



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 1 - East Pallant House Chichester on Tuesday 6 December 2016 at 09:30

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

Members Absent

Officers Present Mr M Allgrove (Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mrs C Christie (Revenues and Performance Manager), Mr R Davidson (Principal Planning Officer (Strategic Planning)), Mrs K Dower (Principal Planning Officer (Infrastructure Planning)), Mr A Frost (Head of Planning Services), Mr S Hansford (Head of Community Services), Mr D Henly (Senior Engineer (Coast and Water Management)), Mr D Hyland (Community and Partnerships Support Manager), Mr T Jackson (Acting Group Accountant (Technical & Exchequer)), Mr P Jobson (Taxation Manager), Mrs T Murphy (Parking Services Manager), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mrs A Stevens (Environment Manager), Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer), Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services) and Mr T Whitty (Development Management Service Manager)

288 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mr Dignum welcomed the members of the public, the two press representatives and Chichester District Council (CDC) members and officers who were present for this meeting. He conveyed seasonal greetings to everyone.

There were no late items which due to special circumstances required urgent consideration under agenda item 14.

No apologies for absence had been received and all members of the Cabinet were present.

[Note Hereinafter in these minutes CDC denotes Chichester District Council]

289 **Approval of Minutes**

The Cabinet received the minutes of its meeting on Tuesday 1 November 2016, which had been circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

There were no proposed changes to the minutes.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on Tuesday 1 November 2016 be signed and dated as a correct record without amendment.

Mr Dignum then duly signed and dated the final (fourteenth) page of the official version of the aforesaid minutes as a correct record.

290 **Declarations of Interests**

The following declarations of interests were made by members of the Cabinet or other CDC members who were present as observers:

Agenda Item 7: Determination of the Council Tax Base for 2017-2018

- Mr A P Dignum declared a personal and a prejudicial interest as a member of Chichester City Council
- Mrs L C Purnell declared a personal and a prejudicial interest as a member of Selsey Town Council

Agenda Item 16: Cultural Grants Review

- Mrs C M M Apel (a Chichester West ward member and chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and who was present as an observer) declared a personal interest as a Friend of Chichester Festival Theatre and the Pallant House Gallery.
- Mr A P Dignum declared a personal interest as a Friend of Chichester Festival Theatre and the Pallant House Gallery.
- Mrs P A Hardwick declared a personal interest as a Friend of Chichester Festival Theatre and the Pallant House Gallery.

291 **Public Question Time**

A public question had been received from Mr R E Plowman, who was the chairman of the Friends of Priory Park in Chichester.

Mr Plowman was in attendance. At Mr Dignum's invitation he came forward to the officers' committee table and read out the text of his question as follows.

[Note In the ensuing text IPPD denotes Initial Project Proposal Document]

Question

'First of all I should like to thank Councillor Barrow and Jane Hotchkiss for addressing a recent meeting of the Friends of Priory Park. During the Q&A session it became apparent that the forthcoming IPPD concerning Priory Park – to be considered by Cabinet in February – has ballooned from a study to determine options for the redevelopment of the buildings in the North-West quadrant of the Park, to a wholesale examination of the status of the Park – in particular whether it should be closed at night and whether it should be changed from an enclosed green space to open parkland. In the view of the Friends and many Park users, both these options would give rise to considerable public anxiety and place children at unnecessary risk. This will certainly give rise to public opposition, lengthy consultations and possible legal challenges.

Priory Park is one of the city's most popular destinations, noted for its rich heritage, its open space and calm ambience, and as a safe place for children to play – one of the factors that led to Chichester being chosen recently as one of the top five places in England and Wales in which to bring up a family.

Would Cabinet agree that the Council's time, resources, and limited financial means, would be best served if the forthcoming IPPD was limited to its original purpose, and that as a baseline, the current status of the Park as an enclosed space, closed at night, should be retained?'

Response

Mr Dignum read out the following reply to Mr Plowman's question:

'I can confirm that a proposal concerning Priory Park will be considered by Cabinet early next year. The proposal is for a consultant's study of the options for the future of the buildings in the Park. The study should not affect the essential character of the Park which is largely laid to grass and enclosed with the gates locked after dark (except when, as in the past, there is an approved evening event).'

Supplementary Question

Mr Dignum offered to Mr Plowman the opportunity to ask one supplementary question. Mr Plowman accepted that invitation and asked for confirmation that the forthcoming IPPD would not be considering Priory Park as an open space without fencing and that it would continue to be kept closed at night.

Response

Mr Dignum replied by saying that the third and final sentence of his previous reply had answered that point and so he had no more to add.

Mr Plowman expressed his gratitude to Mr Dignum.

[**Note** Minute paras 292 to 321 below summarise the consideration of and conclusion to agenda items 5 to 16 inclusive but for full details (excluding exempt agenda item 16) please refer to the audio recording facility via this [link](#)]

292 **Financial Strategy and Plan 2017-2018**

The Cabinet considered the agenda report and its three appendices in the agenda supplement appendix pack (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Hardwick.

No specific officers were present for this item.

Mrs Hardwick explained that the report updated CDC's financial strategy and plan for the year 2017-2018 and prepared the ground for the budget-setting in February 2017 and the council tax-setting in March 2017. She alluded to the prevailing economic climate in which local government had to function, the government's recent autumn statement and CDC's recently agreed four-year settlement. Whilst the settlement afforded a degree of certainty for aspects of CDC's funding stream, much of its revenue requirement was unpredictable, which reflected uncertainties about the economy and the nature of retained non-domestic rates and to what extent central government would seek to reclaim that income. It had been confirmed that CDC would be entitled to raise council tax by 2% or £5 whichever was the greater without a referendum, as it had done for 2016-2017 and the current model assumed a similar increase for 2017-2018 with increases of 2% beyond that. Appendix 2 (page 9 of the agenda supplement) showed the updated five-year model, reflecting the four-year settlement and the most up-to-date estimates for wider CDC activities including the commercial boards and other planned savings. The model incorporated estimates in the context of various uncertainties and risks set out in para 4.11, not least given the climate of political and economic uncertainty following the outcome of the EU referendum. She highlighted (a) income from fees and charges, (b) effects of inflation, (c) pay settlement pressure and (d) new homes bonus. The key financial principles behind CDC's financial strategy were set out in appendix 1. The report had been considered by CDC's Corporate Governance and Audit Committee on 24 November 2016; it had made various recommendations to the Cabinet, which were set out in section 9 of the agenda report.

Members commended the prudent approach to and the guiding principles in the financial strategy and plan in view of the financial uncertainty

Mrs Hardwick and Mr Ward replied to members' questions with regard to (a) the services mentioned in the second bullet point (effects of inflation) in para 4.11 of the agenda report which had struggled to pass on the effects of inflation to customers (Careline and Development Management) and (b) when the figure in the ninth bullet point (amended waste regulations and increased recycling targets) in para 4.11, currently a best estimate, might be reviewed (it would be kept under review in any event and could be addressed again for example in the 2018-2019 financial strategy and plan).

Decision

At the conclusion of the debate the Cabinet voted on a show of hands unanimously in favour of the five recommendations.

RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

That the Council:

- (1) Approves the key financial principles and actions of the five-year financial strategy set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report.
- (2) Notes the current five-year Financial Model in appendix 2 to the agenda report.
- (3) Approves the setting of a minimum level of general fund reserves, having considered the recommendations from the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.
- (4) Approves the continuing participation by Chichester District Council in a West Sussex NDR pool for 2017-2018.
- (5) Notes the current resources as set out in appendix 3 to the agenda report.

293 Award of Contract for Beach Management Plan Works 2016-2017

The Cabinet considered the agenda report and the confidential Part II appendix (copy of the report attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Purnell.

Mr Henly and Mrs Stevens were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Purnell summarised the background to and the nature of the proposal for a shingle recharge at the site in Selsey, which would be undertaken by CDC pursuant to the *Coast Protection Act 1949*. CDC had permissive powers to prevent coastal erosion within its area. The proposed contract would be for the first year of the *Beach Management Plan 2016-2021* (BMP), approved by the Cabinet earlier in 2016, which would implement the hold the line policy for the stretch of coastline between Pagham and East Head. The first five-year expenditure on coastal defence which ended in March 2016 resulted in £1.5m spent on improving extant defences. The new BMP would continue the work of importing shingle in order to maintain and even improve man-made defences, which were a significant means of protecting the sea walls from being undermined and the hinterland from being flooded. The contract was financed by grant via the Flood Defence in Grant Aid awarded to CDC by the Environment Agency. The competitive tender process had used an approved framework for coastal works. The tender price was comparable to the previous year's figure and was judged to represent best value.

Mr Henly and Mrs Stevens did not wish to add to Mrs Purnell's remarks.

Mr Henly and Mr Carvell responded to members' questions on points of detail.

Decision

At the conclusion of the debate the Cabinet voted on a show of hands unanimously in favour of the recommendation.

RESOLVED

That the contract for shingle recharge at Danefield Road Selsey be awarded to the contractor identified in the confidential appendix to the agenda report.

294 **Determination of the Council Tax Base for 2017-2018**

The Cabinet considered the agenda report and its three appendices in the agenda supplement appendix pack (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Hardwick.

Mrs Christie and Mr Jobson were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Hardwick explained that this item related to setting the council tax base for the next financial year. It was effectively an estimate of the number of council tax dwellings in the district (current plus estimation for new dwellings likely to enter the valuation list), which was adjusted to take into account discounts, exemptions and properties being in different bands. The final total was expressed as the number of Band D equivalent dwellings and this was adjusted for an estimated collection rate. The proposed taxbase for the 2017-2018 financial year was 51,918.4 band D equivalents. Appendix 1 (page 11 in the agenda supplement) showed a summary of the calculations. Appendix 2 (pages 12 to 13) set out the tax base for each parish within the district for 2017-2018. Para 5.4 of the agenda report addressed the allocation of grants to parishes and the arrangements put in place by CDC to provide eligible parishes with a gradually reduced level of grant until it was finally withdrawn at the end of 2019-2020. The figures in appendix 3 in the agenda supplement (pages 14 to 16) showed the proposed allocation of grant to parish councils. In order to avoid both any disproportionate impact and administering relatively small grant payments as the taper was implemented each year, CDC was applying a lower threshold of £1,000 or 4% of the parish's precept in 2016-2017 (whichever was the lower), which meant that any computed grant lower than those limits was removed altogether. In order to illustrate how the arrangements operated she referred to Sidlesham (its grant would end in 2016-2017) and Singleton (its grant would end in 2017-2018). All parishes had been given notice of the change and had been informed that they would be advised of the outcome of this meeting at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mrs Christie and Mr Jobson did not wish to add to Mrs Hardwick's presentation.

The Cabinet noted most local authorities had already terminated the parish grant.

In reply to a member's question about the parishes' response to the eventual loss of the grant, Mrs Christie said that there had been very little feedback; one parish

council chairman had accepted the reality of the situation and enquired about alternative funding streams.

The Cabinet noted that there were two small amendments to the recommendations in section 3 of the agenda report. In the final line of para 3.1 (c) the words '(Prescribed Class D)' should be added after '...major repair'. In the final line of para 3.4 (v) '5.4' and '5.5' should replace '6.4' and '6.5' respectively.

Decision

At the conclusion of the debate the Cabinet voted on a show of hands by six votes to none against and with two abstentions (Mr Dignum and Mrs Purnell) in favour of the recommendation (as amended).

RESOLVED

- (1) That the council tax discounts to apply for the 2017-2018 financial year are:
 - i. Nil discount for second homes (to include those with planning restrictions – (Prescribed Classes A and B))
 - ii. Nil discount for vacant, unoccupied and substantially unfurnished properties to include those properties which would previously have qualified for Class C exemption (Prescribed Class C)
 - iii. Nil discount for unoccupied properties which would previously have qualified for Class A exemption (properties in need of or undergoing major repair) (Prescribed Class D)
- (2) That an Empty Home Premium of 50% be charged for the 2017-2018 financial year.
- (3) That no additional locally defined classes of discount should be determined for the 2017-2018 financial year
- (4) That in order to comply with section 35 of the *Local Government Finance Act 1992*, that the following resolutions are made:
 - o No item of expenditure shall be treated as 'special expenses' for the purposes of section 35 of the *Local Government Finance Act 1992*;
 - o This resolution shall remain in force for the 2017-2018 financial year;
 - o The calculation of the Council's taxbase for the year 2017-2018 is approved (appendices 1 and 2);
 - o The amounts calculated by the Council as its council taxbase for the year 2017-2018 for its area and each part of its area shall be those set out in appendices 1 and 2 to the agenda report;

- In order to offset some or all of the costs of council tax reduction to local precepting authorities (parish councils), a grant is distributed as outlined in appendix 3 and described in paras 5.4 to 5.5 to the agenda report.

295 **Introduction of Section 106 Monitoring Fee**

The Cabinet considered the agenda report and its appendix in the agenda supplement appendix pack (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Taylor.

Mrs Dower and Mr Allgrove were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Taylor summarised sections 3 (background), 4 (outcomes) and 5 (proposal) of the agenda report with reference to the funding of CDC's Planning Obligations Monitoring and Implementation Officer.

Mrs Dower and Mr Allgrove did not wish to add to Mrs Taylor's presentation.

Mrs Lintill queried whether the mention of the Head of Planning Services in the recommendation in para 2.1 of the agenda report should include a reference to his acting following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services. Mr Carvell and Mrs Taylor advised that since the setting of these fees would be a straightforward matter such consultation would not be necessary in this particular case. Mrs Purnell felt that nonetheless the Cabinet Member should be made aware by the Head of Planning Services of the fee-setting process and outcome.

Mrs Dower and Mr Allgrove answered members' questions and comments on points of detail with respect to the likelihood of local authorities gradually introducing such a fee given (as stated by Mrs Purnell) the critical importance of the s 106 monitoring role and the need to recover the costs thereof given that this work did not generate an income stream. Although some s 106 fees were currently covered by CDC's budget and/or would be met by some s 106 agreements (the recovery of which had been the subject of legal advice by CDC's Principal Solicitor), in the longer term there was a clear need to charge for this fee. The costs of recovering s 106 monitoring fees could be included in the annual Authority's Monitoring Report. There would be a direct relationship between the fees to be charged and the cost of the officer post.

Decision

At the conclusion of the debate the Cabinet voted on a show of hands unanimously in favour of the recommendation.

RESOLVED

That a section 106 monitoring fee as set out in the schedule in the appendix to the agenda report be introduced and the future annual review of those fees be delegated to the Head of Planning Services.

296 **Off-Street Parking Charges**

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

The report was introduced by Mrs Keegan.

Mrs Murphy was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Keegan summarised sections 3 (background) and 5 (proposal) of the agenda report.

Mrs Murphy did not wish to add to Mrs Keegan's presentation.

There was no discussion of this item.

Decision

The Cabinet voted on a show of hands unanimously in favour of the recommendation.

RESOLVED

That the consultation responses to the charges, which were approved at the Cabinet's meeting on 1 November 2016, be brought back for consideration at the Cabinet's meeting on 10 January 2017.

297 **Authority's Monitoring Report 2015-2016**

The Cabinet considered the agenda report and its appendix in the agenda supplement appendix pack (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Taylor.

Mr Davidson and Mr Allgrove were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Taylor summarised sections 3 (background), 4 (outcomes) and 5 (proposal) of the report. With reference to section 5 and also the Annual Monitoring Report 2015-2016 (AMR) itself in the appendix pack (pages 19 to 114) she highlighted the headline facts and figures for: completed dwellings (including affordable housing); neighbourhood development plans progress; community infrastructure levy contributions; the economy; and infrastructure planning.

Mr Davidson and Mr Allgrove did not wish to add to Mrs Taylor's presentation.

Mr Dignum remarked that Mrs Taylor had outlined very satisfactory, encouraging progress and he referred to the detailed suite of policies in the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029* (CLP) and the importance of CDC currently having a five-year housing land supply. Mrs Keegan and Mrs Plant commended the AMR including the fact that CDC had exceeded the affordable housing target.

In reply to a question by Mrs Plant regarding the graph on page 65 of the appendix pack of the actual/projected housing completions against the CLP housing target 2012-2029, Mr Davidson said that there was inevitably an element of conjecture for much would depend on the state of the economy and the construction industry, yet the trend was moving in the right direction.

Decision

At the conclusion of the debate the Cabinet voted on a show of hands unanimously in favour of the recommendation.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Authority's Monitoring report 2015-2016 be published on Chichester District Council's website.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Services following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services to enable minor amendments to be made to the document prior to and following publication.

298 Report of the Planning Task and Finish Group

The Cabinet considered the agenda report, its four appendices in the agenda supplement appendix pack and the update sheet in a further agenda supplement which had been published the preceding afternoon and circulated in hard copy at the start of this meeting (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Taylor.

Mr Whitty and Mr Frost were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Taylor summarised sections 4 (background), 5 (outcomes) and 6 (proposals) of the agenda report. She drew attention in the agenda report to paras 6.3 (inclusion within the pre-application advice charging scheme CDC's Conservation and Design officers); 6.12 (publication of pre-application advice and associated documentation after the resultant formal planning application had been submitted); 6.14 to 6.23 (use and discharge of planning conditions including the reporting of conditions in Planning Committee agenda papers). She also referred to the summary of consultation responses received which was set out in the update sheet.

Mr Whitty and Mr Frost did not add to Mrs Taylor's presentation but answered members' questions on points of detail with regard to the capacity of Development Management to handle more pre-application application enquiries; the provision of a broader range of services better tailored to meet users' needs including a greater variety of pre-application advice sessions; the decision of the Planning Task and Finish Group (PTFG) in favour of agenda papers having the full text of conditions (officers had considered that to be unnecessary).

With regard to Planning Committee reports containing full details of the recommended conditions, Mrs Taylor mentioned a 12-month trial period to assess its effectiveness. Mr Frost supported having a trial. Mrs Lintill pointed that the report

did not refer to there being a trial period. Mrs Hardwick wondered if a six-month trial period would be more appropriate. Mr Carvell felt that to be meaningful the trial should last for 12 months.

Mr Dignum proposed that the recommendation in para 3.2 a) of the agenda report should be amended to insert after '1 January 2017' the words 'with a review within 12 months'. There was no dissent to this amendment.

During the debate the work and outcomes of the PTFG were commended by members.

Decision

At the conclusion of the debate the Cabinet voted on a show of hands unanimously in favour of the recommendation (as amended).

RESOLVED

- (1) That the adoption of the revised Pre-Application Advice Charging Scheme with effect from 1 February 2017 be agreed.
- (2) That the recommendations of the Planning Task and Finish Group on the use and enforcement of planning conditions be adopted including:
 - a) The full wording of conditions on Planning committee agendas from 1 January 2017 with a review within 12 months; and
 - b) All decisions on planning applications issued from 1 February 2017 adopt the revised format recommended by the Planning Task and Finish Group.

299 Treasury Management 2016-2017 Mid-Year Progress Report

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

The report was introduced by Mrs Hardwick.

Mr Jackson was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Hardwick drew attention to the following matters. The report presented a summary of CDC's treasury management performance for the first half of 2016-2017. The sums invested by CDC had continued to increase during the first half of 2016, mainly as a result of continued receipts of New Homes Bonus monies and the timing of expenditure on CDC's capital programme. The balances held at 30 September 2016 (exhibit 1 in para 5.2 of the agenda report) were near the maximum expected during 2016-2017 and the funds available to invest would fall during the remainder of the year due to the timing of council tax and business rates receipts and expected capital expenditure on the redevelopment of 12 Terminus Road. Para 5.3 of the report highlighted the main investment developments over the first half of 2016-2017, showing that CDC's further investment in the Local Authority Property

Fund during September 2016 had brought the total investment up to the maximum in CDC's guidelines of £10m.

CDC had continued to use Money Market deposits for short-term liquidity and reduced the level of lending to other local authorities due to the poor returns thereby generated. For the first time monies had been invested in Corporate Bonds; such investments were made within the credit rating and terms set out in CDC's treasury management strategy, most being restricted to £1m for a maximum of six months. Section 8 contained three tables which set out CDC's performance against benchmarking produced by Arlingclose for security, liquidity and return. Overall there were no exceptions to report and the only red rating related to the initial cost of CDC's further purchase of shares in the Local Authority Property Fund. As it was not expected to sell those shares that loss was not expected to be a cost to CDC's general fund.

The report addressed the need to redefine the definition of 'principal' following investment in Corporate Bonds (para 5.18). A banking error had led to CDC being briefly overdrawn but the bank had refunded all of the costs in respect thereof. CDC was considering using its considerable cash resources to make a further investment of up to £7.5m in diversified asset funds and this was expected to be included within CDC's 2017-2018 Treasury Management Strategy and Policy which the Council would be asked to approve in March 2017. Treasury management strategy training had been arranged for members of the Cabinet and the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee on 13 January 2017. She emphasised the relevance and importance of attending such training in view of CDC's increasingly sophisticated treasury portfolio and the ongoing economic uncertainty it faced.

Mr Dignum endorsed Mrs Hardwick's exhortation to attend the forthcoming training.

Mr Jackson provided an overview of CDC's investment programme in bonds.

There was a consensus among members that the strategy was commendable.

Mr Jackson, Mr Ward and Mrs Hardwick answered members' questions with regard to the rationale for the short duration (six months) of and the cautious approach to investment in view of economic and political uncertainty.

Decision

At the conclusion of the debate the Cabinet voted on a show of hands unanimously in favour of the recommendation.

RESOLVED

That Chichester District Council's Treasury Management 2016-2017 Mid-Year Progress for the six months to 30 September 2016 be noted.

300 **Appointments to Panels and Forums**

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

This item was introduced briefly by Mr Dignum with reference to section 3 of the report.

This item was not discussed.

Decision

On a vote by a show of hands the recommendation in para 2.1 of the report was unanimously approved.

RESOLVED

That Mrs J E Duncton be appointed to serve on the Chichester District Parking Forum in the place of Mrs E P Lintill as Chichester District Council's representative from Petworth.

[**Note** After the making of the aforementioned resolution and before the consideration of agenda item 14 (Late Items) there was a short adjournment between 11:01 and 11:08]

301 Late Items

As stated by Mr Dignum in his announcements at the start of this meeting, there were no late items for urgent consideration by the Cabinet.

302 Exclusion of the Press and Public

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands to exclude the public and press from the meeting in order to consider agenda item 16 as a Part II matter.

RESOLVED

That the public and press be excluded from the consideration of the agenda report and its appendices for agenda item 16 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* 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 that information.

303 Cultural Grants Review

The Cabinet considered the confidential report and its four appendices circulated with the agenda to CDC members and relevant officers only.

The report was introduced by Mrs Lintill.

Mr Hansford and Mr Hyland were in attendance.

Mrs Lintill, Mr Hansford, Mr Hyland and Mr Over responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail.

Mr Dignum allowed Mrs C M M Apel, the chairman of CDC's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC), to address the meeting briefly; the OSC had considered a report on this matter at its recent meeting on 15 November 2016 and supported the recommendations in the report.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the following recommendations.

RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

That the Council:

- (1) Approves a grant as stated in para 6.1 (a) of the agenda report be offered to the Chichester Festival Theatre for four years commencing April 2018, subject to a funding agreement and confirmation of continued Arts Council England funding over that period.
- (2) Approves a grant as stated in para 6.1 (b) of the agenda report be offered to the Pallant House Gallery for four years commencing April 2018, subject to a funding agreement and confirmation of continued Arts Council England funding over that period.
- (3) Approves the Head of Community Services, following consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Community Services, being given delegated authority to agree the terms of the funding agreements including relevant break clauses.
- (4) Notes that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee continues to monitor performance of these two organisations.

[Note The meeting ended at 11:44]

CHAIRMAN

DATE