

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



Notice of Meeting

To All Members of Chichester District Council

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of **THE COUNCIL** in the Council Chamber, East Pallant House East Pallant Chichester West Sussex PO19 1TY on **Tuesday 22 November 2016 at 2.00 pm** for the transaction of the business set out in the agenda below

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Diane Shepherd'.

DIANE SHEPHERD
Chief Executive
Tuesday 15 November
2016

NOTES

- 1) *The Council meeting will be preceded by the following:*
 - a) *an 'Ideas into Action' schools project display in the foyer outside the Committee Rooms at 12.45pm. Lunch will be available in the Members' Room at 12.45pm.*
 - b) *a presentation on Members' roles during emergency situations at 13.15pm.*
- 2) *Members are asked to bring with them to the meeting their copy of the agenda and the accompanying papers for the meetings of the Cabinet held on 4 October and 1 November 2016.*

AGENDA

This agenda should be retained for future reference with the minutes of this meeting

- 1 **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 18)
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Tuesday 20 September 2016.
- 2 **Urgent Items**
Chairman to announce any urgent items which due to special circumstances are to be dealt with under Late Items.
- 3 **Declarations of Interests**
Members and officers are reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests they may have in respect of

matters on the agenda for this meeting.

4 Chairman's announcements

5 Public Question Time

Questions submitted by members of the public in writing by noon on the previous working day (for a period up to 15 minutes).

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET AND OTHER COMMITTEES

To consider the following Cabinet recommendations requiring the approval of the Council.

The reports giving rise to these recommendations are in the papers for the meeting of the Cabinet on 4 October 2016 and 1 November 2016. These are available in the committee papers section of the Council's website.

6 Appointment of External Auditors

(See report at agenda item 5 (pages 20 to 25) of the Cabinet agenda of 4 October 2016)

RECOMMENDED BY THE CABINET

That the Council approves the opting by Chichester District Council into sector-led procurement of external audit services by the appointed person, Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA).

7 Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan - Modification for the Purpose of Correcting an Error

(See report at agenda item 6 (pages 26 to 33) of the Cabinet agenda of 4 October 2016)

RECOMMENDED BY THE CABINET

That the Council approves the modification of the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan for the purpose of correcting an error and the publication of the modification document in appendix 2 to the agenda report.

8 Chichester Site Allocation Development Plan Document - Proposed Submission

(See report at agenda item 5 (pages 15 to 22) of the Cabinet agenda of 1 November 2016, pages 1 to 68 in the supplement to the agenda, pages 1 to 432 in the (online only) supplement to the agenda and pages 1 to 2 in a further supplement to the agenda)

RECOMMENDED BY THE CABINET

- 1) That the Site Allocation Development Plan Document: Proposed Submission (as set out in appendix 1 to the report) and amended by (a) the revised update sheet and (b) at the meeting, be approved for an eight-week consultation from 1 December 2016 to 26 January 2107, following which it shall be sent to the Secretary of State for examination;
- 2) The proposed responses to representations received (as set out in appendix 2 to the agenda report) be approved; and
- 3) Authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Services, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services, to enable minor amendments to be made to the Site Allocation Development Plan Document: Proposed Submission prior to and following public consultation.

- 4) That the retention of the site to the rear of Stuart Avenue, Camelsdale be approved within the Site Allocation Development Plan Document: Proposed Submission for examination, subject to confirmation from the Environment Agency that there is no objection once the flood zone modelling has been completed.

- 9 **Implementation of Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2017/18**
(See report at agenda item 6 (pages 23 to 26) of the Cabinet agenda of 1 November 2016 and pages 69 to 115 in the supplement to the agenda)

RECOMMENDED BY THE CABINET

That the Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2017-2018 be approved.

- 10 **2015/16 Corporate Governance report and Annual Governance Statement**
(Pages 19 - 30)

RECOMMENDED BY THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE

That the committee's annual report on the Council's governance arrangements, including the 2015-16 Annual Governance Statement, be noted.

OFFICER REPORTS

- 11 **Appointments to Committees and External Organisations** (Pages 31 - 32)
To appoint members to serve on committees and to represent the Council on external organisations.

- 12 **Committee Calendar 2017-18** (Pages 33 - 37)
To approve the calendar of meetings for the Council year 2017-2018.

- 13 **Questions to the Executive**
(maximum of 40 minutes duration)

- 14 **Late items**
The Council will consider any late items as follows:
(a) Items added to the agenda papers and made available for public inspection
(b) Items that the chairman has agreed should be taken as a matter of urgency by reason of special circumstances to be reported at the meeting

- 15 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**
The Council is asked to consider in respect of the following item whether the public, including the press, should be excluded from the meeting 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 an individual) of Part I of Schedule 12A to 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.

- 16 **Succession Planning**
(See report at agenda item 15 (pages 295 to 309) of the Cabinet agenda of 4 October 2016)

RECOMMENDED BY THE CABINET

That the Council approves the recommendations made in paras 3.1 to 3.5

inclusive of the confidential agenda report.

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 open proceedings of this meeting will be audio recorded and the recording will be held for one year by the 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.
3. Subject to the provisions allowing the exclusion of the press and public, the photographing, filming or recording of this meeting from the public seating area is permitted. To assist with the management of the meeting, anyone wishing to do this is asked to inform the chairman of the meeting of their intentions before the meeting starts. The use of mobile devices for access to social media is permitted, but these should be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting. Those undertaking such activities must do so discreetly and not disrupt the meeting, for example by oral commentary, excessive noise, distracting movement or flash photography. Filming of children, vulnerable adults or members of the audience who object should be avoided. (Standing Order 11.3)

MEMBERS

Mrs E Hamilton	Mrs G Keegan
Mrs N Graves	Mrs J Kilby
Mrs C Apel	Mrs D Knightley
Mr G Barrett	Mrs E Lintill
Mr R Barrow	Mr S Lloyd-Williams
Mr P Budge	Mr L Macey
Mr J Connor	Mr G McAra
Mr M Cullen	Mr S Morley
Mr I Curbishley	Caroline Neville
Mr T Dempster	Mr S Oakley
Mr A Dignum	Mrs P Plant
Mrs P Dignum	Mr R Plowman
Mrs J Duncton	Mr H Potter
Mr M Dunn	Mrs C Purnell
Mr J F Elliott	Mr J Ransley
Mr J W Elliott	Mr J Ridd
Mr N Galloway	Mr A Shaxson
Mr M Hall	Mrs J Tassell
Mrs P Hardwick	Mrs S Taylor
Mr R Hayes	Mr N Thomas
Mr G Hicks	Mrs P Tull
Mr L Hixson	Mr D Wakeham
Mr F Hobbs	Mrs S Westacott
Mr P Jarvis	

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 1



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on Tuesday 20 September 2016 at 2.00 pm

Members Present: Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mrs C Apel, Mr G Barrett, Mr R Barrow, Mr P Budge, Mr J Connor, Mr M Cullen, Mr T Dempster, Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Dignum, Mrs J Duncton, Mr M Dunn, Mr J W Elliott, Mr B Finch, Mr N Galloway, Mr M Hall, Mrs P Hardwick, Mr R Hayes, Mr G Hicks, Mr L Hixson, Mr F Hobbs, Mr P Jarvis, Mrs G Keegan, Mrs E Lintill, Mr S Lloyd-Williams, Mr L Macey, Mr G McAra, Mr S Morley, Caroline Neville, Mr S Oakley, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mrs C Purnell, Mr J Ransley, Mr J Ridd, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs J Tassell, Mrs S Taylor, Mrs P Tull and Mr D Wakeham

Members not present: Mr I Curbishley, Mr J F Elliott, Mrs J Kilby, Mrs D Knightley, Mr H Potter, Mr N Thomas and Mrs S Westacott

Officers present all items: Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services), Mr N Bennett (Legal and Democratic Services Manager), Mr A Frost (Head of Planning Services) and Mrs B Jones (Principal Scrutiny Officer)

142 Minutes

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 19 July 2016 be signed as a correct record.

143 Urgent Items

There were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

144 Declarations of Interests

The Chairman read out the following statement:

The Council are debating the A27 route (agenda item 9) and I note that many members own land (including their home) or have an interest in a business affected by one of the potential highway changes being debated. There are a variety of routes which are under consideration and I note the questions which may be put before Council that may refer to other routes which are not subject to the report but which members may wish to debate.

The Monitoring Officer has written to all members providing them with his thoughts on potential interests upon the debate.

The Monitoring Officer's conclusion is that it is appropriate to grant dispensations to all members for them to speak at the debate today. The dispensation is made for a defined period being today only (20 September 2016).

145 **Chairman's announcements**

The Chairman

- 1) advised that August had been a quiet month in respect of events at which she and the Vice-Chairman were requested to represent the community;
- 2) reminded members of the All Parishes Meeting taking place on Wednesday 28 September 2016;
- 3) commented on the success of Recycling Week and invited the Cabinet Member for Environment, Mr R Barrow, to say a few words. Members and Officers were thanked for their time and attendance.

146 **Public Question Time**

Four questions about the improvement of the A27 were asked by Ms Heather McDougall, Ms Linda Boize, Ms Zoe Neal and Ms Emma Horton and answered by Mrs Susan Taylor (Cabinet Member for Housing & Planning) as follows:-

Question from Ms Heather McDougall:

Throughout this consultation, I have tried to read as much of the publicly available information as possible; I have attended the public exhibitions, where Highways England confirmed to me that Option 2 would drive more traffic into Chichester; I have emailed Highways England for more facts to help me understand, but this has yet to be answered; I have attended other Council meetings, where the options have been referred to as a bad bunch that won't solve the problem; I have heard the overwhelming views of Donnington residents about the detrimental impact Option 2 will have, and as a Donnington resident myself, I find myself analysing all these facts and wondering if saving an average 5 minutes and 40 seconds really is worth all the pain to the residents, to the environment, to our local roads? Therefore my question to you is, can you clearly articulate the benefit to local communities that Option 2 will provide and can you, in weighing up the costs and benefits, truly support this as being a good option for the people of Chichester?

Answer:

The broad arguments which are considered to justify the Council giving qualified support to Option 2 are set out in the Cabinet report, and summarised at Paragraphs 5.27 – 5.28 of the report. Based on the information available, Option 2 is considered to offer the greatest long term benefits for the Chichester area. This option performs best in terms of travel and accessibility, providing the greatest reductions in journey times, the greatest improvements in journey time reliability and the best performance in reducing accidents. These benefits would occur not only along the A27 itself, but also to/from Chichester city, whilst the Stockbridge Link Road offers potential journey improvements to/from the Manhood Peninsula. Therefore, it is considered that Option 2 (or an amended version of it) offers the

greatest potential to support economic growth and future development to meet the area's needs.

It is accepted that Option 2, as currently proposed, would have some detrimental impacts (as would any option). The report and the proposed Council response to HE in Appendix 3 make clear that further assessment will be needed through additional studies and design work to avoid or mitigate the potentially significant impacts on the landscape, natural and historic environment, and the loss of land and property. However, it also needs to be emphasised that the A27 Bypass and the existing issues of traffic congestion and safety already cause substantial detrimental impacts for local residents and the environment and that these effects will only continue to worsen unless a scheme for significant improvements is brought forward.

Question from Ms Linda Boize:

'Do you think it acceptable to support Option 2 which focuses on cars and lorries when the impact on south Chichester people will be so damaging in loss of houses and trade, loss of connectivity including cyclist, pedestrian and electric buggy connectivity, loss of local green spaces, over 3 years of construction noise, reduced access and increased pollution especially of particulates, flyovers making a concrete ugly scar and to only ask for serious consideration to the seven mitigation points listed in red in the Agenda Supplement, when at the very least implementing these mitigation points is what is needed. And do you think it is acceptable to ignore the widespread call for reopening the case for a northern alternative.'

Answer:

There are two points raised in this question. In response to the first point about the disruption and potential adverse impacts resulting from Option 2, it should be emphasised that the proposed response to Highways England (which Council is being asked to endorse) does not only include the Cabinet report recommendations themselves, but also the very detailed comments in Appendix 3 of the report which set out a range of additional work which Council officers consider that HE should undertake to develop a better A27 scheme to avoid or mitigate potential adverse impacts.

With regard to a northern bypass route, the proposed Council response seeks to respond specifically to the options proposed in the current Highways England consultation. As indicated in Paragraphs 6.5 – 6.6 of the Cabinet report, it is not considered appropriate for the Council to seek to assess options that do not form part of the current consultation, and it is clear that the Department for Transport and Highways England are now only looking to bring forward an online scheme. In any case, it is not clear that alternative offline options would perform better than Option 2 in terms of benefits weighed against environmental costs.

Question from Ms Zoe Neal, represented by Mr Christopher Hunt:

With reference the Officer's report and the last minute amendments 2.1 points C & D. What certainty do the District Council's Officers have that Highways England will deliver these uncosted amendments, untested against Highways feasibility criteria? Especially given that you would have already made it clear to Highways that you prefer Option 2. Would it not be better to negotiate for better conditions prior to settling on an option first?

Answer:

The Council's role is that of a consultee responding to the current Highways England public consultation on A27 options. The points in recommendation c) to Council, and detailed comments in Appendix 3, constitute the proposed Council's response to Highways England, which sets out additional work which it is considered should be undertaken to develop a better A27 scheme, and to avoid or mitigate potential adverse impacts. However, it will be for Highways England to decide how to respond to these comments, and to comments made by other consultees. The Council is not in a position to "negotiate" with Highways England, although it is hoped that its views will carry significant weight in representing the local community.

The recommendation to Council is to give qualified support to Option 2, for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report (summarised in paragraphs 5.27 – 5.28), which indicate that this option appears to offer the greatest long term benefits to the Chichester area in terms of improving travel and accessibility, thereby supporting economic growth and future development to meet the area's needs. However, the report makes clear that these advantages will need to be balanced against the potentially significant impacts on the landscape, natural and historic environment, and the loss of land and property and that further assessment will be needed through additional studies and design work by Highways England in developing a preferred scheme.

Questions from Ms Emma Horton:

1. Given that the Stockbridge roundabout area has been designated as an 'Air Quality Management Area' or AQMA since 2006, on account of the levels of nitrogen dioxide exceeding UK limits, how can you justify any of the options proposed by Highways England, when they will cause, according to HE, a 'deterioration in air quality around the Stockbridge AQMA'?

Answer:

The methodology for assessing air quality impacts applied by Highways England considers the net effects of all positive and negative effects within and around Chichester city. In terms of overall impact on air quality, Option 2 shows the greatest potential benefit of the options tested, although with some potential negative effects in the immediate vicinity of the Stockbridge junction. However, Highways England has not as yet carried out detailed design work of any of the possible option schemes. Once a preferred option is selected, then this will inform a detailed air quality modelling exercise. In the detailed response to Highways England included in Appendix 3 of the Cabinet report, Council officers have highlighted additional work that should be undertaken by Highways England at the scheme design stage. The Council will comment on the detailed air quality modelling work when it is made available.

2. There is no mention in the Highways England's proposals booklet of the effects and consequences of building a flyover at the Stockbridge roundabout (option 2) on air quality and travel disruption, other than it may take up to 4 years. Do councillors agree that there will be traffic chaos along the A27 for years, causing untold misery for thousands of people on a daily basis, if one of these options are chosen?

Answer:

All proposals to improve the A27 will create issues of travel disruption to a greater or lesser degree during the construction phase. Although Option 2 would require a substantial period for construction, it would provide greater long term benefit compared to the other options, which would therefore reduce the need for further improvements works in the future.

Although the consultation brochure itself provides limited information, a more detailed assessment of the potential impacts during construction is provided in Environment Study Report which has been published on Highways England's consultation website. Highways England has indicated that it will seek to minimise the disruption created during construction by phasing the proposed highways works and that it will produce a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan. The Council will expect to have the opportunity to comment on this when it is produced before the start of construction work.

147 Surface Water and Drainage Supplementary Planning Document for Adoption

Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Housing & Planning), seconded by Mrs Lintill, moved the recommendations of the Cabinet. She stated that the Surface Water and Foul Drainage Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was a planning guidance document for developers and their agents to assist them in determining whether there was sufficient infrastructure available to meet the needs of their proposed development to ensure the safe discharge of both foul and surface waste water. It sets out the procedures to be followed prior to submitting a planning application. The SPD went out for public consultation on 28 March 2016 for a period of six weeks.

Mr Oakley welcomed the overall thrust of the document in consolidating all the guidance in one place to assist the planning process. However he was concerned at the non-requirement to carry out winter ground water monitoring before the submission of the primary application for a site as without that information it limited the Planning Committee as to whether the surface water drainage system proposed for a site could be achieved.

Mr Ransley wished to know what timescales had been set to allow the review and update of the document. Mrs Taylor undertook to provide a written response to this question.

Mr Ransley also referred members to the debate that took place on this matter during the Overview & Scrutiny Committee's review of Southern Water (SW) recently when SW undertook to take positive steps on addressing the long term issue the Council has experienced in relation to the maintenance of ditches and waterways (hence his reason to address the regularity of the reviews). He stated that if anything came out of that proposal it would bring about positive changes to the document. Mrs Apel (Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee) advised that she had received a positive email from SW following the meeting and that she hoped this now provided the basis for good communication between SW and the Council in future.

Mr Barrow requested that where a resident had taken the trouble to respond to the consultation and their response had not been taken into account, it was important to acknowledge these comments and also to pass them to SW in order that they may be addressed.

Mr Plowman commended this document for its clarity and clear flow charts, stating that it provided good help and guidance for the future. He was supported by Mrs Apel and Mr Hayes.

Mr Barrett had an issue with ground water testing, saying that the Manhood Peninsula was low lying and the water table high so there was a risk of flooding. Mrs Taylor advised that the document referred to ground water testing needing to be carried out by the developer for developments of five or more houses, with the Council arranging this testing direct for developments of under five houses. Mr Carvell advised that SW's preference was for ground water testing prior to construction rather than at the detailed planning application stage. Mr Frost continued that the question appeared not to relate so much to the SPD, which is the guidance, but to the wording and requirements of the planning conditions that might be applied to the surface water drainage, therefore enabling the construction but with conditions attached. If there was no drainage solution then it was incumbent upon the developer to come back to the Council to address the condition in an alternative manner. There was the option for interested parties to have a further discussion outside the meeting.

In putting the recommendation to the vote there were four abstentions.

RESOLVED

- 1) That the Surface Water and Foul Drainage Supplementary Planning Document be adopted.
- 2) The proposed responses to the representations received be approved.

148 Avenue de Chartres Car Park - Tender Evaluation

Mr Finch (Cabinet Member for Support Services), seconded by Mr Dignum, moved the recommendations from Cabinet. Mr Finch informed the Council that the Avenue De Chartres car park had been built in 1991 and on 7 April 2015 the Cabinet had approved a project initiation document with indicative costs for:

- essential structural and aesthetic refurbishment works
- optional flexible resurfacing of the intermediate and lower decks
- optional vehicle guidance system
- optional electric charging points
- optional refurbishment of the stairwells, five access towers, retaining walls and paved surfaces

In these cost constrained times the recommendations had been split into two parts - those which were essential to meet structural or health and safety standards and those which provided a modern, safe, car park which was aesthetically attractive to encourage greater use.

Mr. Finch did not propose to move forward with either the vehicle guidance system, as it was costly or the levels of occupancy in the car park did not justify it, or the electric charging points, as grant funding was no longer available. However the £45,000 approved in December 2015 to support this initiative would be reconsidered as part of a wider policy across the district.

Noting that the optional flexible resurfacing of the intermediate and lower decks were not required for structural reasons, Mr Ransley enquired whether the resurfacing would consist of the usual black and white surface or a multi-colour option. Mr Finch confirmed that it was most likely the black and white option saying that it was prudent to undertake this work now as it was important for the long term health of the building.

RESOLVED

- 1) That funding for the essential upgrade of the perimeter vehicle barriers, pedestrian railings and associated works be approved to achieve compliance with current health and safety standards and officers be authorised to invite invitations to tender for these works.
- 2) That funding to refurbish the 5 access towers and clean the concrete retaining wall and paved surfaces be approved and officers be authorised to invite invitations to tender for these works.
- 3) That the asset replacement programme be re-profiled to enable the replacement of the existing lighting installation with a more energy efficient LED system and officers be authorised to invite invitations to tender for these works.
- 4) That the release from capital reserves of the sum identified in the report be authorised to fund the cost of this refurbishment not provided for within the Asset Replacement Programme.

149 Deficit Reduction Strategy

Mrs Hardwick (Cabinet Member for Finance & Governance), seconded by Mr Dignum, moved this recommendation from Cabinet. She stated that in May 2013 the then Cabinet had approved a Deficit Reduction Plan to yield £2.4m of savings and income, aiming to close an anticipated deficit in the then 5 year model. Since then through the hard work of officers and members the Council had achieved savings of £3.6m (over £1.2m more than expected through both revenue savings of £2.2m and additional income of £1.4m). Despite these achievements, the financial forecast remained challenging, with ongoing risks including the full localisation of business rates by 2020, New Homes Bonus likely to be reduced, a possible general downturn in the economy which would inevitably hit income streams and challenging amended waste and recycling targets. The latest five year plan model showed a predicted £2.5m deficit by 2021/22, assuming current policies are continued. If the Council recognises the further risks and cost pressures and agrees and implements the policy decisions, the predicted deficit would grow to £3.8m by 2021/22.

However Officers and Members have continued to develop plans for more savings and yet further income generation and these policies are modelled to generate savings and further income year on year rising to just under £3.9m by 2021/22. The model had assumed modest council tax increases but the need for this would be reviewed annually. In December 2015 the Government offered the Council a specific four year financial settlement if we submitted an 'efficiency plan' demonstrating that we could achieve a balanced budget, however if we did not take up this offer we were likely to achieve worse settlements year on year.

Mr Oakley queried the tax base growth rate of 1.1% and the level of housing delivery rate this would equate to; the costs or estimates of cultural grants when they transfer from being funded from reserves to revenue; and any other 'unknown unknowns' that could undermine the Council's planned balanced budget. Mrs Hardwick advised that the model built in prudence at every level, however implicit in these figures were some uncertainties.

Mr Ward confirmed that local government finance was going through a significant period of change. Moving from 50% to 100% localisation of business rates and the Government's review of the Needs Assessment (effectively the baseline funding position) could create significant risk for the council. A prudent approach had been taken in forecasting. The tax base growth rate was not derived from housing numbers but the equivalent of band D properties and net of discounts e.g. council tax benefits. There was an item within the five year model for grants including cultural grants.

Mr Cullen queried whether it would be at the end of the four year period, when we had received our entire grant, that we could say that we hadn't achieved the savings. Mrs Shepherd (Chief Executive) responded that the model was reviewed quarterly and that there was a legal requirement that each local authority balance its books. This council had been particularly prudent. We didn't use New Homes Bonus (NHB) which was a fairly unique position and we have money in reserves. As past records show we are able to react quickly if things change significantly. Mr Dignum added that the Council was being extremely conservative on business rates. In the current year we had earned about £3m from business rates and we were projecting ahead at a much reduced figure of £2.1m. Ever since he had held the Finance portfolio the NHB had virtually all gone into reserves. Even though we expect a sharp falling off, we were not using it for day to day spending but to support our communities.

Mr Dunn was confident that the council had laid down levels of prudential reserves and that it was comfortably in excess of the minimum requirements.

Mr Ransley, referring to the planned savings, queried whether we would be able to address not only those listed but others in future. Mrs Hardwick advised that the savings were considered quarterly and the Council's Programme Boards were looking for new opportunities all the time.

Mr Oakley asked what incentive there was on local authorities to invest in the local economy if the return on business rates was negative. Mrs Shepherd replied that even if we can't retain business rates we would still want to give our full support to businesses.

RESOLVED

That the Head of Finance and Governance be authorised to submit a request to the Department of Communities and Local Government for a four-year settlement and that this Deficit Reduction Plan is used as the basis for that request.

150 A27 Chichester Bypass Improvement Scheme Response to Highways England Public Consultation

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council), seconded by Mr Finch, moved these recommendations from the Cabinet.

He advised that in July this year Highways England (HE) published its long awaited consultation document on the proposed A27 Chichester Bypass improvement scheme. The consultation period was for a ten week period from 14 July until 22 September 2016 and contained five online options. Officers had analysed the proposals in detail having regard to the Council's corporate priorities, assessing the potential benefits and disadvantages of each of the options. They had concluded that Option 2, based on the evidence provided to date, appeared to offer the best outcome in terms of reduced journey times both for east-west through traffic as well as for local traffic, particularly to and from

the Manhood Peninsula, together with the greatest improvement in journey time reliability and reduction in accidents. However, support for Option 2 was qualified and it was recommended that HE were asked to consider a number of further measures at recommendation 3.

Only the five options that are the subject of the public consultation had been considered as these were the only options being proposed by HE. The Council was asked to support these recommendations for submission as the Council's formal response to HE.

We should recognise that whichever option was ultimately selected would have disadvantages as well as benefits and would not please everyone. But it was essential that the current levels of congestion on the A27, with the resultant adverse effects on journey times and reliability, which in turn impedes development and quality of life, does not continue. It was important therefore that the opportunity was taken to comment on the available proposals in a constructive manner to ensure that improvements to the A27 could be progressed.

Mrs Apel made a statement on behalf of the Fishbourne residents, who were not represented at this meeting, stating that Option 2 would destroy the AONB and the economy. The construction would take time and damage communities. The residents recommended that all options be ruled out and that true transparency was provided by HE in explaining why the northern route was discounted.

Mr Barrow was inclined to support officers' recommendations as Option 2 provided the best way forward for Chichester in getting traffic through and on and off the Manhood Peninsula smoothly, however he had grave concerns regarding the southern link road damaging communities, the environment and historic buildings. He claimed that the Southern Link Road would not be sustainable and could, in future, become a dual carriageway. HE had not done a particularly good job as the two northern options had got into the public domain which had raised false hope for residents of the Manhood Peninsula. He was taken aback by the massive support in the south for a northern option and suggested that HE be encouraged to look at this again and to explain the reasons why the northern routes had been rejected.

Mr Ridd commented on the huge turnout of local residents, including the views received from many in the Donnington and Appledram area. He was minded to reject Option 2 on the grounds that the overpass did not provide access to and from the A27 and required longer and more circuitous journeys, which would be compounded with further turnings from feeder routes onto the A27. He suspected that it would encourage traffic to end up in Fishbourne and then to take rat runs through the city. The ramp, which would start near shops, would have a devastating effect on residents, including the demolition of the Grade 2 Stockbridge House. The pollution as a result of this new bypass would blight the lives of residents living near it.

Mr Jarvis, Mr Barret, Mr Connor and Mr Shaxson were also not in support of Option 2 and suggested either a 'no option' response, alternative options or a re-examination of the northern routes. Mr Jarvis concurred stating that the bypass separated the through traffic from the local traffic, building a damn around the city and cutting the city off from the peninsula. Mr Barrett was concerned that the contribution the economy made to the district would be severely disrupted during the construction process if Option 2 were to go ahead.

Mrs Tull stated that the methodology and data used by the HE appeared to be flawed and therefore the consultation was ultimately flawed. No meetings had been held by the HE with Donnington, Stockbridge, North Mundham and the other affected villages. There was no acknowledgement of the peak summer traffic or of Goodwood event traffic and the gridlock which normally occurred on the A27 and surrounding feeder roads which could be solved by access from the north. Option 2 encroached on the Harbour and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) trapping 25,000 residents on the peninsula. Consideration of the present population should take preference over any housing which was not yet built. She stated that Option 2 should be ruled out. Mrs Purnell moved that a recorded vote be taken, which was supported by more than four members. On a vote being taken, it was declared carried.

Mr Connor, representing Selsey, had met with HE and consultants in 2014 to discuss the A27 improvements and at that time had suggested a grade separated route on the existing lines which would resolve the overcapacity issues. This had been turned down as the route did not have enough space at each junction to create the access slip roads. As through traffic only accounted for 20% of the total it was considered too costly. Since then the through traffic figures had been adjusted to 42% of all users. The A27 route was currently operating at about 50% over design capacity. He proposed an alternative option which offered a lower cost, lower environmental impact northern route with a two way single carriageway northern bypass for through traffic with grade separated roundabouts at Lavant and at Goodwood and built to the same standard as the Bognor relief road.

Mr Oakley questioned the aim of spending thousands of tax payers money on a bypass which would need to be reviewed in 2035. None of the options include the significant upgrade of Portfield roundabout which would become a bottleneck with the increase in housing in Chichester and Arun. HE's ambition to remove the Oving lights would exacerbate the problem. The uncosted shopping list of additional recommendations would push this project above the funding costs. However cheaper options could be suggested by saying to Government that the northern options needed to be looked at in full. The northern options also came with environmental impacts however the bypass could run on the edge of Goodwood and be buried in the landscape. It was evident that Goodwood Estate's case was built on sentiment that would not merit the status of material considerations in planning applications. The northern options represented a long term solution for the district, county and regions road transport networks.

Mr Hall, in response to the request for reconsideration of the northern bypass, commented that this option had been removed by the Secretary of State on a number of sound policy reasons, namely Section 85 of the Countryside Act 2000 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Beauty in AONBs. The proposed northern routes would run from the existing A27 new interchange just west of Boxgrove to Lavant, creating noise and light pollution along the entire length of the South Downs National Park's southern boundary. The compensation to the Goodwood Estate with the loss of its motor sport events had been estimated to be in excess of £30m because the proposed route ran through their car park. This would have been far greater than the building of the road, therefore exceeding the budget that HE had for upgrading the A27. He called upon the Council to protect its own policies and to protect its own AONBs and the thriving rural economy in the district. Mr Hall supported Option 2.

Mr Budge advised that the area was suffering due to the lack of progress on a bypass at the last consultation in 2003 and supported Option 2. He was concerned that in following

the northern route the Council may not then be able to build the houses which had been committed for development.

Mr Dunn stated that the Council was one of many consultees to this proposal; part of a hierarchy of consultees. He was concerned that if an option was not supported fully at this time that the proposal would be put to the back of the queue and that other road schemes would come forward and take precedence as had happened in the past. He supported Option 2 and approved the comments set out in point 3; however he proposed an additional recommendation that the Council request the Secretary of State to explain in more detail the reasons for the rejection of the northern route.

Mr Hobbs, Mr Barrow and Mr Plowman supported Mr Dunn stating that the Council needed to understand why the northern routes had been dismissed.

Mr Oakley proposed that this Council's response to the consultation be as follows:

1. Takes the form of a commentary on the proposed options, enhancing concerns and highlighting risks.
2. Does not implicitly or formally support any of them.
3. Recommends a re-examination of the northern options given the magnitude of their additional benefits and the need to provide high quality road transport connectivity to support growth for all over the long term, hence fully meeting all strategic objectives.
4. Given the short timescale for response, retain Cabinet recommendation D, so that amendments commensurate with the above can be made in time.

Mr Cullen seconded Mr Oakley's proposal, which was also supported by Mr Connor.

The Chairman turned to Mr Oakley's motion. The result of the recorded vote was as follows:

For the recommendations: Mrs Apel, Mr Barrett, Mr Connor, Mr Cullen, Mr J W E Elliott, Mr Galloway, Mrs Hamilton, Mr Jarvis, Mr Macey, Mr Morley, Mr Oakley, Mr Ridd, Mr Shaxson and Mrs Tull (14)

Against the recommendations: Mr Barrow, Mr Budge, Mr Dempster, Mrs Dignum, Mr Dignum, Mrs Duncton, Mr Dunn, Mr Finch, Mrs Graves, Mr Hall, Mrs Hardwick, Mr Hayes, Mr Hicks, Mr Hixson, Mr Hobbs, Mrs Keegan, Mr Lloyd-Williams, Mr McAra, Ms Neville, Ms Plant, Mr Plowman, Mrs Purnell, Mr Ransley, Mrs Tassell, Mrs Taylor and Mr Wakeham (26)

Abstained: None

(Mrs Lintill had left the meeting before this vote)

The motion was declared not carried.

Mr Ransley then moved, duly seconded that Option 2 be supported with an additional recommendation: That for the purpose of transparency and community cohesion the Secretary of State provides this Council with the justification for discounting the previously prepared two offline routes to the north of the city.

The Chairman then asked the Council to consider the Cabinet's recommendations with the addition of the further recommendation from Mr Ransley. The result of the recorded vote was:

For the recommendations: Mr Barrow, Mr Budge, Mr Dempster, Mrs Dignum, Mr Dignum, Mrs Duncton, Mr Dunn, Mr Finch, Mrs Graves, Mr Hall, Mrs Hardwick, Mr Hayes, Mr Hicks, Mr Hixson, Mr Hobbs, Mrs Keegan, Mr Lloyd-Williams, Mr McAra, Ms Plant, Mr Plowman, Mrs Purnell, Mr Ransley, Mrs Tassell, Mrs Taylor and Mr Wakeham (25)

Against the recommendations: Mrs Apel, Mr Barrett, Mr Cullen, Mr Elliott, Mr Galloway, Mrs Hamilton, Mr Jarvis, Mr Macey, Mr Morley, Ms Neville, Mr Oakley, Mr Ridd, Mr Shaxson and Mrs Tull (14)

Abstained: Mr Connor (1)

RESOLVED

- 1) That the overall conclusions of this report set out in Paragraphs 5.27 – 5.29, providing qualified support for Option 2 and based on the information published by Highways England at this stage, be agreed.
- 2) That the comments set out in Appendix 3 (including the Annex) for submission as the Council's formal response to the Highways England consultation on options for the A27 Chichester Bypass Improvement scheme be agreed.
- 3) That Highways England be advised that the Council is only minded to support Option 2, provided that Highways England gives serious consideration to the following:
 - a) Strategic improvements to the Portfield roundabout to increase east-west capacity, possibly including an eastbound flyover for cars and light vans only using the A27;
 - b) The provision of good access for traffic going from the B2145 to the east of Chichester without impeding through east-west traffic (possibly by a slip road from the Whyke Road flyover down to the A27 or a right turn from the flyover down to the A27);
 - c) The reduction of the length of the Stockbridge Link Road, either to only a section from the A286 to the Fishbourne roundabout or to the two sections from the B2201 via the A286 to the Fishbourne roundabout;
 - d) The provision of safe, segregated crossings of the A27 for cyclists and pedestrians at the Bognor Road, Whyke Road, Stockbridge Road and Fishbourne Roundabout junctions;
 - e) The installation of noise abatement screens on the flyovers;
 - f) The examination of the scope for lowering the roundabouts and flyovers at the Bognor Road and, especially, Fishbourne junctions to reduce visual impact; and
 - g) The use of Highways England's Designated Fund to finance the mitigation measures listed above.
- 4) Delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing, to make any consequential amendments to Appendix 3.
- 5) For purposes of transparency and community cohesion that the Secretary of State be requested to provide this Council with the justification for discounting the previously prepared two offline routes to the north of the city.

151 **Making the Chidham and Hambrook Neighbourhood Development Plan**

Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Housing & Planning), seconded by Mrs Duncton, moved the recommendations from Cabinet.

Mr Cullen requested that the volunteers, who had put in a lot of hard work, should be congratulated on a successful outcome. It was noticeable that six/seven years ago the turnout for the Parish Plan was around 90% but for this Neighbourhood Development Plan the turnout had been 30% which was significantly lower.

RESOLVED

That the Chidham & Hambrook Neighbourhood Development Plan be made part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

152 **Approval of the Infrastructure Business Plan 2017-22 for consultation with the City, Town and Parish Councils and key Infrastructure Delivery Commissioners**

Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Housing & Planning), seconded by Mr Dignum, moved these recommendations from Cabinet. She explained that the purpose of the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) was to enable the Council to prioritise and select the infrastructure that was most needed; when and where it was needed. Projects selected from the IBP would aid the cumulative growth of the area and ensure that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was spent to best effect; that a transparent prioritised approach was taken to selecting projects to be funded and that all sources of funding infrastructure were taken into account including S106 monies.

In September 2015 the first draft IBP was reported to Cabinet and subsequently to Council for consultation with WSCC and other Stakeholders. It was emphasised that it was a living document and would be reviewed annually. In February 2016 CIL was adopted by the Council thus giving greater certainty about future funding for infrastructure to support development in the Local Plan. The Council was now beginning to receive income from CIL, although future years' receipts were still estimated.

In assessing the infrastructure requirements and means of meeting those requirements, collaboration would be essential. In April this year a workshop was held with stakeholders and projects identified. The proposed Cashflow and Spending Plan was discussed at a meeting of the Joint Liaison Group, comprising officers and members from West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and the Council, and it was agreed that the Smarter Choices proposals and the Primary School places projects, together with the requested funding for the new Medical Centre on the West of Chichester Strategic Development Location should be subject to further detail and evaluation.

For the period 2016–2021 there would be a projected shortfall of £2,503,870 on the total costs of projects proposed for CIL funding. Therefore it was important that projects were prioritised that would meet the infrastructure needs of development.

The draft IBP would go out for consultation for a period of 6 weeks from 3 October to the 14 November. The results of the consultation would be discussed by the Joint Liaison Group before being reported back to Cabinet.

Mr Shaxson suggested that the foreword be amended to add a sentence to indicate that this plan covered all areas excluding the South Downs National Park (SDNP) and that the Park Authority had its own CIL arrangements. Mrs Taylor advised that the SDNP was referred to as one of the consultees but that this could be included.

Mr Oakley endorsed the comments on Smarter Choices, education and health projects. However he was concerned that the Council was looking to spend this amount of money on projects which would be very difficult to measure. Mrs Taylor advised that further details and an explanation were currently awaited and that all stakeholders agreed that nothing should be spent without good evidence.

Mr Ransley stated that it was essential to know that the infrastructure would be available in order to be able to support development. There would need to be some clarity as to how this was being funded and residents needed to fully understand this. Mrs Taylor replied that the purpose of the IBP was to give that clarity; there must be prioritisation and projects needed to be chosen wisely. Mrs Shepherd said that as there was a major funding gap in the district, the Council was going to have to look for other funding for necessary infrastructure. The prioritisation process within CIL would need to be used wisely, challenging the projects we were going to fund to ensure they were of the highest priority. Parishes which had taken growth would receive their share of the CIL which is paid twice a year as set out in the regulations. The Council is the responsible authority for the distribution of CIL.

Mr Plowman was happy that the document went out to consultation but requested more discussion on it following consultation.

Mrs Plant stated that most of high/essential priorities seemed to be with transport but queried the inclusion of a library at Southbourne and asked for clarification as to how the list had been created. Mrs Taylor confirmed that the library was possibly included during a workshop with residents at Southbourne and that it was considered the highest need in that area.

Responding to a question from Mr Shaxson, Mrs Purnell advised that the reason Selsey was showing no CIL receipt was that all accounting had been through S106 agreements before CIL started.

Mrs Hardwick suggested that in order not to raise expectations on proposed sites the phrasing in the document might be amended. Mrs Taylor noted the concern and would make the amendment.

To a question from Mr Ransley on the final short list Mrs Taylor responded that we were only certain about the first year and that subsequent years were estimates. Mr Dignum suggested that the Cabinet Member go through the document with officers before publication to ensure that it was as user-friendly as possible.

Mrs Purnell moved an amendment that a further recommendation be added: To allow the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing & Planning to correct minor and typographical errors before publication. This was seconded by Mr Dignum.

On the motion being put to the vote, this amendment was carried.

RESOLVED

That the Infrastructure Business Plan 2017-2022 be approved for consultation with the city, town and parish councils, neighbouring local authorities including the South Downs National Park Authority and key infrastructure delivery commissioners for a period of six weeks from 3 October to 14 November 2016.

That the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing & Planning, be authorised to make minor editorial and typographical amendments to the document before publication.

153 **Chichester Electoral Review: Draft Recommendations**

Mr Ridd (Chairman of the Boundary Review Panel), seconded by Mr McAra, moved these recommendations.

Mr Ridd advised that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) published its recommendations for ward names and boundaries for the Council to take effect in May 2019. The consultation period runs until 10 October.

A small number of recommendations contained within this Council's original submission to the LGBCE were not agreed and the LGBCE had instead devised their own different proposals for those areas. The Council's Boundary Review Panel had focussed on these differences, and had not considered matters where the LGBCE had simply accepted the Council's original submission. Firstly, the Harting ward, to include the parishes of Elsted and Treyford, were not agreed by the Commission who thought that they more realistically sat with Midhurst. Mr Shaxson had submitted his defence of the original recommendation on the basis of community identity and of convenient and effective local government. The panel had considered this and now recommended this option. Both parishes had also submitted their recommendations to the LGBCE.

Secondly the LGBCE had not accepted the whole swathe of parishes from Bosham to Tangmere due to the variances proposed. They reconsidered the whole group and proposed a three member ward with Bosham in the west stretching across to Donnington via Fishbourne in the centre and south of the city and this three member ward also included Chidham and Hambrook and Donnington. The panel considered this revised proposal and as there was no overwhelming evidence to overcome this it was accepted with a change of name to Harbour Ward. This then threw up problems to the east because Hunston (which was to be included with Donnington) then had to be accommodated with the eastern ward. The Commission then came back with a two member North Mundham and Tangmere ward (consisting of the parishes Hunston, North Mundham, Oving and Tangmere) with a variance of 4% and again there was no overwhelming evidence to counter that and it was accepted by the panel.

There were some minor changes in Chichester City which the LGBCE discussed directly with the City Council. Finally the panel recommended that name of the proposed Chichester Portfield Ward be changed to Chichester Arundel Park Ward.

Mr Oakley advised that in his view the best way of representing wards was by single member wards. There was an issue with development at Shopwyke which would increase the numbers by 2021. The Council's estimates had been very conservative and at variance with what developers were saying. He didn't support the revised LGBCE

recommendation as there would be issues with community identity, no co-terminosity with County divisions and ineffective local government.

Mr Ridd, along with Mr Ransley and Mr Cullen, also members of the panel, confirmed that Mr Oakley's views had been considered by the panel, however after a lengthy debate it had been agreed to stick to the LGBCE's recommendations.

Mrs Purnell and Mr Connor were concerned that the LGBCE was driven by numbers in determining boundaries and did not take into account the best scenario for communities and they would not be supporting the recommendations. Mr Ridd accepted the comments made by the Selsey members, stating that the panel had not revisited any recommendations that had previously been successfully approved through Cabinet and Council and where the LGBCE had accepted those recommendations.

Mr Dignum referring to recommendations 3, 4 and 5, stated that Chichester City Council would be liaising with the LGBCE in respect of redrawing the city wards.

RESOLVED

That the Council informs the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) that it supports the Commission's draft recommendations for new electoral arrangements for Chichester District Council, with the following exceptions:

- 1) Its proposal to include the parish of Elsted & Treyford in Midhurst Ward. Instead this parish should be included in Harting Ward, as in the Council's original submission, on the grounds that in this case the criteria of community identity and effective and convenient local government should outweigh the fairly marginal electoral inequality.
- 2) Its proposals for the proposed Bosham & Donnington and North Mundham & Tangmere wards are accepted, but the wards should be named respectively Harbour and Tangmere Wards.
- 3) Its proposal to transfer Velyn Avenue from Chichester South Ward to Chichester Central Ward; the flats on the western side of Velyn Avenue, with Peter Weston Close should be so transferred but the eastern and southern sides of Velyn Avenue should remain with the rest of Whyke in Chichester South Ward with which it has more community identity.
- 4) Its proposal to transfer the Pound Farm area from Chichester South Ward to Chichester East Ward, thus creating a very small and unviable city council ward. Under the Commission's proposal, electors in this area will be in Chichester South for County Council elections, Chichester East for District Council elections and Chichester Pound Farm for City Council elections. This will be confusing for electors, and is not conducive to convenient and effective local government.
- 5) The name of its proposed Chichester Portfield Ward; Chichester Arundel Park Ward is preferred.

154 **Questions to the Executive**

Questions to members of the Cabinet and responses given were as follows:

- a) *Question: Rapid transport in the city*

Mr Dunn requested the Leader to give mind to the need for rapid transport in Chichester City.

Response:

Mr Dignum advised that Chichester Vision and the WSCC's road space audit took account of journeys into and out of the city. There was a need to make it safer and more comfortable for people to be able to cycle in and consider a way of routing buses through Chichester. Trams were expensive and very few had broken even.

b) Question: West Sussex Collective's funding for EU Funding Officer

Mr Oakley queried the recent suggestion on pooling of business rates and the desire to allocate a sum of money to fund an EU Funding Officer.

Response:

Mrs Shepherd (Chief Executive) replied that the proposal was not going ahead and that there were no alternatives.

c) Question: Road quality of A27 through Chichester

Mr Oakley queried whether the WSCC or the Council was responsible for cleaning the road surface through Chichester. He was particularly concerned at the unkempt condition of the verges, central reservations etc. between Crockherhill and Fishbourne.

Response:

Mr Carvell, Executive Director, advised that the Council had responsibility for litter picking on the A27 and Highways England had responsibility for maintenance but that in practical terms there may be some overlap of functions. A meeting was shortly to take place with Highways England and a written response would be provided to Mr Oakley following the meeting.

The meeting ended at 5.48 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Minute 154 Questions to the Executive

c) Question: Road quality of A27 through Chichester

Mr Oakley queried whether the WSCC or the Council was responsible for cleaning the road surface through Chichester. He was particularly concerned at the unkempt condition of the verges, central reservations etc. between Crockherhill and Fishbourne.

Written response:

Under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 the Council is legally required to ensure that the A27 trunk road and other adopted highways are, so far as is practicable, kept clean. The Act states:

In determining what standard is required, as respects any description of land, highway or road, for compliance with subsections (1) and (2), regard shall be had to the character and use of the land, highway or road as well as the measures which are practicable in the circumstances.

Until recently the Council employed contractors to litter pick the A27 six times a year. Reactive cleaning was also completed as required i.e. in the event of an accident or spillage. The contractors cleaned the highway verges, whilst any debris accumulating in the central reservations was cleared by Highway England when carrying out their annual maintenance work. Traffic management legislation (which dictates the way in which work should be undertaken safely) was previously applied to highway works such as road surface repairs and lamp or barrier replacement. However, in the past couple of years, and following a series of accidents involving street cleaners, this legislation has been applied to the street cleaning industry as well.

A review of practices determined that, to comply with the regulations, the Council would have to operate road closures and work at night when traffic levels are lower. Specialist contractors are required to put traffic management in place which means the cost of completing the task has risen considerably. The central reservation was cleaned using this method in May 2016 and quotes have been invited from four companies to complete a thorough clean of the A27 from Crockerhill to Emsworth between January and March 2017. This is considered to be the best time of year as roadside vegetation will have died back thereby exposing the litter to be collected. Once costs for this have been confirmed the Council will need to consider the standard and frequency of this work, providing a solution that is practicable and affordable whilst maintaining a satisfactory environment.

Chichester District Council

COUNCIL – 22 November 2016

Report of Corporate Governance and Audit Committee

Background

The Council is responsible for ensuring that its business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for and used economically, efficiently and effectively.

To this end members and senior officers are responsible for ensuring that proper arrangements exist for the governance of the Council's affairs and stewardship of its resources.

In March 2016 the Corporate Governance & Audit Committee considered the Strategic and Organisational risk registers to ensure the adequacy of the Council's actions to control and manage risks.

During 2015/2016 the six highest risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register were:

- **Financial Resilience:** That the Council is unable to set a balanced budget. This is an on-going risk.
- **Skills / Capability / Capacity:** Failure to have resilience in the staff structure due to cost reductions and so lack the right number of staff with the right skills to deliver services
- **Business Continuity:** That a business continuity incident occurs and the organisation fails to respond effectively and continue to deliver services.
- **Cyber Attack Across Entire Estate:** Failure to have necessary processes and procedures in place to eliminate a Cyber Attack.
- **Non Achievement of Recycling Target of 50% by 2020:** Failure to achieve a Recycling Target of 50% by 2020 could mean the Council will incur significant fines.
- **Devolution of Public Services:** Failure to engage in the Devolution of Public Services could potentially lead to the Council being isolated and therefore unable to influence and shape the process.

The Council has taken early action as the current financial crisis started to emerge and has, over the last five years achieved in excess of £7.8m of savings and increased income. During the period 2013-2016 the Council has achieved revenue savings of 2.2m and has generated additional income of £1.4m (£1.2m more than expected). Despite exceeding the target the financial forecast still looks unpredictable. The financial strategy and plan 2016/2017 approved by Council in December 2015, anticipated further funding reductions over the next five-years. It has been via this medium term modelling that the Council has been able to plan ahead and implement sensible and considered efficiencies.

This planning has helped to avoid making severe service cuts, yet thus far enabled the Council to set balanced budgets.

Annual Governance Statement

The Annual Governance Statement has been prepared in accordance with the CIPFA / SOLACE guidance on “Delivering Good Governance in Local Government”. The Statement is attached at Appendix 1 and clearly sets out the 6 fundamental principles of good governance:

- i. Determining the council’s purpose, its vision for the local area and intended outcomes for the community.
- ii. Members and officers working together to achieve a common purpose with clearly defined functions and roles.
- iii. Promoting our values and upholding high standards of conduct and behaviour.
- iv. Taking informed and transparent decisions and managing risk.
- v. Effective Management – capacity and capability of members and officers.
- vi. Engaging with local people and other stakeholders to ensure robust accountability.

Other Potential Risk Issues

The drafting of the Annual Governance Statement has highlighted some risks that have come to light which are receiving attention from those charged with governance. These can have common themes and can overlap with other areas of risk that have been identified. They are being monitored to track whether there are any changes in their risk score. The risks identified as being new or emerging are listed below:

- **Health & Safety:** Health & Safety are in the process of carrying out service H&S challenges with each Head of Service (HoS) which will give a generic view of the level of compliance within teams. The challenges result in an action plan for each HoS where areas of weakness are identified.
- **Contract Management:** Internal Controls are in place, as training and guidance has been provided to relevant staff in June 2014. Any further training needs should be identified in the annual appraisal.
- **Failure of partners to deliver:** Delivery partners have been engaged and consulted on the draft Infrastructure Business Plan throughout its preparation.
- **Staff resources to deliver projects:** Resources in the Estates Service have been agreed in the base budget for the next financial year. A recent financial recruitment exercise has resulted in two new appointments.
- **Financial resources to deliver projects:** The investment fund has been increased to allow further projects to come forward.
- **Triple dip recession and impact on income streams:** The Office for National Statistics (ONS) is raising concerns about the state of the economy and as the Council is reliant on its income streams this risk should remain. Although the triple dip recession did not occur, there is continued uncertainty about the UK economy, post referendum result.

- **Termination of leisure contract either by the Council or the contractor:** To ensure that there are strong working relationships between the contractor and regularly monitor performance.
- **Community Tensions:** To monitor the media reporting of local responses/concerns to local or national issues.

Other than those areas set out above, which are themselves subject of further on-going review, members of the Committee are assured that key systems are in place within the council. This is supported by the internal audit service, which has the responsibility to review independently and report to Committee.

Chichester District Council

Annual Governance Statement 2015-2016

1. Scope of responsibility

Chichester District Council is responsible for ensuring that its business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively. Chichester District Council also has a duty under the Local Government Act 1999 to make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

In discharging this overall responsibility, Chichester District Council is responsible for putting in place proper arrangements for the governance of its affairs, facilitating the effective exercise of its functions, which includes arrangements for the management of risk.

The Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011 require every Council to agree and publish an Annual Governance Statement (AGS).

CIPFA (Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy) have produced an "Application Note to Delivering Good Governance in Local Government: A Framework". This application note builds on the governance requirements of an authority's AGS. In updating this AGS, the application note has been considered.

2. The purpose of the governance framework

The governance framework comprises the systems and processes, culture and values by which the authority is directed and controlled and its activities through which it accounts to, engages with and leads the community. It enables the authority to monitor the achievements of its strategic objectives and to consider whether those objectives have led to the delivery of appropriate cost effective services.

The system of internal control is designed to manage risk to a reasonable level; it cannot eliminate risk completely and therefore provides reasonable and not absolute assurance of effectiveness. It is based on an on-going process designed to identify and prioritise the risks to the achievement of the council's policies, aims and objectives, to evaluate the likelihood and impact should they be realised and to manage them efficiently, effectively and economically.

The Council adopted the CIPFA/SOLACE (Society of Local Authority Chief Executives) Framework in March 2002 which is in place at the 31st March 2016.

3. The Principles of Good Governance

The CIPFA/SOLACE framework Delivering Good Governance in Local Government sets out six core principles of good governance, these are:

3.1. Determining the council's purpose, its vision for the local area and intended outcomes for the Community

Although the Sustainable Community Strategy for Chichester District 2009-2026 is no longer a statutory document, the council continues to be informed by the priorities identified in it. The document has been refreshed during 2016. These are developed further through the corporate plan that sets out the Council's contribution to this partnership document. The Council measures its key priorities by a range of performance indicators which are set out within the Corporate Plan and monitored through Covalent the council's performance monitoring software. Reports on the progress of these performance indicators are available on the council's internet site. In addition the Sustainable Community Strategy sets the vision for working in partnerships with other local and national organisations supported by the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) – Chichester in Partnership, including the publication of a consultation exercise undertaken with partners and stakeholders on behalf of the Local Strategic Partnership.

Cabinet agreed the key financial principles of the 5 year financial strategy, which included continuing to review the council's costs in order to find further savings. A Task and Finish Group meets to discuss the budget, and reviews what is happening in the year and any impact for the new financial year.

The Council publishes its Annual Financial Accounts in accordance with the CIPFA guidelines and International Reporting Standards. As uncertainty continues to surround the current economic and financial climate and in particular public sector spending plans. It is clear that central funding cuts of local councils will continue. The Council is therefore committed to delivering its own services more effectively, in the light of these planned reductions.

The Council continues to track national events, quantifying local impact and taking early action to manage the impact. The objective is to put the Council in the best possible position to deal with the financial issues it faces whilst still protecting the most vulnerable members of the community. It is important that the issues and the scale of the financial position are understood and the council is committed to finding solutions and options. A five year Financial Strategy and Plan was taken to Cabinet and Council in December '15 which detailed the challenges facing the council to provide services that meet community needs with a significantly reduced overall level of resource. The key financial principles in the Financial Strategy offer guidelines for making financial decisions over the next few years, and will assist the Council in achieving balanced budgets.

Following a successful Examination the Council's Local Plan for the period 2014-2019 was adopted on the 1st July 2015, (subject to review within 5 years) and provides greater certainty about growth and development within the plan area. The Council is also taking forward proposals for the Southern Gateway area of Chichester as part of the emerging vision for Chichester City Centre.

3.2. Members and Officers working together to achieve a common purpose with clearly defined functions and roles.

The Council's Constitution clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of the Chief Executive, Chief and Senior Officers, Members and Committees and outlines procedural

standards, scheme of delegation and protocol on Member/Officer relations. A further review of the Constitution has taken place and was taken to Cabinet and full Council. The Leader, Cabinet Members and the Committee Chairmen and deputies receive verbal briefings from the Senior Officers on a regular basis and all Members receive pre-council briefings and participate in workshops particularly for the Local Plan. Members receive monthly bulletins through the Council's intranet site, to keep them informed of any new developments.

The Principal Solicitor was the council's Monitoring Officer, a post responsible for legal compliance; Conduct and Compliance and working with departments to advice on legal issues across the Council. From the 1st May 2016 the Council appointed the post of Legal & Democratic Services Manager which will take over the role of the council's monitoring officer from the Principal Solicitor.

The Head of Finance & Governance is the assigned Section 151 Officer; overall financial responsibilities for this role are detailed within the Constitution.

The Partnership Guidance to assist staff when setting up a partnership was updated in 2015 to strengthen the risk management element of partnerships. Partnership training has been undertaken with Members as part of the induction programme in 2015, guidance has also been published on the intranet for officers. There are currently 10 strategic level partnerships that the council is involved with. An annual review of partnerships is undertaken and the findings are then reported to the Corporate Governance & Audit Committee.

3.3. Promoting our Values and Upholding High Standards of Conduct and Behaviour

The culture of the organisation is founded upon good organisational performance, external recognition, high staff morale and good employee attitude to internal controls. The Workforce Development Plan 2015-2018 sets the Council's vision for providing good quality relevant services to the community, while the Constitution incorporates a Member's and Employees Code of Conduct and a protocol on Members/staff relations. This has been updated and was adopted by the Council following the Joint Employee Consultative Panel which met in April 2015; this will cover the period 2015–2018. Members' misconduct allegations are considered by an assessment sub- committee under the umbrella of the Standards Committee which also investigates allegations of misconduct by Parish Councillors. The Council's monitoring officer will review the case together with an independent person and a decision will be made as to whether there is a case to answer. If a decision is made that there is a case to answer it would be referred to a hearing subcommittee.

There is a complaints procedure in place for the council to receive and investigate any complaints made against its Members or staff, as well as a Register of Interests to ensure that any conflict of interests are open and transparent.

Results of complaints investigated together with the report on all complaints dealt with by the Local Government Ombudsman are reported annually to the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.

The Council takes fraud and corruption and maladministration very seriously. The culture of the council sets the foundation for the prevention of fraud and corruption by creating an

environment that is based upon openness and honesty in all council activities, and has the following policies in place, which aim to prevent or deal with such occurrences:

- Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy
- Whistleblowing Policy – There were no Whistleblowing cases in 2015-2016.
- HR Policies regarding discipline of staff – During 2015/2016 there were 8 dismissals 3 of these were in the probationary period.

The Council's Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy is reviewed and any amendments are subject to the approval of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee, this was last updated in June 2014. Following the disbanding of the Benefits Fraud Team one member of staff has been retained and has become the Council's Corporate Counter Fraud Officer with effect from 30th November, 2015. He has had meetings with all Heads of Service to establish where he can assist departments with fraud investigations. He has identified a total of £25,545 in savings for the period December 2015 to March 2016.

The council has a Corporate Complaints Procedure, forms and guidance for which is available on the council's website. (Results of complaints investigated together with the report on all complaints dealt with by the Local Government Ombudsman are reported annually to the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee).

3.4. Taking informed and transparent decisions and managing risk

All cabinet reports are authorised by the relevant Executive Director and reviewed by the Head of Finance and Governance/Section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer before they are presented to the cabinet. The Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer will also attend Cabinet if required, to answer any specific questions raised by Members.

The Council's risk register are reviewed regularly and presented to the Strategic Risk Group which comprises of Senior Leadership Team (SLT), 3 Members from Cabinet and 3 Members from the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee. Job descriptions of Senior Officers reflect their "Risk Management Responsibilities" and Internal Audit's Annual Audit Plan is drawn up using a risk-based approach, commenting on risk management in the area under review in their report. On a bi-annual basis the Council's Risk Registers including any new and emerging risks is presented to the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee and then onto Cabinet. During 2015/2016 the six highest risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register were:-

- Financial Resilience
- Skills / Capability / Capacity
- Business Continuity
- Cyber Risk Attack Across Entire Estate
- Non Achievement of Recycling Target of 50% by 2020
- Devolution of Public Services

Major projects incorporate a full risk assessment prior to action being taken. As the project progresses a risk assessment is included in the Project Initiation Document (PID) report to committee and during the project risks are reviewed with the cabinet member concerned and updated as necessary.

The Health & Safety Manager has continued to work with services to ensure that there is an adequate business continuity plan and that the findings from the Business Impact

Analysis prepared by Zurich have been implemented. In December 2014 a full exercise was carried out which raised a number of actions; these were completed by the end of March 2014. A decision was made to cease using Shadow Planner and to replace it with a system called Resilience Direct. This is a storage solution and can be used to store key documents should the Council's system go down. Service functions are categorised as critical (systems up and running in 3 days) and non-critical (over 3 days). The Health & Safety Manager will continue to test the robustness of the plans. The Health & Safety Manager together with Zurich is intending to review the existing business impact analysis during the financial year 2016/2017.

The Council operates a shared service with Arun for the provision of its Emergency Planning service. The Emergency Planning Officer will be based between Arun and Chichester with two members of the Housing and Environment Service assisting.

3.5. Effective Management – Capacity and capability of Members and Officers

A comprehensive induction and training programme exists for officers and Members. The training programme incorporates dealing with and understanding new and current legislation, understanding their role as a ward member and developing their personal skills. Training programmes for staff are incorporated into staff appraisals and development programmes.

Member's attendance at meetings is recorded on the modern gov system. In the event of continual non-attendance the matter would be passed to the leader of the political group concerned for action to be taken. Performance issues relating to staff are dealt with by the Manager / Head of Service. An officer's employee specification includes competencies, and is currently included in their annual appraisal. Responsibility for organisational development has moved from HR to the Corporate Improvement Team. Statutory officers have employee specifications that match the legislative requirements of their role.

3.6. Engaging with local people and other stakeholders to ensure robust accountability

The Council's committee meetings are held in public and are recorded; these recordings are suspended when the item goes into part 2. The press and public are only excluded when the report is presented as a Part 2 item in accordance with the applicable paragraph(s) within Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972. In addition audio recordings are also held on the Council's website.

The Council's vision and strategy is included in the Corporate Plan see <http://www.chichester.gov.uk/corporateplan> the annual performance report on the Council's Corporate Plan is reviewed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee mid-year and then the Annual Report of the Corporate Plan goes to Cabinet and Council for approval. The Statement of Accounts, expenditure over £500 and the Senior Staff Pay Policy is available on the Council's website.

The Council's contract with other councils in West Sussex, funded by Government Grant for the provision of e-petition software expired in December 2013. Since then the Council has encouraged organisations to start their own Petitions one such petition was the Traders Market petition.

On-line consultation methods continue to be used, webhost software, enables surveys to be designed, produced and analysed electronically. These surveys are accessed via the Councils website.

On-line polls have continued to be used, which allows members of the public to provide their views on a range of topics in which the Council is involved.

Community Forums – Regular meetings with Parish Councils have continued at Forum level over the year. These meetings are held quarterly and provide a mechanism to engage with the Parishes and to communicate and review information collectively.

The Council continues with its work on Youth Engagement , the Community Wardens main areas of activity are encouraging and increasing community involvement, dealing with environmental issues (e.g. graffiti, litter, abandoned cars, dog fouling etc) within the area by working with appropriate agencies working with police, police community support officers (PCSOs) and local communities to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and fear of crime in the area including providing intelligence and evidence to the police and acting as a professional witness.

4. Review of effectiveness

The Council has responsibility to review the effectiveness of its governance framework. The review of the effectiveness is undertaken by the work of the Corporate Management Team (which is SLT and Heads of Service) who have responsibility for the development and maintenance of the governance environment. The Principal Auditor's annual report and comments made by the external auditor also adds to the effectiveness of the governance framework at the council. The process that has been applied in maintaining and reviewing the system of governance includes the following elements:-

The Council adopted a constitution to ensure it is efficient, transparent, and accountable to local people. Some of these processes are required by law; others are based on decisions made by the council. It is the responsibility of the Council's Monitoring Officer who reviews the constitution as and when required to ensure that it continues to operate effectively.

The Council is made up of 48 Council Members four of these Members take up the roles of Leader and Deputy Leader of the council, Chairman and Deputy Chairman. The Leader and Deputy Leader plus five Cabinet Members are appointed with specific areas of responsibility. There is currently a review being undertaken by the Local Government Boundary commission to reduce the number of Councillors from 48 to 36. This review was requested by the Council.

The Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committee has the power to make reports and recommendations to the Council's Executive on issues which affect the area. The Committee can require Members and Officers to attend meetings and for partner authorities to provide information. The Committee also reviews and scrutinises decisions and may call in a decision made by the council's Executive which has not yet been implemented. The Council also takes part in county wide joint scrutiny reviews on issues affecting the wider area and has a representative on the West Sussex County Council Health and Social Care Select Committee to allow the authority to contribute to health related reviews. In addition to the responsibilities outlined within the statement, the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee also has responsibilities for:

- Control and monitoring arrangements for risk.
- Review and determination of the Internal Audit priorities based on the Governance issues and the risks assessments made.
- Review progress / effectiveness and probity of Corporate Governance within the authority.
- Report to full Council on significant issues or concerns raised.
- Review and make recommendations to Cabinet and the council on the council's financial regulations and contract standing orders.
- Consider reports from the Head of Finance & Governance on the council's financial control system, the council's insurance policies and self-insurance arrangements.
- Monitor the operation of the Members Allowance scheme; approve annually the final accounts of the council and as required to monitor the efficiency of the council's services.

The Corporate Governance & Audit Committee meets five times during the year to consider regular reports from Internal Audit on system reviews, reports from the Head of Finance & Governance and Accountancy Services Manager in addition to Annual Audit and inspection letters from (EY) the nominated External Auditor.

Following the Localism Act the Council agreed to set up a Standards task and finish group to look at the future workings of the standards regime and also to determine the terms of reference which were approved by Full Council.

At the meeting of Full Council on 22nd September 2015 members approved the new arrangements for the Standards Committee. The make-up of the committee will consist of seven members of the Council; there are two Sub Committees (Assessment Sub-Committee and Hearing Sub-Committee) made up of three Members of the Standards Committee, in addition an independent person attends in an advisory capacity. Where the complaint is against a Parish Councillor the independent person or the Parish representative must not have had close association with the accused.

The overall responsibility of Internal Audit is to continually review the adequacy of the council's internal control's and report where necessary, any recommendations to management. Internal Audit reviews are designed to assess the effectiveness of the internal controls on which the council relies for managing risk. A report is prepared annually by Internal Audit on the effectiveness of the section. Internal Audit produces a three year plan which includes; the resources of the section and the number of audits to be undertaken during each year. The annual audit plan is approved by the Corporate Governance & Audit Committee and progress against this plan is reported 5 times during the year.

5. Significant Governance Issues

There were no significant governance issues identified in 2015/2016.

6. Risks Identified

The risks that the Council identified during 2015-2016 are detailed below:

Risk	Mitigating Action	Responsibility	Target date
Financial Resilience	The council needs to maintain a deliverable budget with the resources to fund services and council priorities and achieve action and priorities including deficit reduction plans, and to maximise income streams.	SLT, Head of Finance & Governance	Implement the Deficit Reduction Plan which will identify efficiencies or increased income to address the shortfall expected by 2021/2022.
Loss of income streams.			
Skills / Capability / Capacity	The Workforce Development Plan has been completed and has been applied from the 1 st April '16 as part of the appraisal process. The Hay review and the high achiever scheme and the mentoring scheme has yet to come fully into effect. The new pay strategy report went to Cabinet in September 2016.	SLT, Head of Business Improvement / HR Manager	With the Work Force Development Plan taking effect from the 1 st April 16, other areas mention will be kept under review by the Head of Business Improvement and the HR Manager.
Business Continuity	The council now have Business Continuity document storage solution hosted off site (on a system called Resilience Direct) which means that the staff can access key documents in the event of loss of IT services and systems.	Chief Executive Director / Service Manager	The Health & Safety Manager will continue to test the robustness of the plans with CMT.
Cyber Risk Attack across Entire Estate	Procedures and Policies are in place to deal with the risk. Controls in place include email filtering, and Anti-Virus software.	SLT / Head of Business Improvement	Situation On-going has a target date of 31 st March 2017.
Non-Achievement of Recycling Target of 50% by 2020	The council is working with all other districts within West Sussex on a uniform approach to achieve the 2020 target. There is a partnership working through the inter-authority waste group to consider how to reduce residual waste and increase recycling	SLT / Head of Service – Contract Services	1 st January 2020
Devolution of Public Services	Meetings have been held following positive feedback from the Minister, but further work is required to develop the details for each work	Chief Executive	Situation On - going

Risk	Mitigating Action	Responsibility	Target date
	stream. Each council will then be asked to confirm its commitment to devolution and endorse a set of proposals that will formally be submitted to the Government.		

The process of preparing the Annual Governance Statement has in itself added value to the Corporate Governance and Internal Control framework of the Council.

7. Certification / Effectiveness of Governance Arrangements

The Council is committed to the Governance arrangements and the stewardship of its resources. This commitment can be demonstrated by the following arrangements, where Governance is discussed and reviewed and where necessary actioned.

- Internal Audit - Has a three-year plan of Audits where Governance arrangements are reviewed.
- Corporate Governance & Audit Committee – Discuss the findings of the Audit Reports and any other issues that relate to Governance.
- Corporate Management Team – Review and update Governance arrangements, identify and review new and emerging risks.
- Risk Register – To keep risks, which could affect the Council, under review.

It is therefore our opinion that Corporate Governance, along with supporting controls and procedures, remains very strong within the Council.

Chichester District Council

COUNCIL

22 November 2016

Appointments to Committees and External Organisations

1. Contacts

Mr T Dignum, Leader of the Council

Tel: 01243 538585 Email: tdignum@chichester.gov.uk

Mrs D Shepherd, Chief Executive

Tel: 01243 534511 Email: dshepherd@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

2.1. That the Council appoints nominated members a) to serve on committees and b) to represent the Council on external organisations as detailed in paragraph 4.

3. Background

3.1 Mr B Finch, who held the Cabinet responsibility for Support Services, resigned on Friday 7 October 2016. As a result, the Leader has announced a change to his Cabinet and a reshuffle of Cabinet Member responsibilities under his constitutional discretion. The political balance has not been affected by these changes.

3.2 Paragraph 4 reflects the proposed changes to memberships of committees and member representations on external organisations as a result of this reshuffle.

4. Changes to membership

4.1 The following changes of membership have been suggested to committees:

- Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Mrs P Plant is replaced by Mr J Connor
- Planning Committee: Mrs C Purnell is to remain on the committee, but relinquishes the role of Vice-Chairman to Mrs J Kilby
- General Licensing Committee: Mr R Barrow is replaced by Mrs C Purnell and Mrs P Plant is replaced by Mr N Galloway
- Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee: as for the General Licensing Committee
- Investigation and Disciplinary Committee: Mr B Finch is replaced by Mrs P Plant

4.2 The following changes have been suggested to the Council's representation on external organisations:

- Local Government Association – Coastal Issues Special Interest Group: Mr R Barrow is replaced by Mr C Purnell

- South East Employers: Mr B Finch is replaced by Mrs P Plant
- Standing Conference on Problems Associated with the Coastline: Mr R Barrow is replaced by Mrs C Purnell
- West Sussex Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee: Mrs P Plant is replaced by C Neville
- iESE Transformation Limited - Mr B Finch is replaced by Mrs P Plant

5. Appendices

None

6. Background papers

None

Chichester District Council

COUNCIL

22 November 2016

Committee Calendar 2017/18

1. Contacts

Cabinet Member:

Mrs Philippa Hardwick, Cabinet Member for Finance & Governance Services
Tel: 01243 642464

Report Author:

Bambi Jones, Principal Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 01243 534685 E-mail: bjones@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

That the calendar of meetings for the Council year 2017-2018 be approved.

3. Outcome to be achieved

3.1 A timetable which handles the Council's business effectively and enables members and officers to plan ahead.

3. Proposal

4.1 The Constitution requires that 'ordinary meetings of the Council and of Committees shall be held generally in accordance with a programme to be approved by the Council, although the dates and times of meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman'.

4.2 The Council is requested to approve its committee timetable for the ensuing Council year (May 2017 to May 2018). The draft calendar of meetings is attached at Appendix 1.

4.3 The calendar is prepared on the following basis:

- Avoiding meetings during major school holidays (the West Sussex County Council school holiday dates are shaded)
- There are no changes to the current cycle and number of meetings
- No meetings have been arranged during the week of the Local Government Association Conference (4-6 July 2017)
- Allowing for the West Sussex County Council election on 4 May 2017
- Chichester North and South Community Local Committees (CLCs) are included based on a timetable from West Sussex County Council
- The start times for meetings will be agreed at the first meeting in the new Council year.

- The proposed dates may be subject to change by the Council or by relevant committee Chairmen if the need arises. Special meetings may also be arranged as required.

4. Appendix

4.1 Committee timetable 2017-18

4. Background papers

5.1 None

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2017-2018

Committee	Abbr	Day of week	Time	Meetings p.a.	Venue for meetings
Business Routeing Panel	BRP	Monday	14:00	1	Committee Rooms or Training Rooms
Cabinet		Tuesday	09:30	11	Committee Room 2 (audio)
Community Safety Partnership	CSP	Thursday	07:12	4	Committee Room or Arun DC
Corporate Governance & Audit Committee	CGAC	Thursday	09:30	5	Committee Room 2 (audio)
Council		Tuesday	14:00	6	Combined committee rooms
Development Plan & Infrastructure Panel	DPIP	Thursday	09:30	11	Committee Rooms or Training Rooms
Licensing Committee		Wednesday	09:30	3	Committee Room 2 (audio)
Grants & Concessions Panel	GCP	Wednesday	09:30	5	Either committee room
Infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group	IJMLG	Friday	09:30	2	Committee Rooms or Training Rooms
Joint Employee Consultative Committee	JECP	Monday	09:30	4	Either committee room
Local Strategic Partnership	LSP	Tuesday	14:00	4	Either Committee Room
Overview & Scrutiny Committee	OSC	Tuesday	09:30	6	Committee Room 2 (audio)
Planning Committee		Wednesday	09:30	11	Combined committee rooms
Planning Site Visit	SV	Monday	09:30	11	Planning site
Strategic Risk Group	SRG	Thursday	14:00	2	Committee Room 2
Waste & Recycling Panel	W&RP	Monday	10:00	4	Committee Rooms or Training Rooms
WSCC Community Local Committees (North and South Chichester)	CLC		19:00	6	Around the district

WSCC School Term dates

Summer term	24 April 2017 to 25 July 2017
Autumn term	4 September 2017 to 20 December 2017
Spring term	4 January 2018 to 29 March 2018
Summer term	16 April 2018 to 25 July 2018

	MAY 2017	JUNE 2017	JULY 2017	AUGUST 2017	SEPTEMBER 2017	OCTOBER 2017
Monday	1 May Day		3			2 W&RP
Tuesday	2		4 LGA Conference	1		3 Cabinet / LSP pm
Wednesday	3		5 LGA Conference	2		4 Licensing
Thursday	4 WSCC Elections	1	6 LGA Conference	3		5
Friday	5	2	7	4	1	6
Monday	8 JECF	5	10 W&RP	7	4	9 Planning SV
Tuesday	9 Cabinet	6 Cabinet / LSP pm	11 Cabinet	8	5 Cabinet	10
Wednesday	10	7 KEEP FREE	12 GCP	9	6	11 Planning Committee
Thursday	11	8	13 CSP am	10	7 DPIP	12
Friday	12	9	14	11	8 IJMLG	13
Monday	15	12	17 Planning SV	14 Planning SV	11 Planning SV	16
Tuesday	16 Annual Council	13 OSC	18	15	12 OSC	17
Wednesday	17	14 Licensing	19 Planning Committee	16 Planning Committee	13 Planning Committee	18 GCP
Thursday	18 DPIP	15 DPIP	20 DPIP (TR)	17	14	19 DPIP am / CSP am
Friday	19	16	21	18	15	20
Monday	22 Planning SV	19 Planning SV	24	21	18	23
Tuesday	23	20 N Chi CLC	25 Council	22	19 Council	24
Wednesday	24 Planning Committee	21 Planning Committee	26	23	20 All Parishes eve	25
Thursday	25	22	27	24	21	26
Friday	26	23	28	25	22	27
Monday	29 Spring Bank Holiday	26 JECF	31	28 Summer Bank Holiday	25 JECF	30
Tuesday	30	27 S Chi CLC		29	26	31 S Chi CLC
Wednesday	31	28		30	27 GCP	
Thursday		29 CGAC		31	28 CGAC	
Friday		30			29	

	NOVEMBER 2017	DECEMBER 2017	JANUARY 2018	FEBRUARY 2018	MARCH 2018	APRIL 2018	MAY 2018
Monday			1 New Year's day			2 Easter Monday	
Tuesday			2			3 Cabinet	1
Wednesday	1		3			4	2 Cabinet
Thursday	2 SRG pm		4	1	1	5	3
Friday	3	1	5	2	2	6	4
Monday	6	4	8 W&RP	5 Planning SV	5	9	7 May Day
Tuesday	7 Cabinet	5 Cabinet / LSP pm	9 Cabinet	6 Cabinet	6 Council / N Chi CLC	10	8
Wednesday	8	6	10	7 Planning Committee	7	11	9
Thursday	9 DPIP	7 DPIP	11 DPIP	8	8 SRG pm	12	10
Friday	10	8 IJMLG	12	9	9	13	11
Monday	13 Planning SV	11 Planning SV	15 Planning SV	12	12 Planning SV	16 Planning SV	14 Planning SV
Tuesday	14 OSC / N Chi CLC	12	16 OSC	13	13 Cabinet	17	15 OSC
Wednesday	15 Planning Committee	13 Planning Committee	17 Planning Committee	14	14 Planning Committee	18 Planning Committee	16 Planning Committee
Thursday	16	14	18	15	15 DPIP (TR)/ LSP pm	19	17
Friday	17	15	19	16	16	20	18
Monday	20	18	22	19 JECP	19	23 W&RP	21 JECP
Tuesday	21 Council	19	23 Council	20 S Chi CLC	20 SRG pm	24 DPIP	22 Annual Council
Wednesday	22	20	24	21	21 GCP	25 All Parishes eve	23
Thursday	23 CGAC	21	25 CGAC am / CSP am	22 DPIP	22 OSC	26 CSP am	24 DPIP
Friday	24	22	26	23	23	27	25
Monday	27	25 Xmas day	29	26	26 BRP	30	28 Spring Bank Holiday
Tuesday	28	26 Boxing day	30	27	27 SRG		29
Wednesday	29	27	31 GCP	28	28 Licensing		30
Thursday	30	28			29 CGAC		31
Friday		29			30 Good Friday		