



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in the Committee Rooms at East Pallant House Chichester on Tuesday 7 March 2017 at 09:30

<b>Members Present</b>	Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mrs P Hardwick, Mrs G Keegan, Mrs P Plant, Mrs C Purnell and Mrs S Taylor
<b>Members Absent</b>	Mr R Barrow
<b>Officers Present</b>	Mr M Allgrove (Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager), Mrs H Belenger (Accountancy Services Manager), Mr A Buckley (Corporate Improvement Officer), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr T Day (Environmental Coordinator), Mrs K Dower (Principal Planning Officer (Infrastructure Planning)), Mrs T Flitcroft (Principal Planning Officer (Local Planning)), Mr A Frost (Head of Planning Services), Mrs L Grange (Housing Delivery Manager), Mr S Hansford (Head of Community Services), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mr T Radcliffe (Human Resources Manager), Mr M Regan (Senior Estates Surveyor (Development Support)), Mr B Riley (Contracts Manager), Mrs L Rudziak (Head of Housing and Environment Services), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer) and Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services)

### 337 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mr Dignum welcomed the members of the public, the press representative and Chichester District Council (CDC) members and officers who were present for this meeting.

There were no late items for consideration under agenda item 15 a) or b).

Apologies for absence had been received from Mr Barrow.

All other members of the Cabinet were present; Mrs Keegan arrived shortly after the start of the meeting.

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

### 338 **Approval of Minutes**

The Cabinet received the minutes of its meeting on Tuesday 7 February 2017, which had been circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

There were no proposed changes to the minutes.

#### *Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands to approve the minutes without making any amendments.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Cabinet's meeting on Tuesday 7 February 2017 be approved without amendment.

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

### 339 **Declarations of Interests**

The following declaration of interest was made in respect of agenda item 11 (Grant Application – St Wilfrid's Hospice (South Coast) "Dreambuilding"):

- Mrs P C Plant declared a personal interest as she lived in close proximity to the site on which the new hospice would be constructed.

### 340 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted for this meeting.

[**Note** Minute paras 341 to 353 below summarise the consideration of and conclusion to agenda items 5 to 17 inclusive but for full details (excluding exempt agenda item 17) please refer to the audio recording facility via this link:

<http://chichester.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=754&Ver=4> ]

### 341 **Chichester Site Allocation Development Plan Document - Proposed Submission Update Report**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its four appendices (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Taylor.

Mrs Flitcroft, Mr Allgrove, and Mr Frost were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Taylor (a) summarised the consultation and examination process (section 4 and paras 6.16 and 6.17 of the report), (b) referred to appendices 1 (consultation responses proposing major modifications) and 4 (soundness tests) and (c) reviewed the situation as to the flood zone modelling work which the Environment Agency (EA) had not yet undertaken on the site to the rear of Sturt Avenue Lynchmere/Camelsdale pursuant to the resolution made by the Council meeting on 22 November 2016. The EA's comments on fluvial flood risk were set out in appendix 2 and summarised in para 6.6 of the report. She also reviewed the issues of groundwater flooding with the views of West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (paras 6.8 to 6.10), highway safety (para 6.11) and site access (para 6.12) in the report. She explained the officers' reasons for concluding that the site should not be removed from the Chichester Site Allocation Development Plan Document: Proposed Submission (SA DPD) (paras 6.7, 6.10 and 6.13 to 6.15).

Mrs Flitcroft, Mr Allgrove, and Mr Frost did not wish to add to Mrs Taylor's introduction.

Mrs Hardwick argued for removing the site from the SA DPD. She was supported in this by Mrs N D Graves, her co-ward member for Fernhurst, whom Mr Dignum allowed to address the Cabinet. Officers responded to the points made by Mrs Hardwick and Mrs Graves.

Mrs Hardwick's submission included the following points:

- The EA had not undertaken the flood zone modelling work which the Cabinet on 1 November 2016 (recommendation (4) in minute 277) and then the Council on 22 November 2016 had sought with a view to being satisfied that the EA did not object to the inclusion of the site for reason of flood risk. The EA had stated (page 38) that the remodelling work to be undertaken might result in changes to the Flood Map for the area. There was a demonstrable lack of evidence as to how the site would be categorised between the three flood zones. It was, therefore, premature to include this site within the SA DPD.
- She quoted remarks made by Mr Dignum at that time that there was a need for a 'robust confirmation' by the EA of the absence of a flood risk and that this needed to be crystal clear and not ambiguous. The fourth recommendation made by the Cabinet to the Council seeking such a confirmation was a key requirement.
- The need for robust evidence as to flood risk must be treated as a prospective requirement and not a retrospective one.
- The entire site was at risk of groundwater flooding and the information regarding it, which the local parish council had been instrumental in making available, had only been submitted late to the LLFA and it had been unable to carry out a site-specific assessment and no site visit had taken place. A report commissioned by the developers which stated that there were no

groundwater flooding issues was incorrect in the light of the response by the LLFA.

- The fluvial flood risk information was out of date and incorrect; there could be no certainty at all as to the nature and extent of the flood risk.
- The inclusion of the site within the SA DPD would be tantamount to a grant of planning permission in principle. It would be, therefore, a serious step to take and required clear supporting evidence. It should be noted that statutory regulations to the effect that a site allocation constituted permission in principle were expected to come into force in due course and underlined this point (even if they would not have retrospective effect).
- The consultation response by Thames Water expressing concerns about site access was subject to compliance with certain conditions and so was tentative.
- The assessment of the competing merits could not be carried out currently because it was not possible to weigh up, for example, the sustainability of the site and the flood risk where the evidence in respect of the latter was currently lacking.

Mrs Graves said that she concurred completely with Mrs Hardwick. She believed that it was premature to include the site. She commented on points of detail with regard to the site access: she and others had considerable concerns about what was being proposed in terms of its design features and that it was likely to have a detrimental urbanising impact in a rural area. A final response from Thames Water was awaited. The site was not, moreover, an example of sustainable development.

Mr Allgrove replied to the points made by Mrs Hardwick and Mrs Graves as follows:

- There was sufficient evidence to justify the inclusion of this site within the SA DPD. Despite the absence of the EA's flood zone modelling work, the site promoters had provided detailed information about flood risk. The site could accommodate ten dwellings. The LLFA had responded to the consultation and the further clarification which had been subsequently obtained satisfied officers that the development of the site would be safe and would not increase flooding elsewhere.
- The detail of the regulations as to how site allocations were to be treated in relation to a 'permission in principle' was unknown and it would be surprising if they had retrospective effect. It was correct that the inclusion of a site within a SA DPD was in effect an acceptance of development in principle but the detailed planning application (which had not yet been submitted) would still have to comply *inter alia* with the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029* (CLP).
- It was premature to consider now points of detail such as site access, in respect of which in any event Thames Water had indicated what it would require to make the SA DPD sound with regard to this site.

- The site was sustainable in terms of its accessibility to local facilities and also the town of Haslemere and its railway station.
- The view of officers was that there was far more evidence in support of the inclusion of this site than was often the case.

Mrs Taylor remarked that as with almost any site there were issues to address. Although it was in an area prone to flood risk the CLP had policies to apply in such cases eg Policy 42 (Flood Risk and Water Management). It should be remembered that a site allocation was not a grant of planning permission and any such proposal would have to be considered in the normal way against relevant national and local planning policies and all other material planning considerations. In her judgment there was no justification for removing the site from the SA DPD. Issues as to soundness would be considered by the planning inspector at the examination.

Mr Dignum invited comments from other members of the Cabinet on what he termed was in effect a judgment call on whether this site should be included in the SA DPD.

The consensus of opinion by those members, having regard to the available evidence and the advice of officers, was that on balance the site should be included in the SA DPD.

Mr Frost said that notwithstanding the allocation of this site by the DPD was tantamount to 'permission in principle', this would not obviate the normal development management process for determining outline and reserved matters applications. The detail of the proposed regulations relating to 'permission in principle', including transitional arrangements, was unknown. The applicant would have to comply with the exacting requirements of a technical details consent.

Mr Allgrove said that it was not known when the EA's modelling report would be available. It was probably not going to be published before the examination into the SA DPD, which was scheduled for July 2017.

### *Decision*

At the end of the discussion the Cabinet voted on a show of hands by six votes in favour of making the recommendations set out below and one against (Mrs Hardwick).

### **RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL**

- (1) That the Site Allocation Development Plan Document: Proposed Submission, including the retention of the allocation to the rear of Sturt Avenue Lynchmere, and associated documents be approved for submission to the Secretary of State for examination.
- (2) That the Proposed Modifications to the Site Allocation Development Plan Document: Proposed Submission as set out in the schedule in appendix 1 be approved for submission to the Secretary of State.

- (3) That during the examination into the Site Allocation Development Plan Document: Proposed Submission the Head of Planning Services, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services, be given delegated authority to agree minor amendments to the Site Allocation Development Plan Document.

342 **Consideration of Consultation Responses and Modifications to Chichester District Council's Infrastructure Business Plan 2017-2022**

The Cabinet received and considered (a) the agenda report, (b) its first appendix and (c) the cash flow and spending plan table (para 1.18) from appendix 2 which was circulated initially as the third agenda supplement and then in a corrected version in the amended third agenda supplement (copies attached to the official minutes).

The second appendix had not been included within the agenda papers due to its size and had been published online instead and a hard copy deposited in the Members Room at East Pallant House (copy attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Taylor.

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

Mrs Taylor explained the nature and purpose of the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) and referred to (a) the consultation responses received as set out in section 3 of the report and appendix 1 to the report and (b) the outcome of the meeting of the CDC/West Sussex County Council (WSSC) Infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group (IJMLG) on 8 December 2016 with respect in particular to WSSC's Bike It project (paras 3.8 to 3.10 of the report) and the West Sussex Coastal Commissioning Group's request for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding (para 3.11). Para 3.4 set out the amount of CIL collected to date.

The aforementioned officers did not wish to add to Mrs Taylor's introduction.

Mr Dignum remarked that CDC members of the IJMLG, particularly Mr S J Oakley (the CDC ward member for Tangmere), had taken a robust approach to ensure that CIL monies would, if awarded, be properly spent on education. He pointed out that WSSC Legal Services had agreed with the advice of CDC Legal Services that WSSC's Smarter Choices Bike It project should be deleted from the CIL spending because among other reasons it was a revenue and not a capital project (para 3.10). CDC members of the IJMLG had emphasised that real (hard) infrastructure provision was essential to promote safer cycling in the city rather than so-called soft infrastructure measures such as publicity.

Mrs Hardwick commended the excellent work done by officers in preparing and updating the IBP on an ongoing basis.

Mr Dignum singled out in particular Mrs Dower for her sterling work with the IBP.

## *Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of the recommendations set out below.

### **RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL**

- (1) That the proposed responses to the representations received and subsequent modifications to the Infrastructure Business Plan as set out in appendix 1 to this report be approved.
- (2) That the amended Infrastructure Business Plan including the Community Infrastructure Levy Spending Plan in appendix 2 be approved.

### **343 Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services Project**

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

The report was introduced by Mrs Plant.

Mr Buckley was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Plant outlined how the Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services Project (RBCSP) was one of what would be several in-house CDC projects to be undertaken following the decision by the Cabinet on 10 January 2017 not to pursue the shared services proposal with two other local authorities. The details of the RBCSP were set out in full in the project initiation document (PID) appended to the report and the three key work-streams were summarised in section 5 of the report, a particular feature of which would be the deployment of new software to enable a significant increase in customer self-service functionality. The estimated annual revenue savings to be generated by the RBCSP were set out in para 7.3 of the report and section 7 of the appended PID. The project plan timetable was detailed in section 11 of the PID.

Mr Buckley did not seek to add to Mrs Plant's presentation.

Members spoke in support of the RBCSP.

Mr Buckley, Mr Ward and Mrs Shepherd responded to members' questions with regard to (a) the continued availability of Customer Services to assist individuals with the use of the software (para 9.1 of the report); (b) the Channel Shift Targets table in Appendix A to the PID (page 83); (c) the transfer of investigation of revenue benefit fraud from local authorities to the Department for Work and Pensions and the verification procedure for information provided by customers (CDC's corporate fraud remit was now subsumed within its Internal Audit section); (d) the objective of achieving an overall reduction in staffing levels across both services would involve full consultation and engagement with staff as outlined in section 8 of the report (which included CDC's employment stability policy) with a view to mitigating RBCSP's impact on staff and the risk of staff leaving the organisation ahead of

possible redundancies as well as supporting staff and affording an opportunity to learn new skills and seek promotion opportunities.

Mrs Keegan emphasised the importance of broadband roll-out across Chichester District if customers were to be expected to use the new software system. She also asked for details of the current staff turnover rate and the average length of service for staff within both services.

Mr Buckley undertook to provide after this meeting a written answer to Mrs Keegan's question about staff turnover and length of service.\*

### *Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of the resolutions and also the recommendation to the Council set out below.

### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services Project Initiation Document in the appendix to the report be approved.
- (2) That it be noted that from 2018-2019 the annual revenue budget will include savings estimated at £177,000 as a result of this project, rising to an estimated £224,000 by the 2020-2021 budget.

### **RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL**

That a total budget of £327,000 to be allocated from reserves to fund the one-off delivery costs be approved.

\*[**Note** A written answer by Mr Buckley to Mrs Keegan's question was circulated by Member Services to all CDC members the day after this meeting and a copy is attached to the official minutes for information]

## **344 Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix, which itself had nine appendices (some of which were available to read only as online versions because they were unchanged from the equivalent annual report approved in 2016) (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Plant.

Mr Radcliffe was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Plant explained that CDC had a statutory duty to publish an annual pay policy statement for its statutory and non-statutory chief officers and the senior staff immediately reporting to them. She drew attention to the draft Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement which was appended to the report and highlighted the main salary figures in para 6 thereof.



Mr Radcliffe did not wish to add to Mrs Plant's introduction.

There was no discussion of the item.

*Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously in favour of the recommendation set out below.

**RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL**

That the Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement be published.

**345 Chichester Contract Services - Review of Staff Grading Structure**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its two appendices (copy attached to the official minutes).

In the absence of Mr Barrow the report was introduced by Mrs Plant.

Mr Riley was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Plant summarised section 3 of the report, drawing attention in para 3.5 to the mutual concern expressed about the lack of career progression opportunities for Chichester Contract Services (CCS) staff. She referred to the current and proposed grades and salaries tables in Appendix 1 and the national salary table with local Hay grades and points in Appendix 2. Section 7 of the report set out the cost of the new grading structure and how it would be funded. She paid tribute to the hard work by CCS staff.

Mr Riley did not wish to add to Mrs Plant's introduction but in reply to a question by Mrs Taylor he said that individual assessment and not key performance indicators would be used to determine the staff salaries.

Mr Dignum said that he fully endorsed Mrs Plant's commendation of the CCS staff, a fact that had been recognised by the recent external consultancy report produced by WYG UK and considered with approval by the Cabinet at its previous meeting on 7 February 2017 (minute 332 refers).

*Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands to make the resolution set out below.

**RESOLVED**

That the introduction of the new grading structure for CCS grounds, streets and waste staff be approved at a total cost of £90,000 pa to be funded from efficiency savings.

## 346 Allocation of Commuted Sum to Fund Affordable Housing

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

The report was presented by Mrs Purnell.

Mrs Grange and Mrs Rudziak were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Purnell explained the background and the proposal with reference to paras 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1 and 7.1 of the report. She pointed out that most of the housing registered providers had advised CDC that they were no longer interested in delivering small sites as those were relatively expensive to deliver. In many cases their objective was now to maximise economies of scale as a result of reduced funding and government cuts. The average commuted sum received by CDC from developers in lieu of an affordable house on site was £75,000; the grant per unit in this case was £64,000. This Hyde scheme would make a good use of the commuted sums funds, meeting two of the four objectives set out in the recently approved Housing Strategy Review namely (a) to attract investment to meet specific local needs eg bungalows, disabled units, redevelopment of outdated or difficult to let housing and (b) to make small schemes viable eg rural schemes, those with high design costs or with additional amenity requirements (para 3.2).

Mrs Grange and Mrs Rudziak did not add to Mrs Purnell's introduction.

Mrs Keegan, who was the ward member for Rogate where the site was located, spoke first and contributed further during the debate. She spoke against the scheme and made the following points:

- Small sites such as this one were normally expensive to deliver and tended to be chosen to meet a local demand. Here, however, there was a strong objection by residents in Rogate to this development. She had undertaken a survey in the parish, which revealed that people were in favour of affordable housing but not on that site. Local people felt that their opinion was not being heard.
- The proposed site had well-known and ongoing problems with foul drainage. The problems endured by residents were worse than disgusting. Given the sewage issue it was very difficult to see how the site would be bought privately.
- There were car parking issues by virtue of the estate roads being used by drivers at the start and end of the school day to deliver children to and collect them from the adjacent primary school (which wished to expand and would thereby exacerbate the problem). Local residents had hoped that this site could be used for car parking, thereby alleviating the congestion during each end of the school day. It was very important in principle and in view of the concept of community land trusts to have due and serious regard to the wishes of local people as to how this site ought to be used in the best possible way.

- It was possible to find a much better site within the parish for affordable homes.
- There was a concern locally about the proposed units being either unoccupied or used by people from outside Chichester District. She personally doubted that these three homes would be made available only to Rogate residents.
- Although the parish council had originally supported the proposed use for this site that had been a mistake, hence the change of mind, which was unrelated to a change in the parish council's membership.
- In short there would be a lot of pain for a tiny gain (three properties), losing the opportunity to make a better use of the site that insofar as this scheme was concerned would be subsidised by CDC for the totally wrong purpose.

Mrs Grange responded to members' questions on the following points of detail:

- There were 191 households on the housing register within the South Downs National Park (SDNP) area of Chichester District and currently there were only three prospective new affordable rented homes in the whole of the SDNP area (all in Midhurst) and there were no more due to be built in the foreseeable future. CDC was working hard with housing associations and community land trusts to identify other sites.
- A neighbourhood development plan (NDP) door-to-door survey in September 2015 showed that 44 respondents were in favour of more affordable housing for local families within the parish. The draft NDP had yet to identify any suitable affordable housing sites in the parish.
- Hyde was well aware of the foul drainage issues and was seeking funds in part to address those problems. Southern Water had recently carried out works to improve the existing drainage and it appeared that there had been no recent problems.
- The scheme would provide 13 (instead of the usual five) additional car parking spaces on this site with a vehicle turning space, all of which would have to be provided prior to occupancy commencing.
- In 2016 there had been a slow turnover of vacancies in Rogate, largely associated with changes in Hyde's allocations team being moved from Chichester to London and a number of properties were wrongly advertised which had caused a delay.
- This was a brownfield site in a settlement policy area. If Hyde did not develop the site for affordable housing it was likely that it would sell the site on the open market for market homes to be built, an outcome not desired by the parish council.

- There would be nomination rights to ensure that occupants were local people rather than coming from, say, London. CDC had a local connection requirement in its general allocation policy.

Mrs Purnell emphasised the need for affordable housing in the parish (and beyond) and this site had the requisite planning permission for three houses. The drainage and parking issues were not, therefore, relevant. Originally the parish council had supported this use of the site and the proposal had been taken forward accordingly but since then the parish council had changed in its composition. CDC no longer operated an open housing register. The use of the site for parking should have been raised and considered much longer ago.

Mrs Plant, Mrs Lintill and Mr Dignum spoke in favour of the scheme in view of the need for affordable housing, the local connection requirement, the risk that the site would otherwise be lost to market housing and that the drainage and car parking issues were not relevant in the light of grant of planning permission.

#### *Decision*

The Cabinet voted by a show of hands on the resolution below. There were six votes in favour of the recommendation in para 2.1 of the report and Mrs Keegan voted against it.

#### **RESOLVED**

That an additional £51,000 commuted sum monies be allocated to The Hyde Group to fund in part three affordable rented housing units at Parsonage Estate Rogate.

### 347 **Grant Application - St Wilfrid's Hospice (South Coast) "Dreambuilding"**

**[Note** As recorded in minute para 339 above Mrs Plant declared a personal interest in respect of this item]

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report (copy attached to the official minutes) and its confidential Part II appendix which was circulated to CDC officers and relevant officers only.

The report was introduced by Mrs Lintill.

Mr Hansford was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Lintill explained how the Grants and Concessions Panel (GCP), of which she was the chairman, had considered at its meeting on 19 January 2017 an application by St Wilfrid's Hospice (SWH) for a grant of £50,000 towards the cost of building a new hospice at Bosham. The GCP agreed an award of £25,000, the maximum sum allowed under Mrs Lintill's delegation. The GCP had referred to the Cabinet consideration of the merits of awarding all or any part of the additional £25,000 in the light of the matters set out in the report and the Part II appendix.

Mr Hansford did not wish to add to Mrs Lintill's comments.

During the discussion Mrs Plant said whilst that she was very supportive of SWH and the excellent work undertaken by its staff, she was mindful of the many other demands and needs in Chichester District which were also worthy candidates for an award under CDC's grants and concessions scheme.

Referring to the important service provided by SWH, Mrs Keegan, Mrs Taylor and Mrs Hardwick spoke with wholehearted support for acceding to an award of an extra £25,000.

In the light of the apparent approval by several members for awarding an additional £25,000, Mr Dignum read out a proposed resolution the text of which appears below.

#### *Decision*

The Cabinet was on a show of hands in favour of the resolution below, with six members being in support and one abstention by Mrs Plant.

#### **RESOLVED**

In the light of the decision of the Grants and Concession Panel to offer a grant of £25,000, that a further sum of £25,000 be added from the New Homes Bonus reserve in order to offer a total grant of £50,000 to the St Wilfrid's Hospice (Southcoast) "Dreambuilding" project towards the cost of a new hospice.

[**Note** At the end of this item there was short adjournment between 11:20 and 11:24]

#### 348 **Post Project Evaluation of the Financial Management System Project**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its two appendices (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Hardwick.

Mrs Belenger was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Hardwick commented that the report described the success of this major project which had been delivered on time, was under budget by some £52,500 and had resulted in significant ongoing direct revenue savings of over £150,000 pa in total. Those savings derived from (a) £55,000 per year cost savings for the system (para 5.4); (b) a further £75,000 of savings as a result of consequential staff cost reductions in the accountancy service (para 5.5); and (c) another £25,000 per annum from the discontinuation of the business objects reporting tool (para 5.5). This new financial system was not just a system upgrade but was in fact a catalyst for a major service review of accountancy and budget systems across CDC. Budget managers were now in control of and accountable for their own financial data. Wherever they were working, all staff could access real-time up-to-date financial data in relation to their service area, thereby raising efficiency and improving (i) transparency and accountability and (ii) workflow and business processes. If those less tangible benefits sharpened the focus of all management on the financial

implications of actions and events in their areas, they would be no less valuable than the financial savings.

As to the commendation in para 7.1 of the enormous commitment made by staff into this project, Mrs Hardwick expressed her gratitude not only to Mrs Belenger and team for this excellent report but also to the wider implementation team (over the life of the project) who had put in so much extra time and effort and without whose dedication this multi-faceted project would not have been achievable, namely:

- Mark Dolan (formerly Systems Accountant but now in ICT Support Analyst),
- Carol Anderson-Towner (Exchequer Manager),
- Katie Tucker (Technical and Systems Accountant),
- David Cooper (Group Accountant),
- Karen James (ICT Database Administrator),
- Michelle Beach (Revenue Accountant),
- Alan Storie (Capital Accountant),
- Peter Sargent (Accountant - Asset Register Capital Project),
- Phil Pickard (Procurement Officer)
- Rod Walters (Assistant Procurement Officer)

Mrs Keegan referred to her extensive experience of such IT projects and remarked that this particular project was almost unique in being a fabulous achievement.

Mr Dignum likewise commended not only the project but particularly the people who had so successfully secured its delivery.

The Cabinet had no comments or recommendations which it wished to make.

#### *Decision*

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

#### **RESOLVED**

That the findings of the Post Project Evaluation be noted.

### **349 West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan: Proposed Submission - Consultation Response**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and the appended map (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Taylor.

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

Mrs Taylor summarised section 3 of the report. With reference to the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (JMLP) she drew particular attention to its four key

components (para 3.4); Policy M10, which dealt with safeguarding of minerals supply infrastructure and would ensure the retention of Chichester railway sidings (para 3.7); the importance of minerals safeguarding (paras 3.8 to 3.11); and CDC's proposed response to the JMLP consultation (paras 3.13, 4.1 and 5.2 to 5.4).

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

In reply to a question by Mrs Keegan about JMLP policies on fracking, Mrs Taylor and Ms Flitcroft said that the JMLP had such policies but there were no potential fracking sites in the Chichester Local Plan area.

### *Decision*

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

### **RESOLVED**

That the comments set out in paras 5.2 to 5.4 of the report to the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan: Proposed Submission Draft (Joint Minerals Local Plan) be endorsed.

## **350 Sussex Energy Tariff**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report with its appendix (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Purnell.

Mr Day was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Purnell summarised sections 3, 4 and 5 of the report and referred to the appended draft letter of commitment.

Mr Day commented that CDC wished to lend its support to this partnership project with a view to trying to encourage householders to switch energy suppliers (many of whom would probably not otherwise contemplate doing so) and thereby benefit from lower energy costs with attendant benefits.

In reply to a question by Mrs Hardwick as to whether CDC would be selling electricity, Mr Day said that there was no current intention to do so, not least because CDC did not currently generate surplus electricity. If this were to happen in the future officers would look to see if it could be included in the tariff.

The Cabinet agreed with the suggestion that (a) the word 'the' should be substituted for 'a' in the third line of the recommendation in para 2.1 of the report and (b) the words 'attached to the report' should be inserted between 'Council' and 'regarding' in the fourth line.

*Decision*

The Cabinet voted on a show of hands unanimously in favour of the recommendation below (with the aforementioned amendment).

**RESOLVED**

That the Head of Housing and Environment Services, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Environment Services, be authorised to sign the letter of commitment for West Sussex County Council attached to the report regarding Chichester District Council's participation in the Sussex Energy Tariff.

**351 Late Items**

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

**352 Exclusion of the Press and Public**

*Decision*

It was proposed, seconded and unanimously supported that the following resolution should be passed to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during the consideration of agenda item 17 (Acquisition of Additional Temporary Housing Accommodation).

**RESOLVED**

That the public and press be excluded from the consideration of the report and its appendix for agenda item 17 (Acquisition of Additional Temporary Accommodation) on the grounds that it is likely that there would be in respect of that item 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.

**353 Acquisition of Additional Temporary Accommodation**

The Cabinet received and considered the confidential Part II report with its two appendices which were circulated to CDC members and relevant officers only.

Mrs Purnell presented the report.

Mr Regan and Mrs Grange were in attendance for this item.

The aforementioned officers did not wish to add to Mrs Purnell's introduction.

During the discussion Mr Regan and Mr Ward responded to members' questions on points of detail.



The Cabinet accepted officers' advice that the word 'freehold' should be inserted in the first line of recommendation (1) below immediately before the word 'property' so as to make it clear that it was the freehold that would be purchased.

*Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of the recommendations (as amended in the case of (1)) below.

**RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL**

- (1) That the purchase of the freehold property shown hatched black in appendix 1 to the report on the terms set out in paragraph 4.7 of the report be approved and that the Head of Commercial Services be authorised to conclude the purchase following completion of due diligence investigations.
- (2) That the allocation of the sums in paragraphs 6.1 and 6.2 of the report from the Housing Investment Reserve to cover the costs of purchase, ancillary costs and the appointment of consultants to carry out a full options appraisal be approved.

**[Note** The meeting ended at 11:46]

---

CHAIRMAN

---

DATE