

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD
Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Graham Thrussell on 01243 534653
Email: gthrussell@chichester.gov.uk

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



A meeting of the **Cabinet** will be held in Committee Room 2 at East Pallant House on **Tuesday 9 January 2018 at 09:30**

MEMBERS: Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr J Connor, Mrs J Kilby, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

AGENDA

1 **Chairman's Announcements**

The chairman will make any specific announcements for this meeting and advise of any late items which will be given consideration under agenda item 14 (a) or (b).

Apologies for absence will be taken at this point.

2 **Approval of Minutes** (pages 1 to 16)

The Cabinet is requested to approve as a correct record the minutes of its meeting on Tuesday 5 December 2017, a copy of which is circulated with this agenda.

3 **Declarations of Interests**

Members are requested to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests which they might have in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.

4 **Public Question Time**

In accordance with Chichester District Council's scheme for public question time and with reference to standing order 6 in part 4 A and section 5.6 in Part 5 of the Chichester District Council *Constitution*, the Cabinet will receive any questions which have been submitted by members of the public in writing by 12:00 on the previous working day. The total time allocated for public question time is 15 minutes subject to the chairman's discretion to extend that period.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL

5 **Commissioning of West Sussex Community Advice Services** (pages 17 to 20)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and to make the following resolutions and the recommendation to the Council:

A - RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CABINET

- (1) That the Cabinet agrees to the continuation of the Funding Partnership to commission Community Advice Service across West Sussex beyond 2018 with West Sussex County Council as the lead authority and subject to confirmation of funding by other partners.
- (2) That the Cabinet considers its likely support for the service beyond the bridging period to guide the recommissioning work of the Funding Partnership.
- (3) That the Cabinet delegates authority to the Head of Community Services to agree the Terms of Reference for the Funding Partnership and changes to the Service Specification in agreeing a Bridging Contract.

B - RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That the Cabinet recommends to Council that the availability of £74,000 per annum for up to two years to achieve a bridging contract with the existing provider for the Community Advice Service be approved.

6 Revised Corporate Plan 2018-2021 (pages 21 to 24)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its nine appendices in the agenda supplement and to make the recommendations to the Council and the resolution set out below:

A - RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL

- (1) That the Council be recommended to approve the revised Corporate Plan for 2018-2021 as set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report.
- (2) That, subject to the Cabinet's agreement in the resolution below to approve the new project proposals for 2018-2019, the Council approves £130,000 from Chichester District Council's General Fund Reserve to fund two projects as set out in para 5.7 of the agenda report.

B - RESOLUTION BY THE CABINET

That the new project proposals for 2018-2019 as set out in appendices 2 to 9 to the agenda report be agreed in principle subject to full Project Initiation Document (PID) approval.

7 Revised Local Development Scheme 2018-2021 (pages 25 to 28)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its appendix in the agenda supplement and to make the following recommendation to the Council:

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That the revised Local Development Scheme 2018-2021 be approved.

8 **Site Allocation - Development Plan Document 2014-2029 - Proposed Modifications Consultation** (pages 29 to 31)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its two appendices in the agenda supplement and to make the following recommendations to the Council:

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL

- (1) That the Site Allocation Development Plan Document Further Proposed Main Modifications (set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report) and the Further Proposed Minor Modifications (set out in appendix 2 to the agenda report) be approved for public consultation.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Services, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services, to enable minor editorial and typographical amendments to be made to the document prior to publication.

9 **Statement of Community Involvement** (pages 32 to 34)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and its two appendices in the agenda supplement and to make the following recommendation to the Council:

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That the Statement of Community Involvement be adopted.

10 **Supporting New and Existing Small Businesses** (pages 35 to 39)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and to make the following recommendation to the Council and resolutions:

A - RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

That (a) the establishment of the Shop Front Improvement Grant Scheme and Provision of Retail Training for independent retailers as set out in sections 4.2 to 4.5 of the agenda report supported by £168,800 allocated from the Pooled Business Rates Fund be approved and (b) the Head of Commercial Services be authorised to approve shop front improvement grants under the Scheme.

B - RESOLUTIONS BY THE CABINET

- (1) That the continuation of the Enabling Grant Scheme for new and existing small businesses as set out in section 4.1 of the agenda report supported by £71,428 allocated from the Pooled Business Rates Fund and that the Head of Commercial Services be authorised to approve grants under the Scheme.
- (2) That the allocation of additional funding for Chichester District Council's Choose Work Programme as set out in section 4.6 supported by £32,000 from the Pooled Business Rates Fund be implemented.

- (3) That a record of all grants allocated under the Enabling Grant Scheme and Shop Front Improvement Grant Scheme be reported to the Grants and Concessions Panel to ensure co-ordination of the approval processes.

KEY DECISIONS

11 **Rough Sleepers Outreach Worker** (pages 40 to 43)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and to make the following resolution:

That the creation of a Rough Sleeper Outreach Worker post at a cost of £40,000 per annum to be funded from the base budget, subject to the annual budget process, be approved.

OTHER DECISIONS

12 **Appointments to Panels, Forums and other Groups 2017-2018** (pages 44 to 45)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and to make the following resolution:

- (1) That Peter Wilding as the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services (with responsibility for risk management) be appointed to sit on the Strategic Risk Group in place of Philippa Hardwick.
- (2) That Bob Hayes be appointed to succeed Mark Dunn on the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel.
- (3) That Francis Hobbs be appointed to represent Chichester District Council on Visit Chichester Limited in place of Paul Over.

13 **Section 106 Community Facilities - St Wilfrid's Church Hall Chidham** (pages 46 to 49)

The Cabinet is requested to consider the agenda report and the Part II restricted* appendix for the information of members and relevant officers only (printed on salmon paper) and to make the following resolution:

That £57,368 section 106 Community Facilities monies be released to Chidham Parochial Church Council for identified enhancements to St Wilfrid's Church Hall.

[***Note** Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the *Local Government Act 1972*]

14 Late Items

- (a) Items added to the agenda papers and made available for public inspection
- (b) Items which the chairman has agreed should be taken as matters of urgency by reason of special circumstances to be reported at the meeting

15 Exclusion of the Press and Public

The Cabinet might be asked to discuss the Part II restricted appendix to the Part I report for agenda item 13 (Section 106 Community Facilities – St Wilfrid’s Church Hall Chidham), in which case it will need to consider making a resolution as to whether the public including the press should be excluded from the meeting on the following ground of exemption in Schedule 12A to the *Local Government Act 1972* namely Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) 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.

[**Note** The appendix to the report for agenda item 13 within this part of the agenda is attached for Chichester District Council members and relevant officers only (printed on salmon paper)]

NOTES

- (1) The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any item of business wherever it is likely that there would be disclosure of “exempt information” as defined in section 100A of and Schedule 12A to the *Local Government Act 1972*.
- (2) The press and public may view the report appendices which are not included with their copy of the agenda on the Council’s website at [Chichester District Council - Minutes, agendas and reports](#). unless they contain exempt information.
- (3) Subject to the provisions allowing the exclusion of the press and public, the photographing, filming or recording of this meeting from the public seating area is permitted. To assist with the management of the meeting, anyone wishing to do this is asked to inform the chairman of the meeting of their intentions before the meeting starts. The use of mobile devices for access to social media is permitted, but these should be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting. Those undertaking such activities must do so discreetly and not disrupt the meeting, for example by oral commentary, excessive noise, distracting movement or flash photography. Filming of children, vulnerable adults or members of the audience who object should be avoided. [Standing Order 11.3 of Chichester District Council’s *Constitution*]
- (4) A key decision means an executive decision which is likely to:
 - result in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the Council’s budget for the service or function to which the decision relates or
 - be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area

comprising one or more wards in the Council's area or

- incur expenditure, generate income, or produce savings greater than £100,000

NON-CABINET MEMBER COUNCILLORS SPEAKING AT THE CABINET

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

The Leader of the Council intends to apply this standing order at Cabinet meetings by requesting that members should *normally* seek his consent in writing by email in advance of the meeting. They should do this by noon on the day before the meeting, outlining the substance of the matter that they wish to raise. The word normally is emphasised because there may be unforeseen circumstances where a member can assist the conduct of business by his or her contribution and where he would therefore retain his discretion to allow the contribution without notice.



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 2 at East Pallant House Chichester on Tuesday 5 December 2017 at 09:30

Members Present

Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr J Connor, Mrs P Hardwick, Mrs J Kilby, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

Members Absent

Officers Present

Mrs H Belenger (Accountancy Services Manager), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr M Catlow (Group Accountant (Technical and Exchequer)), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Head of Commercial Services), Mr D Hyland (Community and Partnerships Support Manager), Mr P Jobson (Taxation Manager), Mrs T Murphy (Parking Services Manager), Mr S Oates (Economic Development Manager), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer)

440 Chairman's Announcements

Mr Dignum welcomed the members of the public, the press representatives and Chichester District Council (CDC) members and officers who were present for this meeting. He summarised the emergency evacuation procedure.

There were no apologies for absence and all members of the Cabinet were present.

There were no late items for consideration at this meeting.

Mr Dignum said that this would be Mrs Hardwick's final meeting as a member of the Cabinet following her decision to relinquish her role by virtue of her other commitments. He paid tribute to her competent and invaluable contribution in fulfilling the Finance and Governance Services portfolio. He had no doubt that she would continue to serve on other committees of Chichester District Council with that same ability and approach.

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

441 **Approval of Minutes**

The Cabinet received the minutes of its meeting on Tuesday 7 November 2017, which had been circulated with the second agenda supplement.

There were no proposed changes to the minutes.

Decision

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

RESOLVED

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

442 **Declarations of Interests**

Mr Dignum and Mrs Kilby each declared a personal interest as members of Chichester City Council in respect of those agenda items where it was consulted or otherwise involved in or materially affected by the subject matter, namely items 7, 8 and 9.

Mr Oakley, the CDC ward member for Tangmere, was present as an observer and, with the prior permission of Mr Dignum, addressed the Cabinet during agenda item 5. At the start of his remarks he declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council and the chairman of its Chichester South Local Committee.

443 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted for this meeting.

444 **Chichester Growth Deal 2017-2023**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its two appendices.

The report was presented by Mr Dignum.

Mrs Hotchkiss was in attendance for this item.

In commending the Growth Deal (GD) to the Cabinet, Mr Dignum said that the GD was between West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and CDC and had its origin in the Chichester Place Plan agreed in 2016 between those two local authorities. The purpose of the GD was to define the agreement between WSCC and CDC on the priority projects for growth within Chichester District. WSCC and CDC officers were recommending that partnership working should be focused on four major projects:

- Chichester City Vision: to complete a transport feasibility study for the city that supported the delivery of the Vision and the Chichester Local Plan.

- Chichester Southern Gateway: to enhance this key gateway to the city and deliver a mixed-use development covering 30 acres which included office, retail, residential and leisure uses. The Southern Gateway Masterplan had received Council approval on 21 November 2017.
- Chichester Northern Gateway: to enhance this key gateway to the city and deliver a mixed-use development which included office, retail, residential and leisure uses.
- Gigabit West Sussex Fibre Broadband Project: to improve digital connectivity in Chichester. This project would be financed by a government grant specifically restricted to linking central and local government offices.

WSSC and CDC would agree opportunities for aligning and prioritising funding from all available funding streams, eg Business Rates Retention Scheme, Local Growth Fund, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), section 106 etc, to support the delivery of the four priorities identified within the GD. It should be understood, however, that the Growth Board possessed no executive decision powers, as was made clear in section 7.2 of the report and section 3 of the terms of reference in appendix 1, which stated that any recommendation of funding allocations would require to be taken through the appropriate CDC and WSSC decision process respectively for approval.

Therefore it was proposed that the role and existing terms of reference of the current Infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group (IJMLG) would be subsumed into the Growth Board. This would ensure that the existing arrangements for considering spending bids and priorities for CIL as part of the preparation of the annual Infrastructure Business Plan were retained. Decisions about CIL spend would, however, remain with CDC's Cabinet and Council.

The GD priorities would be delivered through a series of associated projects brought together and managed within an overall Growth Programme to be progressed over the next five years ie 2018 to 2023.

The delivery of the GD would be overseen by a Growth Board of WSSC and CDC members and officers.

He proposed that there should be an amendment to the terms of reference to allow three rather than two representatives from each of the authorities, the three CDC members being Mrs Taylor, Mr Oakley and himself, each of whom were the current CDC members of the IJMLG.

CDC would lead on the Southern Gateway major project and WSSC would lead the other three major projects.

The projects were self-evidently focused on Chichester city but this was because of the scale of those projects. WSSC naturally wished to focus on major projects with

the greatest benefits. There were no projects of such a scale in prospect for the rural towns. It was also important to recognise that all Chichester District's residents would also benefit from the economic growth of the city and from investment returns on the District's assets in the city.

Mrs Hotchkiss did not wish to add to Mr Dignum's introduction.

During the debate members supported the GD. They welcomed the confirmation given by Mr Dignum that the Growth Board would not be a decision-making body, that its recommendations as to funding allocations would be considered by CDC's Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel (DPIP), the Cabinet and the Council (clause 3.0 of the terms of reference), that the annual review of its decisions (clause 4.0) would be undertaken by CDC's Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet, and that the current three CDC members of the IJMLG would (if approved) transfer to the Growth Board and so afford continuity of their experience and involvement. The transport feasibility study to support delivery of the Chichester *Vision* (page 10) was welcomed and should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity. Notwithstanding that the Gigabit project was unavoidably city-centric due to the government's requirement that it must be for the benefit of local government and also to EU funding rules, it was recognised that the county's district and borough councils needed to promote the extension of the project to the rural areas which often had poor broadband connections.

With the prior permission of Mr Dignum, Mr Oakley addressed the Cabinet. He said that whilst he agreed in principle with the GD and the Growth Board he sought certain reassurances:

- Given the city-centric focus of the GD and the final sentence of para 5.6 in the report, the pursuit of meritorious projects elsewhere in Chichester District could be compromised.
- How the governance arrangements would apply to WSCC's Chichester South County Local Committee (CSCLC) and the reason for not mentioning its North equivalent.
- How the IJMLG's role would function after it had been subsumed into the Growth Board given that the Board itself would concentrate on priority projects and CDC's DPIP's focus would be on the *Chichester Local Plan*. There was a concern that the IJMLG's input might be eclipsed. Infrastructure needs outside the city existed and would require CIL funding.

In reply, Mr Dignum said (with contributions also from Mrs Shepherd and Mrs Hotchkiss):

- The GD's focus was on the city because that was where the scale of projects existed. The Growth Board would be concerned only with joint projects which required WSCC funding. Since WSCC would take the lead on projects (except the Southern Gateway regeneration), if CDC did not follow suit it would have to lead its own projects unaided. Mrs Shepherd advised that if the

GD was not signed there would be neither WSCC support nor funding from the region's Local Enterprise Partnership.

- Officers had been requested to liaise with WSCC about inclusion of the reference to the CSCLC since that committee was irrelevant to the GD process. Mrs Hotchkiss added that having discussed the point with her opposite number at WSCC it had been agreed that the paragraph that referred to the CSCLC would be amended to say that the CSCLC would have a purely consultative role.
- As to the monitoring and scrutiny of CIL projects, the decision-making structure for CIL expenditure was CDC's DPIP, the Cabinet and the Council and the Growth Board would continue to exercise the IJMLG's current scrutiny function.

At the close of the debate the need to make the following amendments was noted and agreed by the Cabinet.

First, textual corrections to the documents in the two appendices as follows:

- (1) In appendix A to appendix 1 on page 13 the reference to 'Adur & Worthing' in the fourth bullet point in the final (Outcomes) section of the Gigabit table should be replaced with 'Chichester District'.
- (2) In the terms of reference in appendix 2 on page 14, the first para in clause 1.0, there should be inserted 'and the Council' after 'Cabinet' in the first line.

Secondly, the recommendations in section 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 of the report should be amended as advised by Mr Over in a sheet circulated to the Cabinet by (a) referring to two (instead of only one) additional members in 2.1.2; (b) adding 'and terms of reference' after 'role' in 2.1.3; and (c) insert '(as amended)' in 2.1.4.

Decision

At the end of the debate the Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands to support the recommendations in their amended form to be made to the Council and in addition the resolution (which had not been amended).

RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

That the Council:

- (1) Approves the Growth Deal between West Sussex County Council and Chichester District Council as set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report, subject to the aforesaid amendments in appendix A to appendix 1 and in appendix 2.
- (2) Approves the appointment of the Leader of the Council, Susan Taylor and Simon Oakley recommended by the Cabinet to represent Chichester District Council on the Growth Board.

- (3) Dissolves the Infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group and subsumes its role and terms of reference into the Growth Board.
- (4) Approves the terms of reference of the Growth Board (as amended) contained in appendix 2 to the agenda report subject to comments from West Sussex County Council

RESOLVED

That authority be delegated to the Head of Commercial Services to agree minor amendments to the final Growth Deal document, following consultation with the Leader of the Council.

445 Financial Strategy and Plan 2018-2019

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its three appendices, the third of which had been omitted from the agenda papers and was circulated subsequently in the first agenda supplement.

The report was presented by Mrs Hardwick.

Mrs Belenger was in attendance for this item.

In commending the recommendations to the Cabinet, Mrs Hardwick said that the report updated the financial strategy and plan for 2018-2019 and created the framework within which the council tax base would be set (agenda item 9) and set the scene for the budget in February 2018.

The backdrop to the strategy was the uncertain geo-political climate and reducing central government funding for local government. CDC was two years into its four-year agreed settlement with central government, so there was a degree of certainty over some parts of the funding stream, although only until 2019-2020. Thereafter retained business rates would provide an increased proportion of funding but that source and much of CDC's other income eg from car parks and planning fees was fairly unpredictable, reflecting the state of the wider economy. Thus CDC would have to navigate through financial uncertainty into a new era outside the EU.

Appendix 2 showed the updated five-year model, reflecting the consolidated budget from the service areas, the four-year settlement and the most up-to-date estimates for the wider CDC activities including the Programme Boards and other planned savings.

Confirmation was awaited from the government as to whether CDC could raise council tax by 2% or the higher rise (for CDC) of £5 (for a so-called Band D property) without a referendum. This higher rise was applied in 2016 and the current model assumed the higher (£5) increase this year as the government's consultation proposed that option for at least one more year with increases of 2% thereafter.

The model reflected various uncertainties and risks set out in para 4.16, from which she drew particular attention to (a) income from fees and charges; (b) pay

settlements; (c) localisation of business rates; and (d) the new homes bonus (the parish allocation in respect of which was the subject of the next agenda item).

Appendix 1 set out the key financial principles behind the financial strategy and appendix 3 summarised the resources position, with the up-to-date position of CDC's reserves and assets, demonstrating that CDC remained in a sound and sustainable prospective financial state.

As previously notified to the Cabinet and circulated on a sheet immediately prior to the start of this meeting, the third recommendation in para 3.3 of the report had been amended twice so that it now read:

'That a minimum level of general fund reserves be set at £5m and to maintain the £1.3m provision for revenue support, having considered the recommendations from the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.'

She expressed her own and the Cabinet's gratitude to Mrs Belenger and her team.

Mrs Belenger did not wish to add to Mrs Hardwick's introduction.

The Cabinet noted and agreed with the amended version of the third recommendation in para 3.3 of the report.

The Cabinet did not debate this agenda item.

Mr Dignum commented that it was proposed to continue the same strategy with its cautious approach and maintaining reserves in view of economic uncertainties. He highlighted the financial impact on CDC if there was a fall in planning and car parks income, which were especially vulnerable to the vicissitudes of the economy. If allowed to do so, the Cabinet would recommend to the Council in due course a £5 council tax rise, which whilst being a very modest increase for residents would nevertheless materially improve CDC's income stream.

Decision

At the end of the debate the Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands to support the recommendations, with the aforesaid agreed amendments to para 3.3 of the report, to be made to the Council.

RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

That the Council:

- (1) Approves the key financial principles and actions of the five-year financial strategy set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report.
- (2) Notes the current five-year Financial Model in appendix 2 to the agenda report.

- (3) Approves that a minimum level of general fund reserves be set at £5m and the £1.3m provision for revenue support be maintained, having considered the recommendations from the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.
- (4) Approves that Chichester District Council participates in the West Sussex 100% Business Rates Pilot for 2018-2019 if the bid is accepted by the Department of Communities and Local Government or continues to participate in a West Sussex Business Rates pool for 2018-2019 if the pilot bid is unsuccessful.
- (5) Notes the current resources position as set out in appendix 3 to the agenda report.

446 New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Policy

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its two appendices.

The report was presented by Mrs Lintill.

Mr Hyland was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Lintill summarised the report with particular reference to section 3 and para 7.1. The New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Policy was nearing the time for renewal and the Grants and Concessions Panel, which she chaired, strongly supported its continuation for a further four years from 2018. The benefits it brought to Chichester District's communities, as outlined in section 4 of the report, were self-evident and should continue to be made available.

Mr Hyland did not wish to add to Mrs Lintill's introduction.

In a short discussion Mr Dignum and Mrs Hardwick spoke in support of the Policy and the recommendation. The projects it had helped to deliver had been well received in the communities. It was essential to protect the funds from government frontline cuts so that they could be dedicated to projects envisaged by the Policy.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the following recommendation to the Council.

RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

That the New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Policy and the delegations therein be approved.

447 Chichester Vision - Approval of Action Plan and Delivery Governance Arrangements

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix.

The report was presented by Mr Dignum.

Mr Oates was in attendance for this item.

In seeking the Cabinet's approval of the Delivery Action Plan and oversight of its implementation by the Chichester Vision Steering Group, Mr Dignum said that the final text for the *Vision* document had been approved by the Vision Steering Group members in June 2017 and then formally approved by the Council on 25 July 2017. With document design completed, the *Vision* was now ready for publication. It would be a principal guide for all three local authorities and the key organisations in Chichester when setting resource plans and considering significant issues and proposals affecting the city centre. To provide the leadership and governance, it was proposed that the existing Steering Group would fulfil the role of Chichester City Vision Delivery Steering Group.

Key projects within the *Vision* that would require close partnership working with WSCC had been identified in the Chichester Growth Deal and would be monitored by the proposed Growth Board. Other actions to deliver the *Vision* would be prioritized in the delivery action plan (appendix 1) with a schedule of the proposed initial projects and activities. The Cabinet's approval of the plan was sought but it might well be subject to change after discussion with CDC's partners on the Steering Group. At its next meeting the Steering Group would agree the priorities for the coming year having regard to the available resources and the costs of the proposed projects.

With the Growth Deal's four large projects each contributing to the realisation of the *Vision*, the Vision Steering Group's focus would be on much smaller projects which shared the objective of making the city more attractive to users of all ages, namely residents, visitors, workers and students. Those projects included improved wayfinding, more cycle racks and benches, refurbishment of the Priory Park buildings and an improved tourism offer.

Mr Dignum said that as part of the 2018-2019 budget preparation he would propose that a sum should be allocated for use by all of Chichester District's Visions, including Selsey, Midhurst and Petworth, as well as Chichester. The Chichester *Vision* projects might also benefit from Chichester City Council's share of the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Mr Oates did not wish to add to Mr Dignum's introduction.

During the discussion members expressed their satisfaction with Mr Dignum's proposal that there should be a fund available for the use by all of Chichester District's other visions. It was important to avoid or address any perception of a solely Chichester-centric *Vision*.

In reply to Mr Connor who queried having a vision for the southern peninsula rather than just Selsey, Mrs Shepherd explained that visions were suited and designed for major towns and there were limited resources available. It was for parishes to lead the way with these visions and CDC was keen to work with parish councils, as it was

doing with Chichester City Council (CCC) on the Chichester *Vision*. She was arranging meetings with parish councils to facilitate this process.

Mr Dignum added that in the case of the Chichester *Vision*, the major funder was CCC, which had 15% of the Community Infrastructure Levy receipts (these were now being collected at an appreciable rate).

Decision

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

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Delivery Action Plan for the Chichester City Centre Vision as set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report be approved.
- (2) That the continuation of the Chichester Vision Steering Group in overseeing the implementation of the Delivery Action Plan be approved.

448 Determination of the Council Tax Base for 2018-2019

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its four appendices.

The report was presented by Mrs Hardwick.

Mr Jobson was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Hardwick said that this item related to setting the council tax base for the next financial year. It was effectively an estimate of the number of council tax dwellings in Chichester District, ie current plus estimation for new dwellings likely to enter the valuation list, which was then adjusted for the effect of discounts and exemptions (appendix 4) and for properties being in different bands. The final total was expressed as the number of Band D equivalent dwellings and then adjusted for an estimated collection rate. That figure would be used by the relevant authorities to set their council tax/precepts.

The calculations were detailed in appendix 1. Calculating the tax base as an equivalent number of Band D properties, there were 50,225 chargeable properties estimated for 2018-2019. These were then weighted to convert them to a Band D equivalent, producing 55,688 Band D equivalent properties. Net of additional charges for second and empty homes, making allowance for both eligible claimants under CDC's Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) and estimating losses on collection, the net tax base was 52,804. This was broken down by parish as shown in Appendix 2.

Since 2013 CDC had received funds from the government in order to assist parishes which would receive less precept due to residents in their parishes receiving relief under the CTRS. From 2014-2015 CDC had continued to pay parishes out of the Revenue Support Grant (RSG) a grant to reflect that lost precept but at an ever

decreasing rate. After the 2017-2018 financial year the RSG would no longer exist. Parishes were given notice last year that the CTRS-related grant would be tapered down each year over three years and by the end of 2019-2020 will have been withdrawn altogether. Appendix 3 detailed the taper relief which had been applied in the previous year where the grant represented a material amount for that parish (defined as being in excess of 4% of the precept). In order to avoid administering relatively small grant payments CDC was continuing to apply a lower threshold of £1,000 so any computed grant still lower than that limit was removed totally.

Mr Jobson commented that the council tax base had experienced a healthy growth compared with the previous financial year, which was the result of housing developments in several areas in and around the city. The estimate presented to the Cabinet was a fairly accurate one based *inter alia* on CDC inspectors going into the community and talking with developers about their expectations and taking into account the build-out rates of previous developments.

During the discussion Mr Jobson answered members' questions on points of detail (a) relating to the calculation of the 99% collection rate and what was factored into it; (b) with respect to students; (c) the reduction for occupiers with disabilities, which was taken into account in the calculation without resorting to section 13A (1) of the *Local Government Act 1992* as amended; (d) the comparative numbers of properties below and above Band D and how the number of higher band homes was taken into account in calculating the number of Band D equivalent properties.

The Cabinet noted and agreed with Mr Dignum that 'for 2018-2019' should be added to the end of the recommendation in para 3.4 (v) of the report.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands to make the resolution set out below with the aforesaid amendment to the recommendation in para 3.4 (v) in the report.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the council tax discounts to apply for the 2018-2019 financial year are:
 - (a) Nil discount for second homes (to include those with planning restrictions – (Prescribed classes A & B))
 - (b) Nil discount for vacant, unoccupied and substantially unfurnished properties to include those properties which would previously have qualified for Class C exemption (Prescribed class C)
 - (c) Nil discount for unoccupied properties which would previously have qualified for Class A exemption (properties in need of or undergoing major repair - (Prescribed Class D))
- (2) That an Empty Home Premium of 50% be charged for the 2018-2019 financial year.

- (3) That no additional locally defined classes of discount should be determined for the 2018-2019 financial year.
- (4) In order to comply with section 35 of the *Local Government Finance Act 1992*, that the following resolutions are made:
- (i) No item of expenditure shall be treated as “special expenses” for the purposes of section 35 of the *Local Government Finance Act 1992*;
 - (ii) This resolution shall remain in force for the 2018-2019 financial year;
 - (iii) The calculation of Chichester District Council’s taxbase for the year 2018-2019 is approved;
 - (iv) The amounts calculated by the Chichester District Council as its council tax base for the year 2018-2019 for its area and each part of its area shall be those set out in appendices 1 and 2 to this report;
 - (v) In order to offset some or all of the costs of Council Tax Reduction to local precepting authorities (parish councils), a grant is distributed as outlined in appendix 3 and described in paragraph 5.4 of the agenda report for 2018-2019.

449 **Parking Payment Machines**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report.

The report was presented by Mr Dignum.

Mrs Murphy was in attendance for this item.

Mr Dignum summarised the report with reference to sections 3, 4 and 5.

Mrs Murphy pointed out that all of the machines would be solar-powered and those already deployed in the city centre had resulted in significant savings. The extension of these machines to all the rural car parks was in recognition of the very positive customer feedback received. Machines located in coastal areas were designed with protective material to prevent erosion.

Mrs Murphy answered members’ questions and comments on points of detail with respect to (a) cleaning maintenance of the machines; (b) seasonal non-tariff periods and options for decommissioning the machines during those months; and (c) how the bringing forward of the £97,000 asset replacement budget allocation would be balanced by various savings which would be made.

Decision

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

RESOLVED

That it be approved that the existing asset replacement budget allocation of £97,000 be brought forward from 2021-2022 to be used in 2017-2018 for the replacement of parking payment machines in the rural car parks, to enable coin, card and contactless payment.

450 Appointments to Outside Organisations - West Sussex Joint Leaders Group

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report.

The report was briefly explained by Mr Dignum.

There was no officer in attendance for this item.

The Cabinet did not discuss this matter.

Decision

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

RESOLVED

That with effect from 1 January 2018 Tony Dignum be reappointed as Chichester District Council's representative on the West Sussex Joint Leaders Group.

451 Review of the Rural Settlement List

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix.

The report was presented by Mrs Hardwick.

Mr Jobson was in attendance for this item.

In commending the Rural Settlement List (RSL) to be approved for publication, Mrs Hardwick explained that it identified rural settlements in Chichester District for the purposes of allocating Rural Rate Relief. The relief was funded by the government to assist rural communities by allowing small rural businesses such as village shops, post offices, pubs and petrol stations to receive business rate relief.

One of the proposed changes was to recognise that Hampers Green was a rural settlement in its own right as distinct from Petworth town. The existing wider defined area within Petworth parish, which was currently known as Petworth for the purposes of the list and contained Petworth town and Hampers Green, was likely to exceed the population limit of 3,000. Although no businesses currently were in receipt of such relief, it was proposed to recognise the Hampers Green settlement as a distinct rural settlement so that the potential for rural rate relief continued to be available for both these areas as in other parishes across Chichester District.

Mr Jobson commented that the RSL was only for non-domestic rates and that CDC was able to draw and amend the settlement boundaries.

Mr Jobson responded to questions on points of detail with regard to (a) the correct parish for Maudlin; (b) how for RSL purposes the boundary was redrawn for Hampers Green in accordance with the regulations; and (c) the boundaries for other areas within Chichester District such as East Wittering and Bracklesham would be reviewed during the next 12 months and if members had points or concern they were welcome to notify Mr Jobson.

Mr Dignum proposed with the Cabinet's agreement that the following words should be added to the end of the recommendation in para 2.1 of the report: 'subject to a further check of the boundaries by the Head of Finance and Governance Services'.

Decision

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

RESOLVED

That the amended Rural Settlement List be approved for publication as set out in the appendix to the agenda report subject to a further check of the boundaries by the Head of Finance and Governance Services.

452 Treasury Management 2017-2018 Half-Yearly Update Report

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its three appendices.

Mrs Hardwick presented the report.

Mr Catlow was in attendance for this item.

Mr Dignum first of all began by reminding the Cabinet and other CDC members who were present as observers about the treasury management training session on 8 December 2017. He, and later Mrs Hardwick, strongly encouraged members (particularly those who sat on the Cabinet and the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee (CGAC)) to attend this very valuable workshop.

Mrs Hardwick said that the report presented a summary of CDC's treasury activity for the first half of 2017-2018. A slightly fuller version of this report had been presented to the CGAC on 23 November 2017, which had noted the direction taken so far, the challenges faced for the future and their impact on a future strategy. Those challenges were summarised in para 3.3 with further details in appendix 2. The greatest challenge was to respond to the new Prudential Code and the Regulatory Guidance that were expected to be issued early in 2018. The aforementioned forthcoming treasury management training session would cover those regulatory changes together with the wider environment within which treasury decisions were made.

As to 2017-2018, treasury funds had risen to around £60m and CDC had continued to use money market deposits for short term liquidity while reducing the level of lending to other local authorities due to the poor returns offered. The current quarterly return for internal investments of 0.52% in para 5.2 was in line with the return received by other district and borough councils in the benchmarking data.

Longer term investments had increased following a further investment in external pooled funds (similar to unit trusts) early in the financial year. The return to date for investment in the Local Authority Property Fund and the new external pooled funds was set out in paras 5.4 and 5.5 respectively.

The return on CDC's property portfolio was estimated at 7.82%. However, this did not take into account any income and expenditure for 2017-2018 and Estates officers were developing a system to monitor and report the performance of CDC's investment properties going forward.

Two tables in section 5 of the report set out CDC's performance against Security and Liquidity benchmarking. Overall there were no exceptions to note although the Treasury team was not seeking to increase CDC's use of bank deposits over the short term to ensure that the proportion of funds exposed to bail-in remained below the average of other district/borough councils.

Three exceptions to Treasury guidelines during the first half year were listed in section 6 of the report. These had been reviewed for learning points and procedures had been reviewed to ensure that required improvements were made.

Appendix 1 contained a summary of CDC's external advisor's latest economic commentary, which dealt with the present economic and credit outlook.

She thanked Mr Catlow and his colleagues for their hard work in treasury management.

Mr Catlow did not wish to add to Mrs Hardwick's introduction.

Mr Catlow responded to members' comments and questions on points of detail with respect to (1) the first report from M and G which had been received the previous day and had yet to be fully considered but (a) it was noted that the rate of return for the six-month period was lower than anticipated and this would be clarified and (b) the capital growth statement had not yet been provided; (2) the reason for exceeding the unsecured building society deposit limit with the national Counties Building Society in July 2017 (page 77) was due to human error and steps had been taken to ensure it would not be repeated; and (3) the reason for the external funds capital losses recorded in the Return table in section 5 of the report (page 77).

Decision

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

RESOLVED

That the Treasury Management activity and performance for 2017-2018 to date and the comments made by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee be noted.

453 **Late Items**

There were no late items for consideration at this meeting.

454 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no restricted items for consideration at this meeting and so no Part II resolution was required to be made.

[Note The meeting ended at 10:53]

CHAIRMAN

DATE

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

9 January 2018

Commissioning of West Sussex Community Advice Service

1. Contacts

Cabinet Member:

Eileen Lintill - Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Community Services
Telephone: 01798 342948 E-mail: elintill@chichester.gov.uk

Report Author:

Dave Hyland - Community and Partnerships Support Manager
Telephone: 01243 534864 E-mail: dhyland@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

A - RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CABINET

- 2.1 That the Cabinet agrees to the continuation of the Funding Partnership to commission a Community Advice Service across West Sussex beyond 2018 with West Sussex County Council as the lead authority and subject to confirmation of funding by other partners.**
- 2.2 That the Cabinet considers its likely support for the service beyond the bridging period to guide the recommissioning work of the Funding Partnership.**
- 2.3 That the Cabinet delegates authority to the Head of Community Services to agree the Terms of Reference for the Funding Partnership and changes to the Service Specification in agreeing a Bridging Contract.**

B - RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

- 2.4 That the Cabinet recommends to Council that the availability of £74,000 per annum for up to two years to achieve a bridging contract with the existing provider for the Community Advice Service be approved.**

3. Background

- 3.1 On 14 October 2014, and subsequently on 14 December 2014, Cabinet approved recommendations and delegations that saw a Community Advice Service commissioned on a county-wide basis through a Funding Partnership lead by West Sussex County Council (WSSCC). Following a tender process a three year contract was awarded to the Citizen's Advice (CA) with Central and South Sussex Citizens Advice (CaSSCA) as the contract holder. The contract was funded by WSSCC and all the District and Borough Councils in the county. Chichester District Council's contribution was £74,000 per annum.**

- 3.2 The Chichester Citizens Advice Service is provided by Arun and Chichester Citizens Advice (ACCA), a long established local charity. Face to face advice is available from the Chichester office free of charge to individuals, between 10:00 to 16:00. Outreach sessions are also provided in Selsey and East Wittering. Telephone advice is provided and a “webchat” facility has been phased in. ACCA has also secured external funding that provides a home-visiting service for those unable to visit the office and need face to face support. While ACCA do employ some core staff, as with all CAs, the majority of advice is provided by trained volunteers.
- 3.3 The service in Chichester helped 3,880 clients in 2016-2017, 74% of these presented to CA in person. 15% of enquiries required face to face appointment to resolve issues. Issues relating to Benefits, Employment and/or Debt account for the majority of queries. Local Authority funding (including contributions from Town and Parish Councils) make up around 66% of the costs of the service. ACCA fundraise and bid for projects that support the service.
- 3.4 During the last year of the contract, monitoring meetings have focussed on provision beyond March 2018. The service continues to be of value to local residents which is recognised by all funders in this partnership, and have informally indicated that they wish to see the service continue in future years. However the current contract does not allow for extension.

4. Outcomes

- 4.1 Identification of the most effective economic and efficient means of continuing a community advice service which meets the need of residents within Chichester District. Ensure the sustainability of a generalist advice service providing a specified range of free advice to resident in an accurate and timely way.
- 4.2 In funding this service within Chichester District, this Council wishes to ensure that residents can receive:
- Timely and convenient access to impartial advice
 - Support for avoiding or reducing debt
 - Advice that ensures they are receiving their correct benefits
 - A quality volunteering experience for those involved in delivery

5. Proposal

- 5.1 In the short term, CDC acts together with WSCC and the other districts and boroughs to offer a bridging contract to the existing contract. This would broadly be on the basis of the existing specification and (subject to confirmation from all funders) at the same funding level, and could be put in place for 12 to 24 months. The current contract holders have experienced no let-up in the demand for the services (Q1 of 2017/18 ACCA assisted 957 clients, 2.4% increase on the same quarter 2016/17), and there is County wide satisfaction with the current provision. Within Chichester District, ACCA have recently relocated into East Pallant House.
- 5.2 To achieve the bridging contract, the existing Funding Partnership needs to revise its Terms of Reference in order to continue beyond March 2018, reconfirm WSCC as the lead commissioning body and agree the duration of the bridging arrangements (in consideration of subsequent arrangements). In the longer

term, the Funding Partnership will need to formulate a commissioning process beyond the bridging contract. To inform the ongoing discussions about the form it should take, this Council will need to give indications of the amount and duration of funding available.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 The District Council could choose not to continue to commission this service, but the current level of usage (and the recent relocation to EPH) is clear evidence that there is a need for such a service.
- 6.2 The CDC could commit to a “bridging” arrangement of up to two years but not make any commitment to longer term funding. Without confirmation of likely funding beyond 2020, it would be unlikely that the funding partnership could achieve an appropriately commissioned countywide arrangement.
- 6.3 The Funding Partnership and countywide contract arrangements were products of the Legal Services Commission commissioning a Countywide Specialist Legal Advice contract which were discontinued prior to the 2014 contract. As time has passed it could be possible to return to local grant giving or commissioning; in this District as a direct grant from this Council to ACCA, or an alternative process to identify a suitable contractor. However there are now greater mutual aid arrangements between the two CAs. The Countywide approach also draws in significant funding from WSCC (currently £350,000 pa) which might be jeopardised.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 Provision for the funding of this service has been made within the CDC base budget, subject to annual review. An indication of future funding intentions could be indicative and made subject to reconfirmation nearer the time.
- 7.2 WSCC has offered (subject to agreement by the Partnership) to lead on the commissioning process; there is a cost benefit to continuing this arrangement over any one of the Districts or Boroughs undertaking to take the lead instead, or indeed coming to individual arrangements locally. There may be some need for support from our own legal team in protecting this Council’s interests in any proposed future contract.
- 7.3 Once a means to bridge the existing contract has been secured then commissioning for the subsequent period (beyond 2019 or 2020 as agreed across the County) can be developed. A subsequent paper will come back to Cabinet to determine support for that further contract.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 Regular monitoring of the current contract has fostered good dialogue with other councils within the Funding Partnership and the wish to continue the funding of the service between the current funders, is unanimous. ACCA has been well supported by councillors, and relationships between ACCA and key services within this Council are positive.
- 8.2 Grants Panel are due to meet on 31 January 2018 and will receive an annual monitoring report in respect of ACCA and an indication of the way forward for

funding beyond March 2018. Ahead of that meeting, a short briefing for Panel Members has been prepared and circulated, who indicate their support for funding to continue.

8.3 ACCA continues to actively fundraise to sustain its service to local residents and has been successful in securing funding for additional services during the contract period. The funding they receive through this funding arrangement is invaluable to funding their core offer and as a result ACCA would wish the current funding arrangements to continue.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

9.1 The decision to make direct award of a contract could be the subject of challenge and review. Whilst that risk is considered low it could require the District Council and the other parties to the contract to terminate the contract and undertake a tender process.

9.2 The District Council will seek an appropriate clause in the contract to provide for its termination in the event that a challenge arises to the contract award.

10. Other Implications

Crime and Disorder		No
Climate Change		No
Human Rights and Equality Impact An equality impact assessment was completed during initial tendering exercise and demonstrated a positive impact	Yes	
Safeguarding Through the community advice service arrangement vulnerable people receive help and advice which gives a positive effect	Yes	

11 Appendices

11.1 None

12 Background Papers

12.1 None

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

9 January 2018

Revised Corporate Plan 2018 – 2021

1. Contacts

Cabinet Member:

Tony Dignum - Leader of the Council

Telephone: 01243 538585 E-mail: tdignum@chichester.gov.uk

Report Author:

Joe Mildred - Corporate Improvement Manager

Telephone: 01243 534728 E-mail: jmildred@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. That the Council be recommended to approve the revised Corporate Plan for 2018-2021 as set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report.**
- 2.2. That, subject to the Cabinet's agreement in para 2.3 below to approve the new project proposals for 2018-2019, the Council be recommended to approve £130,000 from Chichester District Council's General Fund Reserve to fund two projects as set out in para 5.7 of the agenda report.**
- 2.3. That the new project proposals for 2018-2019 as set out in appendices 2 to 9 to the agenda report be agreed in principle subject to full Project Initiation Document (PID) approval.**

3. Background

- 3.1. The Corporate Plan sets out the Council's overall vision alongside priorities and objectives for the future. Each year the Plan is reviewed to take into account any emerging issues and challenges whilst ensuring it remains focused, relevant and affordable in delivering the needs of our community and especially protecting the most vulnerable in our society. As part of this process an assessment is made as to which projects should progress into the following year.
- 3.2. The current Corporate Plan (2015 – 2018) was approved by the Council at its meeting on 27 January 2015. The Plan set out four priorities, with a fifth added in December 2015 following a review:
 - (a) Improve the provision of and access to suitable housing.
 - (b) Support our communities.
 - (c) Manage our built and natural environments
 - (d) Improve and support the local economy
 - (e) Prudent management of the Council's finances

- 3.3. Since the December 2015 review the Corporate Plan, although it has continued to be reviewed, has remained largely unchanged. With the plan period due to end in 2018, a more comprehensive review has taken place.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1. The proposed Corporate Plan 2018 – 2021 (appendix 1) contains a full list of outcomes to be delivered over the plan period. It also enables the Council to manage its resources effectively and ensures that projects can be delivered by services and that enough capacity is available to deliver them. The corporate planning process also helps in creating a Work Plan for the Council; ensuring timescales are managed in a way that allows sufficient input from members at an early enough stage.
- 4.2. The Corporate Plan also provides the framework that allows the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to hold the Cabinet to account in terms of delivery and achievement of objectives.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. It is proposed that, as part of this review, the overall priorities do not need to change significantly, although some minor wording changes are proposed. The new Corporate Plan for 2018 – 2021 (see appendix 1) sets out the following five priorities which are consistent with, but build upon, the five priorities in the current plan:
- Improve the provision of and access to suitable housing.
 - Support our communities.
 - Manage our built and natural environments to promote and maintain a positive sense of place
 - Improve and support the local economy to enable appropriate local growth
 - Manage the Council's finances prudently and effectively
- 5.2. As in previous versions of the Corporate Plan, each of these priorities is underpinned by several objectives, setting out what the Council aims to achieve in support of each of the identified priorities. Below these objectives sit further, more specific actions the Council will undertake to achieve each objective. In some cases, other agencies are supported or encouraged to take action. Where appropriate, these actions are accompanied by specific, measurable outcomes.
- 5.3. It is this level of specific targets and actions that contains the most change in the proposed Corporate Plan. Many of the targets from the previous version have been achieved and therefore required removing or updating. Some targets have been affected by legislative changes or changes to the ways other agencies work. These too have been considered by the relevant officers and Heads of Service and changes proposed.
- 5.4. The previous Corporate Plan was underpinned by a set of guiding principles that confirmed the Council's commitment to how the organisation is run. This section remains in the new Corporate Plan and has undergone only very few, minor wording changes. This continuing commitment cuts across all our services and will be incorporated as services develop.
- 5.5. New projects for 2018/19 are also proposed. They have been assessed for their viability to proceed alongside the Corporate Plan priorities and objectives whilst taking into account existing projects that have already commenced. Initial Project Proposal

Documents (IPPDs) have been prepared for each new project. The proposed IPPDs are:

- (a) Depot Wash Facility
- (b) Midhurst Vision
- (c) Selsey Vision
- (d) Bracklesham Bay Land
- (e) The Old Bakery, Petworth
- (f) Social Prescribing
- (g) Preparing for the reduction in Councillors from 2019 onwards
- (h) Member induction 2019

5.6. The Cabinet is asked to consider the updated Corporate Plan 2018 - 2021 (Appendix 1) and IPPDs (Appendices 2 to 9), to recommend the updated Corporate Plan to the Council, and to approve the IPPDs in principle for further development of the proposed projects. For IPPDs approved in principle, further reports, including Project Initiation Documents (PIDs), will come forward to the Cabinet as more detail on each proposal is developed.

5.7. In the case of two projects, the Council is also recommended to approve funding from reserves to progress them further. These projects are:

- Social Prescribing – up to £57,000pa for 2 years to part fund the social prescribing project in Appendix 7
- 2019 Member induction - £16,000 to fund one off costs as part of the member induction process as set out in Appendix 9

6. Resource and Legal Implications

6.1. The annual review of the Corporate Plan is considered alongside the Financial Strategy for which a separate report was presented to the Cabinet in December 2017. At this stage there are resources in place to deliver all of the projects other than those bids for funding outlined in paragraph 5.7 and as detailed in 6.2 below. However, as full details of those projects that require PIDs are finalised, they will be considered by Cabinet along with any additional resource requirement.

6.2. Estates project support for the Old Bakery and Bracklesham projects amounting to £45,000pa over 2 years will be required to fund an additional post. This sum is reflected in the budget report being considered by the Cabinet at its meeting in February 2018.

7. Consultation

7.1. Internal consultation on the Corporate Plan and the IPPDs has been carried out.

7.2. In addition, where appropriate, this plan uses recent intelligence and data to set appropriate targets. Consultation has also been undertaken with stakeholders and communities in formulating the major strategies of housing, economic development and, most significantly, the Local Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy.

8. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

8.1. Failure to have a clear vision and priorities that are forward looking with both members and senior officers adhering to that shared vision and priorities is monitored through the Council's strategic risk register. The Corporate Plan minimises the risk of a disjointed approach and waste of both staff and financial resources.

- 8.2. For all new project proposals officers are asked to identify, within the IPPD and PID, risks to the achievement of the outcomes to be achieved in addition to other related tasks or issues that the project will not include and could therefore be considered a risk.

9. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder Maintaining low crime levels and reducing reports of anti-social behaviour are referred to specifically in the Corporate Plan under the priority: Support our communities.	x	
Climate Change Encouraging sustainable living is referred to specifically in the Corporate Plan under the priority: Manage our built and natural environments to promote and maintain a positive sense of place.	x	
Human Rights and Equality Impact Addressing inequalities remains a key focus for the Council. Work provided by our services is assessed to ensure our customers' needs continue to be met.	x	
Safeguarding and Early Help Providing support to communities and individuals who are vulnerable is referred to specifically in the Corporate Plan under the priority: Support our communities.	x	
Other n/a		

10. Appendices

- 10.1. Corporate Plan 2018 – 2021
- 10.2. Depot Wash Facility IPPD
- 10.3. Midhurst Vision IPPD
- 10.4. Selsey Vision IPPD
- 10.5. Bracklesham Bay Land IPPD
- 10.6. The Old Bakery, Petworth IPPD
- 10.7. Social Prescribing IPPD
- 10.8. Reduction of members and committee structure IPPD
- 10.9. Member induction IPPD

11. Background Papers

None

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

9 January 2018

Revised Local Development Scheme 2018-2021

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Anna Miller - Planning Policy Officer

Telephone: 01243 521031

E-mail: amiller@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Planning Services

Telephone: 01243 514034

E-mail: sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the Council be recommended to approve the revised Local Development Scheme 2018-2021.**

3. Background

- 3.1. The Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) was previously updated and approved by Council for publication in June 2017.
- 3.2. The LDS is kept under review as it is a statutory requirement and updates are published on the Council's website so that the local community and developers are kept informed of the current timetable for producing planning policy documents during the rolling three year timeframe. It is necessary to amend the LDS to take account of any changes to the timetables for the Chichester Local Plan Review and Site Allocation Development Plan Document. The updated version of the LDS covering the period 2018-2021 is in the Appendix.
- 3.3. The LDS contains information about the current Development Plan for the Chichester Local Plan area. It provides a profile for each of the Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents to be prepared, and a timetable for each main stage of documentation production, including public consultation stages. The LDS also contains information on other documents including Neighbourhood Plans and the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 3.4. The LDS is used to monitor the Council's progress in producing planning policy documents as part of the Authority's Monitoring Report.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. The revised LDS, which covers the period 2018-2021 and details the current Development Plan and proposals for new documents for the Chichester Local Plan area, will help to manage workloads, resource requirements and enable the

public and other interested parties to know when they are able to take part in the planning policy preparation process.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. There are two main areas where it is proposed to change the LDS, which relate to adjusting the timetables for preparation of the Chichester Local Plan Review and the Site Allocation DPD. These documents are addressed in turn below, followed by necessary amendments to take account of made neighbourhood plans.

Chichester Local Plan Review

- 5.2. The LDS published in June 2017 outlined the timetable for the Chichester Local Plan Review. However, in September 2017 the Government published a consultation proposing a methodology for calculating housing need. As a consequence there is some uncertainty regarding whether this proposed methodology will be incorporated into legislation or national policy. This uncertainty regarding housing numbers has implications for other evidence base studies that will be required to support the strategy and policies in the new plan.
- 5.3. In light of the potential changes to legislation and/or national policy and the nature of the evidence based studies, which have interlinked dependencies, there has been a delay to the timetable for the Chichester Local Plan Review. In addition, workloads associated with the Site Allocation DPD, planning appeals, the Brownfield Register and the Southern Gateway Masterplan have, at times, diverted resources away from Local Plan Review preparation. In addition it has not yet been possible to secure additional staff resources to the new posts in the Planning Policy Team (see para 7.1 below). The timetable has therefore been reviewed in the LDS to incorporate an additional 5 months between the Issues and Options consultation and the consultation on the Preferred Approach Plan.
- 5.4. Consequently the anticipated adoption of the Chichester Local Plan Review would be achieved 4 months later than currently identified. Whilst this reduces the contingency in the timetable, adoption of the Chichester Local Plan Review is timetabled for March 2020, which remains 4 months prior to July 2020, which is the end of the period that the Inspector who examined the current Local Plan expected the Council to commit to completing a review by. This is less than the 5 months referred to in paragraph 5.3 above due to a slightly compressed timetable in the latter stages.

Site Allocation DPD

- 5.5. The Site Allocation DPD was submitted to the Secretary of State in March 2017. As part of the submission, a number of main and minor modifications to the Site Allocation DPD were included for the Inspector to consider. The Site Allocation DPD and the proposed modifications were to be considered at the Examination Hearing that was expected to take place in July 2017. However, due to the availability of the Inspector and staff resources, the Examination Hearings were undertaken in September 2017.

- 5.6. Following the Examination Hearings and the receipt of a letter from the Inspector, which has yet to be received, the Council will need to consult on the proposed modifications. The Inspector will then consider any representations and determine whether any further hearings are necessary. She will then issue her report.
- 5.7. In light of the changes to the timing of the Examination Hearings, the timetable for the Site Allocation DPD has been revised in the LDS to incorporate the further seven months necessary to achieve adoption of the Plan.

Neighbourhood Plans

- 5.8. Section 4 of the proposed revised LDS refers to the Development Plan and the fact that neighbourhood plans form part of the Development Plan. More specifically paragraphs 4.1 and 4.5 set out that since the publication of the last LDS in June 2017, the Lavant neighbourhood plan has been 'made'.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1. The timetable for the Chichester Local Plan Review outlined in Appendix 1 could be postponed until changes to the Government's proposed methodology on calculating housing need have been clarified. However, the Inspector recommended that to make the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 (Chichester Local Plan) sound, the Council should commit to completing a review of the Plan within five years.
- 6.2. It is not considered feasible to propose a quicker timetable than the one being suggested in the proposed revised LDS. This would mean that the plan would have to be prepared without the completion of the evidence base on which it is based or that there would be insufficient time to take in to account representations made on the Preferred Approach Plan. The timetable that has been proposed is the quickest that it is considered could be delivered.
- 6.3. Work on the Site Allocation DPD could be halted; however, this could adversely impact on the delivery of housing within the parishes without a neighbourhood plan and the Council's five year supply of housing.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1. In May 2016, Cabinet agreed the Local Plan Review - Project Initiation Document, which included the estimated costs of the project. Appropriate budgetary provision has therefore been provided. It is also intended to add two new posts to the Planning Policy team to ensure that the Local Plan Review work can be effectively progressed. The budgetary implications will be addressed within a future report to Cabinet.
- 7.2. The main resource implications for the Council regarding the Site Allocation DPD involve officer time to review and consult on the modifications proposed and the project management of the work.

8. Consultation

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

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1. The production of the Chichester Local Plan Review and Site Allocation DPD will require formal consultation with the public and a wide range of stakeholders to ensure that all potential community impacts and views are considered.

10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		✓
Climate Change		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact		✓
Safeguarding and Early Help		✓
Other (please specify)		✓

11. Appendices

- 11.1. Revised Local Development Scheme 2018-2021.

12. Background Papers

- 12.1 None.

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

9 January 2018

**Site Allocation - Development Plan Document 2014-2029
- Proposed Modifications Consultation**

1. Contacts

Report Author

Tracey Flitcroft - Principal Planning Officer (Local Planning)

Telephone: 01243 534683 E-mail: tflitcroft@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Planning Services

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

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Council be recommended that:

- 1) The Site Allocation Development Plan Document Further Proposed Main Modifications (set out in appendix 1 to this report) and the Further Proposed Minor Modifications (set out in appendix 2 to this report) be approved for public consultation.**
- 2) Authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Services following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services to enable minor editorial and typographical amendments to be made to the document prior to publication.**

3. Background

- 3.1** In March 2017, following approval by the Council of the Site Allocation: Development Plan Document 2014-2029 (DPD) for an eight week consultation, the DPD was submitted with a schedule of proposed modifications to the Secretary of State. During September 2017, the Inspector, Roisin Barrett Bsc Msc Dip UD Dip Hist Cons MRTPI IHBC, held hearings as part of the examination of the submitted DPD to ensure it was prepared in accordance with the duty to co-operate, legal and procedural requirements, and to assess whether it is sound. These requirements are set out in the *National Planning Policy Framework* paragraph 182.
- 3.2** During the debate at the examination hearings, officers responded to issues raised by the Inspector and where it was possible to agree a way forward that would improve the DPD, further Proposed Modifications to the submitted DPD were identified. The Inspector has written to the Council recommending modification to the DPD to ensure soundness. The recommended modifications are set out as Proposed Main Modifications which are attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

3.3 In addition, officers have identified a number of Minor Modifications that do not go to the heart of the DPD but are required, for example, to improve clarity, consistency and updating. These are included as Appendix 2 to this report.

3.4 A sustainability appraisal (SA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the proposed modifications to the DPD are currently being undertaken and these will be published for consultation at the same time as the consultation on the modifications is being carried out.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

4.1 The Site Allocation DPD when adopted will help deliver the housing proposed in the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029. It is intended that the DPD will be consulted upon between 1 February and 16 March 2018, following which, the Inspector will make a final recommendation to the Council as to whether the DPD is sound and can be adopted.

5. Proposal

5.1 That the further Proposed Modifications, as set out in Appendix 1 and 2, are the subject of public consultation for six weeks. It is anticipated that this process will start at the beginning of February 2018.

5.2 The responses on the main modifications will be forwarded directly to the Inspector who will then consider any representations received during the consultation period and decide whether to hold an additional hearing or take such other action she considers appropriate.

6. Alternatives Considered

6.1 The alternative is not to proceed with the DPD, however, this would have implications for delivery of the Local Plan strategy.

7. Resources and Legal Implications

7.1 The Site Allocation DPD follows on from the adoption of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies. It is part of the Planning Policy Team work programme and the costs of the preparation of the Site Allocation DPD are programmed in the existing budget.

7.2 The process being followed meets the statutory requirements of the plan-making process.

8. Consultation

8.1 Once approved, the Main (Appendix 1) and the Minor (Appendix 2) modifications will be the subject of public consultation. Consultation will be undertaken for a period of six weeks between 1 February and 16 March 2018.

8.2 All comments on the Main Modifications will be sent directly to the Inspector for her consideration. It is intended that comments made on the Minor Modifications, which cover for example typographical changes, will be considered as part of the report that recommends adoption of the SPD.

8.3 It is also necessary to comply with other statutory regulations that require consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment alongside the Proposed Modifications.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

9.1 Once adopted the Site Allocation DPD will provide certainty for small scale residential development in areas not progressing a neighbourhood plan as well as identifying land for employment development. The consultation process for the Main Modifications will enable any issues raised to be considered by the Inspector conducting the Examination.

9.2 The main corporate risk is related to any legal challenge to the adoption of the DPD.

10. Other implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		✓
Climate Change		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact		✓
Safeguarding and Early Help		✓
Other		✓

11. Appendices

11.1 Proposed Main Modifications to the Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2014-2029

11.2 Proposed Minor Modifications to the Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2014-2029

12. Background Papers

None

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

9 January 2018

Statement of Community Involvement

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Kate Chapman - Planning Policy Officer

Telephone: 01243 534686. Email: kchapman@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Planning Services

Telephone: 01243 514034. Email: sttaylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

That the Council be recommended to adopt the Statement of Community Involvement.

3. Background

3.1 It is a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 for a Local Planning Authority to produce a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). An SCI sets out the Council's approach to engage the public and other stakeholders in all planning policy and development management matters to ensure that as many people as possible are able to have a say in planning decisions that affect them.

3.2 The document provides guidance on how the planning system works and sets out how the Council will inform, consult and involve people in both the preparation of planning policy documents and decisions on planning applications. It also sets out guidance on the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans.

3.3 On 16 May 2017, the Council approved the SCI for a 6 week public consultation. In addition, authority was delegated to the Head of Planning Services following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services to enable minor amendments to be made to the document prior to and following public consultation.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

4.1. Appropriate engagement of all stakeholders in planning related matters.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 That following the minor amendments made as a result of public consultation the SCI is adopted.

6. Summary of the Statement of Community Involvement Content

- 6.1 The SCI contains:

- A demonstration in simple terms of the Council's commitment to ensure that community and stakeholder engagement is effective, involvement is genuine, and that planning decisions are accountable.
- An explanation of how these principles will be applied to strategic plan-making and development management decisions.
- A description of the different types of planning policy documents and the processes involved in their adoption.
- A diagram demonstrating the three stages of planning policy document production, and explanation of the statutory regulations relating to the production process.
- A list of statutory consultees.
- Information on support provided for neighbourhood planning with referenced links to guidance documents such as 'Support for Neighbourhood Planning Groups' which has been updated accordingly.
- Development Management consultations and decision making.

- 6.2 The below amendments were made following Cabinet held on 9 May 2017 and the Council held on 16 May 2017:

- Amendment of paragraph 2.9 clarifying that the processes shown within the diagram, within Section 2, apply to Development Plan Documents. An additional paragraph has been added explaining the process for a Supplementary Planning Document.
- Insertion of two paragraphs after paragraph 3.7, stating that communities can engage at the independent examination stage by, in certain circumstances, giving evidence. Reference has also been made to this within the diagram within Section 2.

7 Alternatives Considered

- 7.1 The alternative is not to proceed with updating the SCI however this may result in the current document being out of date.

8 Resource and Legal Implications

- 8.1 There are no significant resources or legal implications arising from the adoption of the SCI.

9 Consultation

- 9.1 The SCI was the subject of formal public consultation for six weeks between 25 May 2017 and 6 July 2017. Four representations were received. The

representations received and the minor amendments made to the document are included in Appendix 2 of this report.

- 9.2 The Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel considered the representations and revisions to the SCI at its meeting in December 2017. It agreed that the SCI should be considered by the Cabinet and the Council for adoption.

10. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 10.1 Once adopted the SCI will continue to provide transparency in the Council's approach to engaging the public and other stakeholders in all planning policy and development management matters. It will form a commitment that will need to be considered by Planning Services when undertaking consultations.

11. Other Implications

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

12. Appendices

- 12.1 Appendix 1 – Revised SCI
- 12.2 Appendix 2 – SCI representations and corresponding amendments.

13. Background Papers

- 13.1 None

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

9 January 2018

Supporting New and Existing Businesses

1. Contacts

Cabinet Member:

Tony Dignum – Leader of the Council

Telephone: 01243 538585

E-mail: tdignum@chichester.gov.uk

Report Author:

Stephen Oates – Economic Development Manager

Telephone: 01243 534669

E-mail: soates@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Cabinet approves:

- (a) **The continuation of the Enabling Grant Scheme for new and existing small businesses as set out in section 4.1 of the agenda report supported by £71,428 allocated from the Pooled Business Rates Fund and that the Head of Commercial Services be authorised to approve grants under the Scheme.**
- (b) **The allocation of additional funding for Chichester District Council's Choose Work Programme as set out in section 4.6 of the agenda report supported by £32,000 from the Pooled Business Rates Fund be implemented.**
- (c) **A record of all grants allocated under the Enabling Grant and Shop Front Improvement Grant Scheme be reported to the Grants and Concessions Panel to ensure co-ordination of the approval processes.**

2.2. That the Cabinet recommends the Council to approve:

- (a) **The establishment of the Shop Front Improvement Grant Scheme and Provision of Retail Training for independent retailers as set out in sections 4.2 to 4.5 of the agenda report supported by £168,800 allocated from the Pooled Business Rates Fund and (b) the authorisation of the Head of Commercial Services to approve shop front improvement grants under the Scheme.**

3. Background

Enabling Grant Scheme

- 3.1 Between 2005 and 2009 the Council operated an 'Enabling Grant Scheme', which offered small match-funded grants to small businesses for a variety of items. In September 2013, £51,000 was secured from WSCC KickStart funding

to re-establish the scheme and in late 2016 £71,428 was secured from the pooled business rate fund to offer the scheme in 2017.

- 3.2 Over the years the scheme has benefitted over 400 businesses across the District, with many seeing their business turnover increase, some by up to 50%. This has created economic growth and new job opportunities in the District.
- 3.3 Each round of the scheme has been administered within the Council's Economic Development Service and an important aspect of the scheme is that it is easy to access.
- 3.4 Following the success of the latest round, a further application to the Pooled Business Rates Fund, in conjunction with the other West Sussex districts and boroughs, has been approved, with the Council securing a further £71,428 to continue the scheme in 2018.

Shop Front Improvement Grant and Provision of Retail Training

- 3.5 While the enabling grant scheme has proved very popular with small businesses there has been lower take up by the independent retail sector. Reasons for this are varied but feedback from the sector suggests that independent high street businesses would welcome bespoke training which specifically focusses on how they can improve their own individual businesses.
- 3.6 In 2008 a three year programme in Midhurst and Selsey was run which targeted 'inside and out' refurbishment for independent retailers. Funded jointly by SEEDA and the Council, shopkeepers were able to apply for a grant to have their shop fronts renovated, but they also had to undergo merchandising training and a business health check. The purpose of this approach was to ensure that retailers were able to take a fresh look at their business and were armed with the skills to improve their store and attract new customers.
- 3.7 This training was extremely well received by businesses and the work undertaken encouraged other shops, which were not part of the scheme, to redecorate. The feedback showed that the training helped recipients to view their businesses differently, increased their confidence and, importantly, increased sales, with increases varying from 5% to 100%.
- 3.8 Retail has changed substantially over the last decade. Businesses face numerous new challenges and many independent retailers are struggling to survive whilst the general public are increasingly critical of town centres with perceived dwindling numbers of independent businesses. Very few independents can afford the rents in primary locations so are often located in secondary locations.
- 3.9 These locations have lower footfall so it is important for businesses to be able to maximise sales opportunities and to increase their conversion rates. Visual merchandising, window displays, buying and store management all combine with customer service to make sales, but many independent businesses struggle to find the support and training in these areas which the multiples are able to deliver to their stores.

- 3.10 Following an application to the Pooled Business Rates Fund in conjunction with four other West Sussex districts and boroughs, the Council has secured £168,800 to establish a new Shop Front and Training scheme.

Choose Work Programme

- 3.11 Since its inception in January 2013, the Council's Choose Work Programme has been, and continues to be, very successful, delivering well over 200 work placements, helping 98 local residents back into work, with an estimated saving to the public purse of £805,462
- 3.12 The project is currently funded in partnership between CDC and the Department for Communities and Local Government Communities Fund programme until end of March 2020
- 3.13 Following an application to the Pooled Business Rates Fund in conjunction with four other West Sussex districts and boroughs, the Council has secured a further £32,000 to contribute to the total project funding.

4 Proposal

Enabling Grant Scheme

- 4.1 The Enabling Grant Scheme will continue throughout 2018 on the same simple-to-operate and easy-to-access basis. Each applicant will be eligible for up to 50% of the total cost of their project, subject to a maximum of £2,500 for capital projects and a maximum of £1,500 to assist apprenticeship training.

Shop Front Improvement Grant & Provision of Retail Training

- 4.2 Fully funded bespoke retail training will be offered to independent business in the District's 'high streets' – to include Chichester, Midhurst, Petworth and Selsey.
- 4.3 The training will start with facilitated retail workshops. These workshops will be focussed on generating ideas for businesses to convert footfall into sales and on the associated developmental challenges businesses will face. The workshops will be offered in the City and in each of our three market towns, and there will be up to 6 workshops in each area for businesses to choose from.
- 4.4 Following this, bespoke individual rapid improvement sessions will be offered, comprising in-store training by an independent retail training specialist to establish ways to improve performance and to ensure that all commercial opportunities are being identified and acted upon.
- 4.5 Each business undertaking the training above will be eligible to apply for a grant to refurbish and improve their shop front. The grant available will be up to 75% of eligible costs, subject to a maximum contribution of £4,000.

Choose Work Programme

- 4.6 The funding will enable Choose Work to strengthen one strand of its work to help businesses engage better with schools and colleges. We will stage a major 'jobs fair' during 2018, bringing employers and job-seekers together. The funding will also assist with establishing 'employability hubs' in selected locations across the District to build on existing partnerships, enabling even more people to access our career support workshops and drop-in sessions.

5 Outcomes to be Achieved

- 5.1 To create jobs and growth by:

- giving small businesses the confidence to try something new
- enhancing the entrepreneurial culture within the District
- increasing access to new markets for small businesses
- increasing apprenticeships across the District
- assisting individuals who are currently out of work
- making a difference to the viability, success and growth potential of at least 40 existing small businesses and 100 independent retailers
- encouraging landlords and tenants to refurbish and improve city and town centre shop fronts

- 5.2 The application forms will ask applicants to state their intended outcomes, jobs created, business turnover, profit enhancements, etc. The Council will then carry out a post-project evaluation to measure the outcomes. Regular updates will be coordinated with the other participating districts and boroughs to provide updates on grants awarded, match-funding secured and jobs created.

6 Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 Do nothing. With funding available this is not considered appropriate.

7 Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 The total budget of £272,228 will be funded from the Pooled Business Rates Fund. CDC will receive the funding in advance of the commencement of the schemes. At least £71,428 will be invested as match funding by businesses securing enabling grants, and at least £30,000 will be invested as match funding by independent retailers securing shop front improvement grants.
- 7.2 The scheme will be administered by the Economic Development Service and no additional resources are required.
- 7.3 The shop front improvement grant scheme and provision of retail training is being coordinated county-wide by the Council's Economic Development Service. The enabling grant scheme is being coordinated county-wide by Arun District Council's Economic Development Service. The additional funding for Choose Work is being coordinated county-wide by Horsham District Council's Economic Development Service.

8 Community Impact and Corporate Risks

8.1 Each scheme supports the objectives of the Council's Corporate Plan and Economic Development Strategy. The provision of retail training and shop front improvement grants supports the Visions for Chichester City Centre, Petworth, Selsey and Midhurst. Choose Work is a key project under Chichester in Partnership's 'Getting People into Work' Strategy.

9 Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		✓
Climate Change		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact		✓
Safeguarding		✓
Other		✓

10 Appendix

None

11 Background Papers

None

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

9 January 2018

Rough Sleeper Outreach Worker

1. Contacts

Cabinet Member:

Jane Kilby - Cabinet Member for Housing Services

Telephone: 01243 773494 E-mail: jkilby@chichester.gov.uk

Report Author:

Linda Grange - Housing Enabling Manager

Telephone: 01243 534582 E-mail: lgrange@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the Cabinet approves the creation of a Rough Sleeper Outreach Worker post at a cost of £40,000 per annum funded from the base budget, subject to the annual budget process.**

3. Background

- 3.1. Since 2010 the number of rough sleepers in Chichester District has ranged from 14 to 26. There are currently 18 known individuals sleeping rough in the district. These include a handful of entrenched rough sleepers, some who intermittently engage with homeless services and transient rough sleepers who stay in the district for a period of time before moving on.
- 3.2. Although there has not been an overall increase in the number of rough sleepers, the visibility of rough sleeping, particularly in the city centre, has increased over the past five years. Reported incidences of violence against and perpetrated by rough sleepers has also increased.
- 3.3. In October 2016 the government launched a Rough Sleeping Grant Funding Programme. The East and West Sussex bid was successful and as a result one full time equivalent (FTE) Homeless Outreach Worker was employed to work across the districts of Arun and Chichester on a one-year fixed term contract at a cost of £40,000 per annum including on costs plus £5,000 operational costs. The post began on 12 July 2017, however the current post holder is leaving at the end of December. Arun have committed additional funds from their Safer Community Partnership so that the post can be advertised and extended for 12 months to cover Arun District.
- 3.4. The Outreach Worker obtains referrals through the Council's Rough Sleeper Panel and works with a select number of rough sleepers addressing key areas of concern by working proactively with the individuals and all partners involved to enable and achieve sustained positive behavioural change.

- 3.5. The current Outreach Worker will be leaving the post this month and although Arun District Council has secured additional funds to extend the post a further year, it is generally difficult to recruit to temporary short term posts. Furthermore, in order to build the trust and relationships with individuals to encourage them to engage it is essential to provide a consistent service. Over the last five years the service has been fragmented and delivered through a number of different projects, organisations and outreach workers.
- 3.6. The prevalence of rough sleeping across Arun and Chichester demonstrates a need for more than one FTE to cover the geographical area.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1. Continuity of support for behavioural change for the most entrenched local rough sleepers and/or homeless people in Chichester leading to reduced demand on public services. The outcome for the individual is hoped to be improved life chances and where possible a move to settled accommodation.
- 4.2. Reduces visibility of rough sleeping and proactive discouragement of new rough sleepers.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. The proposal is to create a new post within the Housing Interventions team which is specifically focused on providing outreach support to rough sleepers in the Chichester District.
- 5.2. The outreach worker will obtain referrals through the Council's Rough Sleeper Panel and will work with a select number of rough sleepers addressing key areas of concern by proactive, persistent and assertive outreach engagement. This high level of engagement over a longer term will allow the outreach worker the time to build trust and confidence and accurately assess individual needs enabling the formulation of personalised action plans and tailored support with the agencies involved to help move clients into settled accommodation.
- 5.3. The type of action required is very practical, ranging from taking individuals to appointments, acting as an advocate to help express their needs, ensuring that they have equitable access to public services, and supporting clients during difficult times whilst challenging them when their behaviour and actions are considered problematic with the aim of encouraging clients to make changes to their lives.
- 5.4. The rationale for identification and targeting of these individuals is based on their high risk factors in respect of anti-social behaviour, criminal activity, homelessness, high dependency on drugs and alcohol, poor physical and mental health.
- 5.5. The outreach worker role will act as a focal point for bringing agencies together, agreeing actions and building positive working relationships which enable service provision to be tailored on a case by case basis.

5.6. The role will directly contribute and is expected to meet the following performance outcomes over a one-year period with clients:

- Support clients to access and sustain appropriate housing involving other specialist partners and provision to help eliminate rough sleeping
- Support positive tenancy compliance in order to sustain and prevent intentional homelessness and rough sleeping
- Secure positive and sustained engagement with services to enable effective treatment where need is identified including:
 - GP services
 - Drug and Alcohol services
 - Adult mental health services
- Where identified, reduce involvement in reported anti-social behaviour

6. Alternatives Considered

6.1. To continue to provide a piecemeal service which relies on government funding initiatives. The demand for this service is not expected to decrease and issues identified in section 5 would not be addressed. Longer term provision is recommended.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

7.1. The proposed post as outlined above is considered essential to ensure the Council provides an effective service that meets the needs of both the community and rough sleepers, whilst helping to safeguard the environment and economy of Chichester District. The intention is that the additional resources recommended in the report will be funded from base budget.

8. Consultation

8.1. Informal consultation has been undertaken with partners who were supportive of the proposals.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

9.1. The impact of the proposal will benefit the residents of the district. Additional resources will enable us to provide both effective support to help entrenched rough sleepers move to settled accommodation and early intervention in the case of new and transient rough sleepers. It will also help reduce anti-social behaviour, and criminal activity associated with rough sleepers.

10. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder	X	
Climate Change		X
Human Rights and Equality Impact	X	
Safeguarding and Early Help	X	
Other (please specify): eg biodiversity		X

11. Appendices

None

12. Background Papers

None

Agenda Item 12

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

9 January 2018

Appointments to Panels, Forums and other Groups 2017-2018

1. Contacts

Cabinet Member:

Tony Dignum - Leader of the Council
Telephone: 01243 538585

E-mail: tdignum@chichester.gov.uk

Report Author:

Bambi Jones - Principal Scrutiny Officer
Telephone: 01243 534685

Email: bjones@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

The Cabinet is requested to agree:

- 2.1. **That Peter Wilding as the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services (with responsibility for risk management) is appointed to sit on the Strategic Risk Group in place of Philippa Hardwick.**
- 2.2. **That Mark Dunn is replaced by Bob Hayes on the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel.**
- 2.3. **That Francis Hobbs is appointed as the Council's representative on Visit Chichester Limited in place of Paul Over.**

3. Context

- 3.1. The establishment of most panels and forums and their membership is constitutionally the responsibility of the Cabinet. They are not subject to political balance.
- 3.2. Philippa Hardwick has relinquished her role as the Cabinet Member for Finance and Governance Services with effect from 31 December 2017 and the Cabinet has shuffled its responsibilities with effect from 1 January 2018. As set out in the Constitution the portfolio holder with responsibility for risk management would be one of the three Cabinet members on the Strategic Risk Group. Peter Wilding, who has taken over the finance and governance responsibilities within his portfolio as the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, would therefore sit on this group in place of Philippa Hardwick. The two other Cabinet members on this group, Tony Dignum and Eileen Lintill, remain on the group.
- 3.3. Mark Dunn is stepping down from the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel and he will be replaced by Bob Hayes.
- 3.4. Paul Over is stepping down from as the Council's representative for Visit Chichester and he will be replaced by Francis Hobbs.

4. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

4.1. None

5. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		x
Climate Change		x
Human Rights and Equality Impact		x
Safeguarding and Early Help		x
Other (please specify) eg Biodiversity		x

6. Appendices

7. None

8. Background Papers

None

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

9 January 2018

Section 106 Community Facilities – St Wilfrid’s Church Hall Chidham

1. Contacts

Cabinet Member:

Eileen Lintill - Cabinet Member for Community Services

Telephone: 01798 342948 E-mail: elintill@chichester.gov.uk

Report Author:

David Hyland - Community and Partnerships Support Manager

Telephone: 01243 534789 E-mail: dhyland@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the Cabinet approves the release of £57,368 section 106 Community Facilities monies to Chidham Parochial Church Council for identified enhancements to St Wilfrid’s Church Hall.**

3. Background

- 3.1. In April 2015, Chichester District Council received £18,075.22, the section 106 community facilities contribution secured from the development of land at Hambrook Hill South. In July 2016, £46,418.38 was received as the corresponding contribution from development at Land West of Broad Road.
- 3.2. Since receiving the funds in 2015, £1,183.72 has been used to fund, in addition to other monies, improvements to Chidham and Hambrook Village Hall.
- 3.3. St Wilfrid’s Church Hall is the closest community building to the development locations. Chidham Parochial Church Council (PCC) have identified the range of wider community activity that takes place at that location and have identified a programme of improvements that they would wish to make to the Hall to improve facilities for existing users and new residents to the area.
- 3.4. An initial proposal to enclose the open space next to the Hall for the safety of young children attending playgroups has already been supported through a New Homes Bonus application submitted by Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council in July 2017.

4. Outcomes

- 4.1. Under the Local Plan, this Council was able to secure section 106 contributions from developers for the enhancement of Community Facilities, recognising the additional use required by new households.

- 4.2. At the time of the planning applications highlighted in 3.1, officers made representations to the developer regarding the payment of the contribution, citing the need for improvements to facilities in the local area. The resultant section 106 agreements stipulate the use of these monies for providing and enhancing community facilities in the parish of Chidham and Hambrook

5. Proposal

- 5.1. As a timber-framed and clad building, St Wilfrid's Church Hall will require re-cladding in order to reasonably extend its life. Accordingly the major part of the improvements to the fabric is re-cladding. It is only when the existing cladding is removed that the condition of the frame can be assessed and therefore a contingency of £2,000 is requested against repairs to the frame. At the same time the PCC would like to upgrade existing toilets facilities to increase the Hall's functionality, and make improvements to its heating (for greater year round use of the facility).
- 5.2. The existing car park to the side and rear of St Wilfrid's Church Hall is currently partly gravelled and as a result, usage is weather dependent. The PCC would also wish to improve drainage and hard standing in these areas with the aim of providing year round car parking, which is hoped to increase usage particularly in the winter months.
- 5.3. The PCC sought and received a number of quotes for the works, which have been detailed in the exempt appendix. The PCC wishes to contract with their preferred contractor (B) for the internal works to the Hall. They acknowledge that other contractors were slightly cheaper when quoting for the heating works alone, but saw some benefit in engaging with a single contractor for the works to the building.
- 5.4. As a standalone piece of work, the PCC preferred to go with Contractor C for the car park improvements as this offered better value for money.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1. The section 106 agreements do allow the Council a period of time (notionally up to five years from receipt) in order to spend the money, so a decision could be deferred in case alternative suggestions are brought forward from within the parish. The only other community building in the parish is the Chidham and Hambrook Village Hall, which has had a number of improvements, partly funded from other section 106 receipts.

7. Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1. As with other spends of this type, the implementation of the proposed projects will be undertaken by the facility owner, in this instance Chidham PCC. It is expected that the decision to fund will enable the PCC to commission the works, but implementation will be monitored by officers and monies released on evidence of spend.

8. Consultation

8.1. The project has been promoted by Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council, and the need for improvements to St Wilfrid's Church Hall has previously been highlighted in responses to the Community Facilities Audit.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

9.1. The proposed allocation of section 106 community demonstrates direct benefit both to residents of the relevant development and the wider community of Chidham and Hambrook Parish.

10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following?		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		X
Climate Change		X
Human Rights and Equality Impact Positive – improved provision of public space to existing community and new residents	X	
Safeguarding Positive - the proposed enhancements to car parking are connected to recent improvements to the venue to improve the safety of children playing in the grounds of the building.	X	

11. Appendices

11.1. Summary of quotes received [**Note** Part II exempt material for the information of members and relevant officers only: Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the *Local Government Act 1972*]

12. Background Papers

12.1. None

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

Document is Restricted