- Queried whether SW was liable to pay money to people who may have suffered damage from flooding – SW advised that in most instances residents had household insurance and this would cover any flooding. However they would consider individual circumstances.
- Queried whether horse manure had an effect on the system – Mr Kent advised that it shouldn't get into the system and that it therefore wouldn't have a significant impact.
- Queried whether a pipe could be installed to discharge out at sea instead of into the harbour and whether it would improve capacity for Apuldrum – SW advised that it wasn't a cost effective solution.
- Queried the capacity at Thornham – **Mr Kent did not have that data but would respond to the committee with an up to date figure.**
- It was ten years since SW was fined roughly £20m for incorrect information. There was still a perception that SW waste disposal falls short. Queried whether there was something fundamentally wrong with SW and the way it gets its funding – SW funding comes from its customers but it also needs to borrow money.
- Queried the current future and planned investment in pipework infrastructure versus the required investment to reduce the problems - Mr Kent advised that SW spends £20-30m a year in maintaining and improving the infrastructure, and slightly in excess of that on waste water treatment. They have an environmental improvement programme of £50m year to improve the quality of effluent. The whole business is somewhere in the region of £3b in terms of capital costs. The funding is not an issue, it is spending it at the right time, but also a need to recognise that it won't get large sums like that from customers; SW needs to plan incrementally.

- Queried whether the detail could be collated at Chichester district level only – **Mr Kent undertook to dissect some figures for the Chichester district area only and to let members have the information. Also to detail what investment SW currently have in place and what is required to solve the area's problems.**
- A large part of the district is rural; there is a large surface water runoff into ditches and water courses. Queried how watercourses and ditches flow rates are monitored - SW has no direct role in this. Riparian owners are maintaining them. Some will be the responsibility of the county or district councils. It is a complex issue. Where SW has information and intelligence it can work with others. This will be done on the Manhood peninsula. Need to consider the quality of those watercourses and the impact agriculture has on it and work with farmers. **SW undertook to send members an A4 sheet showing responsibilities.**
- Nitrate levels are high on the Downs; queried the impact on water quality – Mr Kent acknowledged that this had got worse and needed to be addressed. Again there was a need to engage with farmers and landowners to understand and address the issues. It was suggested that the Manhood Drainage Partnership could be used for this purpose. Mr Kent confirmed that SW could make a start by linking with this focus group and widening its remit.
- Queried how SW educates the public and suggested that wider publicity could be given to SW initiatives in the Council's newsletter – Mr Kent advised that there was a SW team of six people who had recently been talking to local people about a blockage hotspot. Benchmarking had been done to increase public perception and feedback received about how SW engage with stakeholders in the future. Mr Carvell sits on one of the stakeholder panels.
- SW is starting to develop the next Business Plan. A series of stakeholders workshops will take place in the Autumn and members' views are welcomed and they are invited to play a role in how SW develops its plans.
- Queried SW's plans for improving capacity beyond what is required in the current Local Plan e.g. to deal with the impact of Southern Gateway and other unplanned growth – SW will work closely with developers and the planning officers to ensure that the infrastructure is there for development when it goes ahead. The key critical evidence base will be the wastewater treatment study.

Mr Hayes, Chairman of the council's Planning Committee, advised that the Planning Committee was told that flooding events were 1 in 500 years. As Chairman of the committee he needed to have confidence in the figures provided by SW. Mr Kent advised that SW was trying to predict the future. When new sewers were put in the ground SW designed for water flows which are uprated by 20% to cover climate change.

RESOLVED

1. That a meeting be arranged with interested parties to include the Environment Agency, Southern Water, West Sussex County Council, this council and other relevant bodies to investigate and identify a way forward to resolve the issue of flooding as a result of riparian watercourses.

2. The council investigates the imposition of better planning conditions for dealing with foul water drainage which reflect the requirements of individual sites and ensure that these conditions are properly enforced over the lifetime of the development.
3. Southern Water is requested to provide written answers to those questions that were not able to be answered at the meeting.

107 **Choose Work Evaluation**

The committee considered this report (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Oates and Ms Loaring from CDC and Gary Edwards from DWP attended presented the report. Mr Oates provided an update on inaccuracies in the report as follows:

- Page 1, Exec Summary, the second sentence across lines 2, 3 and 4 should read: "This project was set up by Chichester in Partnership as part of its 'Getting people into Work Strategy' in 2012, and has delivered 187 work placements helping 94 local residents back into work, with an estimated saving to the public purse of £772,586."
- Page 2, section 4.3, line 8 – delete 25% and replace with 47%
- Page 2, section 4.3, line 9 – delete 23 persons and replace with 44 persons
- Page 2, section 4.3, line 11 – delete £8,956 and replace with at least £8,219
- Page 2, section 4.3, line 12– The final sentence should read: From 2013 to date, the project has cost in total £130,367.25. 189 work experience placements have been delivered and 94 persons are now in employment, Page 4, section 6.2.1, line 2 – delete £114,000 (£38,00pa) and replace with £120,000 (£40,000pa)
- A corrected table at section 3.1 (page 4) of the Evaluation was circulated (copy attached to the official minutes).

The committee made the following comments:

- Queried the reason for the lack of funding offered by partners – The housing associations referred to the project but hadn't been around the partnership table, however they work on a wider basis now.
- There has been an estimated saving of £777,000 on the public purse so unsure why the Department of Works & Pension (DWP) are not prepared to further fund this project.
- Queried the meaning of 'a more holistic and personal development approach' – Some people need more ongoing support (training, coaching, confidence building, encouragement) and/or they may have low level mental health problems. Support does not cease and case workers are in continuous communication with work seekers using formal and informal contact.
- Part of the scheme is engaging with employers to encourage them to offer placements
- The project is a Chichester brand. It has no competitors. The council has started to create a market and is not limited as to who it can work with. Officers will approach the county council as there are links with the Think Family project.

One other authority had approached us to use our brand but they were not going to deliver a sufficiently similar project so it was decided not to share it.

- The project has helped mostly Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) claimants however we are now being requested by DWP as part funders to help claimants on Employment Support Allowance (ESA) as well. These are people who may not be able to work due to illness or disability. The number of ESA claimants in the district is much higher than for JSA
- Queried the cases coming forward, how long they had been unemployed, number of ex-offenders, etc – This was exclusively through the Job Centre initially but now a number of sources and agencies make referrals, including housing associations We don't have statistics as to ex-offenders or the time they have been unemployed. Those with a disability may have been unemployed for a longer period. A breakdown of the type of cases would have been helpful.
- Queried whether the New Homes Bonus (NHB) funding was appropriate for this project – The council has ring-fenced £250,000 NHB to parishes. The residual amount is in reserves and not ring fenced in any way.
- The Big Lottery Funding is Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) funding. The result of the council's bid will be known in the autumn; however the LEP is considering larger scale projects which cover the entire LEP area and this project might not fulfil their criteria.

Members were very supportive of the programme, however there were concerns that partners were not contributing to this project. The council commits its support to hosting the project and to part fund 30% of the costs. If the Lottery Fund bid is successful this would cover the costs of project for two years. The committee requested officers to seek the remainder of the funding from partners.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

- 1) That the Choose Work Project be continued.
- 2) That the change in focus of the Choose Work Project from Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) claimants to Employment Support Allowance (ESA) claimants be acknowledged and supported.
- 3) That the council continues to support the project by hosting it and part funding it at 30% and, if in the event that there is a shortfall in funding, the council makes up that shortfall, but that further enhancements to the project should be sought.

108 Post Project Evaluation of the Multi-Agency Agreement for the Management of Encampments across West Sussex and the Provision of a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Site at Chichester, West Sussex

The committee considered a report by Mr J Bacon and Mr S Hansford (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Bacon and Mr Hansford introduced the report and Ms Esther Quarm, Gypsy and Traveller Team Manager, West Sussex County Council attended to answer questions in relation to the management of the site.

The committee made comments including those that follow. It:

- Queried the cost of running the site – All authorities contribute to the running of the transit site. The cesspit emptying costs were £15,500 per annum, electricity £3,500 and the total rent collected £17,000. This year there had been a surplus of £43,000 which it had been agreed would be held over as a sinking fund for future maintenance costs.
- Travellers are well looked after by a number of agencies who visit the site.
- The figures are high for 2016-17 in comparison to last year as the summer period is the main travelling period for travellers.
- The total number of dwell days has gone down significantly from 611 in 2014/15 to 78 in the current year.
- The average length of stay is roughly 6 weeks, although some families stay only a few days. DCLG guidance and regulations state that the maximum stay can be up to 12 weeks.
- Queried the reason why the transit site was not connected to mains waste – the Council did apply to Southern Water but connection to this site was refused due to capacity issues in the pipework. All foul water is emptied into two cesspits on site.. Following the discussion held with Southern Water earlier at agenda item 6 it was suggested that the council reapply to Southern Water for a connection at this site.
- The number of encampments/lived-in vehicles was higher than last year. There has been an increase in van dwellers (homeless people who have chosen to live in vehicles).
- Court appearances by Ms Quarm had reduced significantly since the introduction of the transit site, which had brought significant savings.

RESOLVED

- 1) That the findings of the Post Project Evaluation be noted.
- 2) That Officers approach Southern Water to ask that they reconsider a mains waste service connection at the transit site.

109 Housing for Care Leavers - West Sussex Joint Scrutiny Review

The committee considered the report in the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs N Graves informed the committee of the work of this joint scrutiny group. Mr R Dunmall and Mrs L Rudziak attended to answer questions.

The need for holistic working with care leavers and the need to plan ahead were discussed. This is in order that they adapt and thrive in their new environment. The Foyer currently takes 16-18 year olds and into adulthood to 25 if required. Planning policy would need to be taken into account in considering any future housing arrangements however this is dependent upon analysing need across the county in a partnership approach. Future monitoring arrangements had been suggested as one of the recommendations to ensure that there was a consistent approach across the county.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

- 1) That the recommendations set out in appendix 1 to the Joint Scrutiny Task and Finish Group report in respect of housing for care leavers be endorsed.
- 2) That this Council's response to the recommendations as set out in appendix 2 to the report be agreed and conveyed to the West Sussex Joint Scrutiny Steering Group.

110 Corporate Plan Task and Finish Group - Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference for the Corporate Plan Task and Finish Group were agreed.

Mrs P Dignum, Mrs P Plant, Mr N Galloway and Mr S Morley agreed to take part on this group. It was agreed to seek one further volunteer from the wider membership.* Mrs Dignum was agreed as Chairman of the Group.

*Subsequent to the meeting, Mrs D Knightley confirmed that she wished to take part on this group.

111 Forward Plan

Mr Galloway raised a number of items for further involvement by this committee:

- devolution (there will be wide member involvement in this issue)
- Museum Options appraisal (on the committee's work programme)
- Review of Locally Defined Council Tax Discounts (*subsequent to the meeting it was ascertained that this issue was not raised earlier in the year when setting the committee's work programme)

The meeting ended at 11.58 am

CHAIRMAN

Date:

Chichester District Council

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15 November 2016

Report from the Corporate Plan Task & Finish Group

1. Contacts

Mrs P Dignum, Chairman of the Corporate Plan Task & Finish Group
Tel: 01243 538585 Email: pdignum@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

The committee is requested to note this report from the Corporate Plan Task and Finish Group and to confirm that it is satisfied that the Council is achieving satisfactory levels of performance against the targets and activities in the 2016/17 Corporate Plan mid-year progress report.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Task and Finish Group met on 2 November 2016 to consider the Corporate Plan mid-year progress report from April to September 2016. The aim was to review the Council's performance, identifying individual areas where performance was below that expected, and to reduce risks to an acceptable level.
- 3.2 Members were Mrs P Dignum (Chairman), Mr N Galloway, Mr L Hixson and Mr S Morley. Apologies were received from Mrs D Knightley.
- 3.3 Members used the Council's Covalent performance indicators to examine areas of the Corporate Plan that had not reached their targets.

4.0 Monitoring and Review

- 4.1 Rise in crime in the Chichester area: the aim was a 0% increase but ours was 8.5%, still lower than average. It comprises opportunistic thefts, greater numbers of reported assaults and sexual offences.

Members were reassured by Cllr Galloway's report of a talk given to the City Council this week, addressed by Chief Inspector Burtenshaw, who had spoken positively of the new policing methods, deploying police constables and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) quickly where needed county wide and dealing with mental health problem sufferers by taking a mental health nurse with them when a remand might be necessary.

New laws meant new things being recorded as crime – for example throwing a crisp bag at someone now counted as assault.

Ms Bushby, Community Interventions Manager, mentioned that the new police attitude was to respond only to situations involving threat, harm or risk (which did not include all burglaries). She felt the greater reporting of sexual offences was a good thing because it suggested a more receptive attitude: many reports are historic, not present. Domestic abuse was on-going and often private. The Community Safety Partnership was meeting its targets. Vulnerable people migrated to city centres and keeping CCTV in the city was important. The work of Stonepillow and the City Angels was most important in containing crime. The Council's team, with its Rough Sleepers Panel and joined-up thinking, was working unseen all over the district to help vulnerable and sometimes difficult-to-help individuals. Ms Bushby's personal, proactive ideas last year had cut thefts from building sites.

Members felt reassured by the wealth of information showing the width of the Council and its partners' efforts to tackle crime in the district. They also wanted to request the Chief Inspector to speak to the committee in a year's time when police reorganisation had had time to bed in. Mrs Lintill, the portfolio holder with responsibility for this area, already raises concerns on the Police Crime Panel and West Sussex County Council has a scheme for perpetrators of violence.

- 4.2 Staff absence rates: our target is 7 days lost per employee per year, and our current figure is 8.8.

Mr Radcliffe, HR manager, said this was not the highest ever recorded at the Council, and it compared with public organisations nationally. The figures were easily skewed by a few long-term sickness cases, as had happened here, although some of those people had now left the Council. The organisation has no slack and temporary/agency staff were expensive.

Injuries, anxiety and depression were some causes of sickness absence. The HR and Wellbeing teams worked with those affected. The Employee Assistance Programme had been introduced which offered phone counselling 24/7 and opportunities for eight face to face discussions a year. There were fitness, sports, and mindfulness sessions, health checks and advice available. Men did not always take these up. Staff had an opportunity to raise issues during the annual appraisal process; flexi-time was helpful; working from home was a solution for some injuries and illnesses. Team consultations kept up morale.

Mr Radcliffe undertook to provide further information regarding comparisons with other local authorities and analysis of outturn over a number of past years.

Members felt reassured that staff absence had causes already being cared for, that the Council offered staff a number of ways to maintain good health, and felt men should be encouraged to use these services more.

- 4.3 Wellbeing: Improving the health of our communities and workforce – (Update following the meeting - The indicator is showing amber as Wellbeing staff have been unable to meet the target of delivering the Make Every Contact Count training to 100 frontline staff. When the training was piloted with other services it was found that staff struggled to see the relevance for themselves so the content of training for future sessions is being reviewed.)

- 4.4 Wellbeing: Increase the number of referrals to the Wellbeing hub - Referrals to the hub for cardiovascular disease and cancer by GPs were below the desired level. Members were advised that this was possibly because the Wellbeing team was focusing on smaller businesses with fewer advisors, but spending longer quality time with them. (Update following the meeting – the latest outturn is 91% which brings this indicator into the ‘In Progress/green’ status.)
- 4.5 Participation in Sport in the community: The target was not met during the Westgate Leisure contract changeover time. (Update following the meeting – this indicator has been superseded by key performance indicators (KPIs) in the Leisure Contract which will be monitored separately.)

Mr Morley raised the continued heating issues in the dance studio at the Grange. (Update following the meeting: The heating system in the dance studio has been altered to stop the air flow being directed at the floor and the temperature was raised. Some of the yoga sessions have moved to alternative rooms which the participants prefer. The contractor is responsible for the operational maintenance of the building and service agreements and these are monitored on a monthly basis. The Council is responsible for the structural maintenance.)

- 4.6 Your Energy Sussex (YES): CDC had not achieved its goals of reducing fuel poverty, improving energy efficiency etc. as the Government had cancelled its Green Deal scheme and scaled back its energy obligations.

(Update from Mr T Day, Environmental Co-ordinator, following the meeting - The latest position with YES is that work continues on solar photovoltaic schemes on WSCC land and on social housing. Work is also on-going on procurement for a Sussex Energy Tariff to be offered to householders and businesses. However we became involved with YES mainly to offer an integrated energy efficiency offer to residents. The cancellation of the Green Deal scheme by the Government without any replacement and the cuts in Energy Company Obligation (ECO) funding have led to the collapse of the two schemes offered to householders. These are national problems that all local authorities are struggling with. The launch of ECO2 next year may offer some slim hope of funding again becoming available. The YES milestones have been made out of date by the above developments and new targets are being worked up.)

- 4.7 Parking Charges review: The new proposed charges for 2017-18 have this week been agreed by the Cabinet and put out to consultation. Several new payment schemes were planned, with payment by credit, debit and contactless cards, and by phone, over coming months. Members felt all was progressing well here.
- 4.8 New Ways of Working Phase 2: The CAB move into the Council offices was proceeding well with understandable delays.
- 4.9 Syrian vulnerable persons relocation programme: There was a request to have a report on how refugees were housed and assimilated into the local community to a future OSC meeting to answer questions such as – Is the Council meeting its obligations? Is Government money being received? Has there been an increase in hate crime? What help is there for emotional and financial problems, exploitation and trauma?

- 4.10 Think Family Programme: Challenges had been raised in the media to earlier indications of success in this scheme claimed by some councils. An update on this is provided at Appendix 1. Mr Hixson advised that the scheme had been a great success in Chichester East.
- 4.11 Fly-tipping: The group suggested a report be provided to the committee in a year's time to assess whether there had been an increase in fly-tipping following the reduced hours put in place at local recycling depots.
- 4.12 New Tourism strategy: Mr Morley asked about the position of Midhurst, now there was no Council contact point at the Grange. He would see if the library offered information. The Tourism Strategy would cover the whole district and was due to be considered by the committee in January 2017. A tourism information point would still be available at the Grange.
- 4.13 Avenue de Chartres repairs: Members queried the setting of the new milestones following Council approval of the additional works. (Update following the meeting – The programme of works had been received from the contractor and the additional work relating to lighting, work on the barriers and the five towers was now being integrated into the project plan.)

5.0 Outcomes

- 5.1 The group considered that there were good explanations for areas of the Corporate Plan where targets had not been met; some were outside our control, others showed great council input making a difference, some needed a little more time.

While several requests were made for further scrutiny or information, there was a feeling that the limited number of concerns raised from a huge range of projects showed the Council's high standards and care in carrying out its Corporate Plan priorities.

6.0 Appendices

Appendix 1 – copy of an email relating to the Think Family programme at para 4.10

7.0 Background papers

Corporate Plan 2016-17 mid-year progress report

From: Phillip Finlinson [<mailto:phillip.finlinson@westsussex.gov.uk>]
Sent: 03 November 2016 11:35
To: Pam Bushby
Subject: RE: request

Criticisms of Troubled Families

You may have become aware recently of some rather disheartening media coverage of the national Troubled Families programme – for instance in Channel 4's Dispatches. Whatever picture that programme may have painted of certain local authorities receiving money from government but not delivering meaningful change in deprived areas, that situation is NOT true in West Sussex.

Our County Council has put a very large additional amount of its own money into this scheme. There would have been absolutely no point in doing this if it wasn't going to yield genuine, sustainable outcomes. All the grant money received has gone straight back into the service – and it's only about half of our overall costs.

We specifically set out to work assertively with the most challenging families, in ways that make a difference: that is why we set up the Keyworker service, formed an alliance across the public sector in West Sussex, and launched the transformation of our services to work intensively with whole families in an efficient way; that is why we've been putting money into local neighbourhoods, to improve the quality of life for whole communities. The savings we expect to see are in terms of reduced demand in the future through preventative intervention and support – with today's children becoming the successful adults and parents of tomorrow.

Through your efforts and those of staff in services who worked alongside us with the families, we really have got children back into school, adults into work, and resolved ASB, Crime and Domestic Violence and of course we are continuing to make even more of a difference under the broader factors in Phase 2. You may very well be aware from your own experience how much families appreciate what you have achieved with them; and we have abundant evidence from personal testimony, case studies and independent reviews, of lives genuinely turned around.

Yes, we do manage data effectively (through Holistix), but in the case of West Sussex it's data that reflects actual achievements on the ground. The success we have declared is rigorously audited and verified.

We can't speak for everyone, but we know in our county that whole-family keyworking works! However, it requires proper investment, alongside commitment of the kind you have shown. Thank you, and keep up the good work for the families and communities of West Sussex.

Hayley Connor - Strategic Commissioning Manager (Think Family & Early Help)

Agenda Item 10

BUDGET REVIEW

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Review Topic	Budget 2016-17 outturn and variances
Membership (and Chairman)	3 members of Corporate Governance & Audit Committee and 3 members of Overview & Scrutiny Committee to be sought at their meetings in November 2016.
Terms of Reference	To consider the original budget for 2016-17 and compare this with the projected outturn. To consider the proposed variances on the 2017-18 budget. To comment on these in advance of Cabinet consideration of the Budget 2017-18 in February 2017.
Scope	5 Year Financial Model Statement of Resources 2016-17 to 2021-22 Projected Revenue Budget Variations 2016-17 and 2017-18.
Review Period	December 2016
Officer support	Mr J Ward, Mr D Cooper and Mrs B Jones
Frequency of Meetings	One meeting to be held in early December 2016
Report back to	OSC on 17 January 2017 and CGAC on 26 January 2017

Chichester District Council



CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

FORWARD PLAN

**For the period
1 December 2016 to 31 March 2017**

An outline of the decisions expected to be made by the Council's Cabinet

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL
FORWARD PLAN FOR THE PERIOD 1 DECEMBER 2016 TO 31 MARCH 2017

This Forward Plan outlines the decisions which are expected to be made by the Council's Cabinet during the period of four months from 1 December 2016 to 31 March 2017. On occasions the timetable for reports may change due to unforeseen circumstances. Additionally the Forward Plan also identifies decisions which are likely to be taken by the Cabinet in the coming year beyond the four month period covered by the Plan.

The meetings of the Cabinet due to be held during this period are 6 December 2016, 11 January 2017, 7 February 2017 and 9 March 2017 to be held at the offices of Chichester District Council, East Pallant House, East Pallant, Chichester.

Parts of these meetings may be held in private if the Cabinet considers it likely that there will be disclosure of confidential information or exempt information of a description specified in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

The Forward Plan includes key decisions, which are those which if taken by the Cabinet will have significant financial implications or significant impact in the District, and other decisions which may be of interest to the public.

The Forward Plan includes information on the person to contact to inspect relevant documents.

The Cabinet may also consider other documents or items which are not included in the Forward Plan due to changing circumstances.

The Membership of the Cabinet is currently as follows:

Councillors Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr P R Barrow, Mrs G Keegan, Mrs P A Hardwick, Mrs P Plant, Mrs C Purnell and Mrs S T Taylor.

The Forward Plan will be revised each month and rolled forward to the next four monthly period.

Any person who wishes to make representations about any matter in the Forward Plan should contact the report author or Member Services, Chichester District Council, East Pallant House, Chichester, PO19 1TY (e-mail memberservices@chichester.gov.uk) at least a week before the meeting at which the decision is to be made. Any person who wishes to receive a copy of any document relevant to the matters listed in the Forward Plan should contact the same people.

If you have any general queries on the contents of the Forward Plan please contact Katherine Jeram, Member Services Officer on 01243 534674 (e-mail kjeram@chichester.gov.uk)

Tony Dignum
Leader of the Council

Topics due to be considered are as follows:

Topic	Page
6 December 2016	
Authorities' Monitoring Report	5
Award of Contract for Beach Management Plan works 2016-2017	5
Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Plan - Making the Plan	5
Chichester Vision - Approval of Draft Prior to Public Consultation	6
Code of Conduct for Employees and the Protocol on Member/Staff Relations	7
Cultural Grants - review of arrangements	7
Determination of the Council Tax Base for 2017-2018	8
Financial Strategy and Plan 2017/18	8
Housing Allocations Scheme Review	9
Introduction of Section 106 Fee	9
Pallant House Gallery - Approval of Revised Articles of Association	9
Petworth Skatepark Project	10
Report of the Planning Task and Finish Group on Pre App Advice Scheme and use, discharge and enforcement of conditions	10
Road Space Audit	11
South Downs National Park Authority Extension of Management Agency Agreement	11
Treasury management 2016-17 Half Year Performance Report	12
10 Jan 2017	
Devolution Report	12
Litter Clearance Programme for A27 Trunk Road	13
Maintenance Programme for Closed Churchyards	14
Revised Local Development Scheme 2016-2019	14
To Authorise Technical, Financial and Socio-economic Studies of a Potential Haven (small harbour) in Selsey	15
7 Feb 2017	
Budget Spending Plans 2017-2018	15
Financial Management System Upgrade - Post Project Evaluation	16
Infrastructure Business Plan - Approval	16
Museum Service Options Appraisal	16
Parking Strategy Review	17
Plot 21, Terminus Road, Chichester	17
Recycling Action Plan	18
Review of CCTV Assets, Functions and Costs	18
Senior Staff Pay Policy	19
Shared Building Control Service	19
Shared Services	19
Tourism and Visitor Economy Strategy	20
Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2017-18	20
4 Apr 2017	
Joint Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Supplementary Planning Document Adoption	21
Chichester Vision - Approval of Final Document	21
Southern Gateway - Approval of Draft Masterplan and Consultation Process	22
June 2017	
Southern Gateway - Approval of Masterplan and the Reporting of a Project Initiation Document	22

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Authorities' Monitoring Report The Authorities' Monitoring Report (AMR) is prepared annually and is the main mechanism for assessing the performance, implementation and effects of the Local Plan. This AMR will cover the period between 1 April 2015 and 31 March 2016. (Recommendation from Development Plans and Infrastructure Panel)
Report author	Mrs Anna Miller, Planning Policy Officer amiller@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Award of Contract for Beach Management Plan works 2016-2017 Approval by cabinet is required for the award of Beach Management Plan contractor contract required due to value of contract. (Standing Order rules)
Report author	Mr Dominic Henly, Senior Engineer (Coast and Water Management) dhenly@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Plan - Making the Plan To make the Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park); The report will recommend, subject to a successful

	<p>referendum to be held on 16 November, that Cabinet recommends that Council makes the Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>(recommendation to Council)</p>
Report author	<p>Mrs Valerie Dobson, Neighbourhood Planning Officer, Mrs Katherine Jeram, Member Services Officer vdobson@chichester.gov.uk, kjeram@chichester.gov.uk</p>
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Chichester Vision - Approval of Draft Prior to Public Consultation</p> <p>To review and approve the draft Chichester Vision prior to public consultation. The Vision will set out how the City Centre might develop over the next 20 years. It will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be a clear articulation of 'what we want Chichester to be; - Ensure that all past, current and future proposals, ideas and opportunities take account of each other to produce a cohesive approach; - Set-out a wide range of projects and strategic proposals, including a number of previous items worthy of reconsideration; - Identify and articulate the opportunities for significant economic growth and job creation, and the risks of missing opportunities and stifling growth; and - Provide the guiding principles for a new planning policy framework for the City, and form the basis of a strategy to attract inward investment into the City. <p>Expected outcomes: Key project outcomes and potential outcome measures are as detailed in sections 4.2 and 4.3 of the PID.</p> <p>(Recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee)</p>
Report author	<p>Mr Stephen Oates, Economic Development Manager soates@chichester.gov.uk</p>
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet

Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Code of Conduct for Employees and the Protocol on Member/Staff Relations Review of Code and Protocol. Recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mr Tim Radcliffe, Human Resources Manager tradcliffe@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016 15 Nov 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Cultural Grants - review of arrangements Review of the cultural grants for 2018-22 as the current arrangement ends on 18 March 2018. (Recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee) (Recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mr Steve Hansford, Head of Community Services shansford@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Fully exempt Sensitive information relating to funding for two local organisations.

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Determination of the Council Tax Base for 2017-2018 To set the Council Tax base for 2017/18 The tax base is effectively an estimate of the number of council tax dwellings

	in the district. This is adjusted for the effect of the discounts and exemptions, properties being in different valuation bands expressed as the number of band D equivalent dwellings in the district. This figure is then adjusted for the assumed collection rate. (recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mrs Christine Christie, Revenues and Performance Manager cchristie@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Financial Strategy and Plan 2017/18 The purpose of this report is to update the Council's financial strategy and action plan to help guide the management of the Council's finances during a period of diminishing resources, and to build upon the work already achieved in this area in previous years. The key recommendations from this report will help to formulate the 2017-18 budget, and level of Council Tax. (recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mr John Ward, Head of Finance and Governance Services jward@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Housing Allocations Scheme Review Three yearly review of the rural allocations scheme. (Recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee)
Report author	Mr Rob Dunmall, Housing Operations Manager

	rdunmall@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Introduction of Section 106 Fee To consider and approve the introduction of a fee to cover the costs of monitoring Section 106 Agreements.
Report author	Mrs Karen Dower, Principal Planning Officer (Infrastructure Planning) kdower@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Pallant House Gallery - Approval of Revised Articles of Association Following a Governance Review, the Pallant House Gallery Board have made a series of recommendations that require amendments to their Articles of Association. Given the context of the establishment of the Gallery, the Articles have been referred to CDC for comment
Report author	Mr David Hyland, Community and Partnerships Support Manager dhyland@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Petworth Skatepark Project</p> <p>The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its appendices and to make the following resolutions:</p> <p>(1) That the results of the Options Appraisal undertaken by Petworth Town Council of sites for a skatepark be noted.</p> <p>(2) That further discussion between Petworth Town Council and officers to advance outline plans for the provision of a skatepark in the Pound Street Car Park Petworth in order that the implications can be better understood be authorised.</p> <p>That the availability of £70,000 towards the project, subject to further consideration and approval by the Cabinet of the precise location, design, risks, management and lease terms, be provisionally confirmed.</p>
Report author	Mr David Hyland, Community and Partnerships Support Manager dhyland@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Report of the Planning Task and Finish Group on Pre App Advice Scheme and use, discharge and enforcement of conditions</p> <p>(Recommendation from Planning Task and Finish Group)</p>
Report author	Mr Tony Whitty, Development Management Service Manager twhitty@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
-----------------	------------

Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Road Space Audit</p> <p>Along with many towns and cities across the UK Chichester faces a number of challenges – it must accommodate significant new development, both residential and commercial, whilst preserving its historic character. Parking is particularly problematic, with high demands and constraints in meeting supply in the area of greatest demand. West Sussex County Council has appointed consultants (WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff) to consider the parking issues and use of road space in Chichester city to consider the challenges and consider how these might be affected by emerging strategies and plans in the area, along with consideration of the changing role of the high street. The work undertaken will set the way for a strategic vision for parking within the city.</p> <p>This report to members will provide an update on the work undertaken so far and will request consideration of the proposals which are being put forward.</p>
Report author	Mrs Tania Murphy, Parking Services Manager tmurphy@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>South Downs National Park Authority Extension of Management Agency Agreement</p> <p>Extension of the current host authority arrangement on the current (2016/17) payment terms for a period of no more than 6 months up to 30 September 2017, in order to complete negotiations on new Agreements under Section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 to enable Chichester District Council to continue to provide development management services for up to three years from 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2020. (Recommendation to Council)</p>
Report author	Mr Andrew Frost, Head of Planning Services afrost@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No

Exempt?	Open
---------	------

Date of Meeting	6 Dec 2016
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Treasury management 2016-17 Half Year Performance Report
Report author	Mark Catlow, Group Accountant (Technical and Exchequer) mcatlow@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	10 Jan 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Devolution Report</p> <p>This report seeks authority to proceed with the devolution proposals for the Three Southern Counties – East and West Sussex and Surrey County Councils and all of the District and Borough Councils that fall within their boundaries. The report sets out the legal framework for a governance review, the principles that will apply and the considerations that each authority will be asked to examine as governance options are examined.</p> <p>Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council the following:</p> <p>(1) That the Council endorses formal submission to the Government as a devolution proposition which this council wishes to be party to;</p> <p>(2) That the Council delegates to Leader of the Council the authority to negotiate with the other authorities and with the Government a devolution deal based on those proposals;</p> <p>(3) That the Council endorses a plan to undertake a review of governance arrangements that would be required to enable the authorities to discharge the powers they seeks to be devolved;</p> <p>(4) That the Council endorses the proposals for the establishment of arrangements for collective decision making as interim arrangements pending the conclusion of the review of governance; and</p>

	<p>(5) That the Council receive a report on the outcome of the governance review in the Autumn with a view to deciding whether to adopt new governance arrangements</p> <p>(Recommendation to Council)</p>
Report author	Mr John Ward, Head of Finance and Governance Services jward@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	10 Jan 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Litter Clearance Programme for A27 Trunk Road</p> <p>The Council is the Primary Litter Authority and is responsible for keeping relevant land clear of litter and debris. This responsibility includes the A27 trunk road.</p> <p>A change to the way that traffic management legislation is applied to work on the highway has meant that the previous litter clearance methodology is no longer adequate.</p> <p>The report will outline proposals for a revised cleansing regime and request funding to carry out one full clean of the trunk road in the spring. The street cleaning budget for 2017/18 onwards will be adjusted to allow for additional costs</p> <p>(Recommendation to Council)</p>
Report author	Mr Bob Riley, Contracts Manager briley@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	10 Jan 2017
Matter in respect of	Maintenance Programme for Closed Churchyards

which the decision is to be made	<p>The Council has responsibilities for several closed churchyards and burial grounds throughout the district.</p> <p>A full survey has been carried out of the various grounds, identifying the need to develop an enhanced R & M programme to ensure that the sites are maintained to satisfactory standards.</p> <p>The report will request the provision of addition budget to complete this work.</p> <p>(Recommendation to Council)</p>
Report author	Mr Bob Riley, Contracts Manager briley@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	10 Jan 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Revised Local Development Scheme 2016-2019</p> <p>To consider the revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) 2016-2019. The LDS details the current Development Plan and proposals for new documents in the Chichester Local Plan area. It ensures that the local community and developers are kept informed of the current timetable for producing planning policy documents during the rolling three year timeframe.</p> <p>(Recommendation to Council)</p>
Report author	Mrs Anna Miller, Planning Policy Officer amiller@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	10 Jan 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to	To Authorise Technical, Financial and Socio-economic Studies of a Potential Haven (small harbour) in Selsey

be made	<p>Description: Following an initial feasibility study the report requests authorisation to commission further reports (technical, financial & socio-economic) into the feasibility of building a small harbour near East Beach, Selsey including associated business units, to provide fisheries protection, economic opportunities, flood protection and a visitor focus on the Manhood Peninsula.</p> <p>Expected outcome: A secure and expanding inshore fishing industry. A place where Selsey businesses can grow; and where residents and visitors can find good cultural, leisure and sporting activities.</p>
Report author	Mrs Louise Rudziak, Head of Housing and Environment Services lrudziak@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Budget Spending Plans 2017-2018</p> <p>To set a net budget requirement and council tax increase for the Council for the financial year 2017-2018. (Recommendation to Council)</p>
Report author	Mrs Helen Belenger, Accountancy Services Manager hbelenger@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Financial Management System Upgrade - Post Project Evaluation</p> <p>To receive a review of how the project has performed following implementation of the upgrade.</p>
Report author	Mrs Helen Belenger, Accountancy Services Manager hbelenger@chichester.gov.uk

List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Infrastructure Business Plan - Approval Consideration of the Infrastructure Business Plan for approval. (recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mrs Karen Dower, Principal Planning Officer (Infrastructure Planning) kdower@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Museum Service Options Appraisal Cabinet to consider the findings of the options appraisal of the current museum service management. To identify options for delivery of the museum and recommend preferred model for future delivery of The Novium. (Recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee)
Report author	Mr John Ward, Head of Finance and Governance Services jward@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Parking Strategy Review</p> <p>The Chichester District Car Park Strategy 2010 – 2020 sets out the principles and vision for the provision of parking by the authority. It is considered that now is a good time to review and re-fresh this document, to enable changes which have been seen over recent years to be considered and to allow consideration of emerging policies and strategies to be included. Links to other projects – such as the Road Space Audit and Smarter Choices – will also be considered. The document will be considered first by the Chichester District Parking Forum and is being submitted to Cabinet for final agreement.</p> <p>(Recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee)</p>
Report author	Mrs Tania Murphy, Parking Services Manager tmurphy@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Plot 21, Terminus Road, Chichester</p> <p>Tender analysis and contract award</p> <p>The Public are likely to be excluded from any discussion at which this report is considered 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 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.</p>
Report author	Mr Patrick Harrison, Strategic Asset Management Surveyor pharrison@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Fully exempt

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Recycling Action Plan To approve the Recycling Action Plan that aims to achieve the EU and national recycling and waste minimisation targets. (Recommendation from Waste Panel)
Report author	Mr Bob Riley, Contracts Manager briley@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Review of CCTV Assets, Functions and Costs To consider how to provide the service more efficiently. Consider data on the use of CCTV in prosecutions and reducing crime. (Recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee)
Report author	Mrs Tania Murphy, Parking Services Manager tmurphy@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Senior Staff Pay Policy Publication of the Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement. (recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mr Tim Radcliffe, Human Resources Manager tradcliffe@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet

Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Shared Building Control Service The Public are likely to be excluded from any discussion at which this report is considered 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 1 (Information relating to any individual) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.
Report author	Mr Andrew Frost, Head of Planning Services afrost@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Fully exempt

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Shared Services To consider the detailed business cases from the Shared Services Programme that is being undertaken with Arun and Horsham District Councils.
Report author	Mr Joe Mildred, Corporate Policy Advice Manager jmildred@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Tourism and Visitor Economy Strategy Following Town and City Centre research undertaken as a result of Initial Project Proposal Document agreed by

	Cabinet January 2015, and visitor and destination research undertaken under the Project Initiation Document agreed by Cabinet July 2015, to approve a new strategy and funding contribution for developing the District's visitor economy (Recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee) (Recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mr Stephen Oates, Economic Development Manager soates@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	7 Feb 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2017-18 Setting out any proposed changes to the Council's Treasury Management Policy and Strategy, Investment Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision Statement for the forthcoming financial year 2017/18 and the prudential indicators and limits as required under CIPFA's Prudential and Treasury Management Codes. (recommendation to Council)
Report author	Mark Catlow, Group Accountant (Technical and Exchequer) mcatlow@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	4 Apr 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Joint Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Supplementary Planning Document Adoption Following consultation on the draft document, the representations received during the consultation (10 November - 22 December 2016) have been considered and amendments proposed. These have been incorporated into the final document for adoption by the Council.

	Recommendation: to adopt the Joint Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Supplementary Planning Document.
Report author	Ms Sue Payne, Planning Policy Officer spayne@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	4 Apr 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Chichester Vision - Approval of Final Document To approve the final Chichester Vision document and the accompanying project plan and timetable. To note any comments and recommendations from OSC. To agree any funding to commence implementation of initial projects.
Report author	Mr Stephen Oates, Economic Development Manager soates@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	4 Apr 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Southern Gateway - Approval of Draft Masterplan and Consultation Process (Recommendation to Special Council)
Report author	Miss Amy Loaring, Partnerships Officer, Mr Mike Allgrove, Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager aloaring@chichester.gov.uk, mallgrove@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	No
Exempt?	Open

Date of Meeting	June 2017
Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	<p>Southern Gateway - Approval of Masterplan and the Reporting of a Project Initiation Document</p> <p>To approve the Masterplan and a Project Initiation Document that will propose the arrangements for the implementation of the Southern Gateway project.</p> <p>(Recommendation to Special Council)</p>
Report author	Mr Mike Allgrove, Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager, Miss Amy Loaring, Partnerships Officer mallgrove@chichester.gov.uk, aloaring@chichester.gov.uk
List of documents to be submitted to the Cabinet	Report to Cabinet
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt?	Open

Agenda Item 13

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

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

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

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted