



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in the Committee Rooms at East Pallant House Chichester West Sussex on Tuesday 25 July 2017 at 14:00

Members Present Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mrs C Apel, Mr G Barrett, Mr R Barrow, Mr J Brown, Mr P Budge, Mr J Connor, Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Dignum, Mrs J Duncton, Mr M Dunn, Mr J F Elliott, Mr J W Elliott, Mr M Hall, Mr L Hixson, Mr F Hobbs, Mrs G Keegan, Mrs J Kilby, Mr L Macey, Mr K Martin, Mr G McAra, Mr S Morley, Caroline Neville, Mr S Oakley, Mr C Page, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mrs C Purnell, Mr J Ransley, Mr J Ridd, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs S Taylor, Mr N Thomas, Mrs P Tull, Mr D Wakeham, Mrs S Westacott and Mr P Wilding

Members Absent Mr A Collins, Mr T Dempster, Mr N Galloway, Mrs P Hardwick, Mr R Hayes, Mr G Hicks, Mrs E Lintill, Mr S Lloyd-Williams, Mr H Potter and Mrs J Tassell

Officers Present All Items: Mr M Allgrove (Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr A Frost (Head of Planning Services), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer) and Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services)

229 **Approval of Minutes**

The Chairman of the Council first of all welcomed everyone present to this meeting of the Council and explained the emergency evacuation procedure.

The Council received the minutes of its special meeting on Monday 19 June 2017, which had been circulated with the agenda supplement released simultaneously with the agenda (copies attached to the official minutes).

There were no proposed changes to the minutes.

Decision

The Council voted unanimously on a show of hands to make the following resolution.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Council's special meeting on Monday 19 June 2017 be approved without making any amendments.

Mrs Hamilton then duly signed and dated the final (fifteenth) page of the official version of the aforesaid minutes as a correct record.

230 **Late Items**

Mrs Hamilton stated that there were no late items under agenda item 16 for consideration at this meeting.

231 **Declarations of Interests**

Declarations of personal or prejudicial interests (with in the latter case the grant by the Monitoring Officer of dispensations) were made in respect of agenda items 6 (Approval of the Vision for Chichester City Centre), 9 (South Downs National Park Authority – Development Management Agency Agreement), 11 (Community Governance Review - Midhurst) and 14 (Community Governance Review - Chichester) by the undermentioned who were members of the stated councils or bodies consulted about or otherwise involved with the subject matter of those items:

A - PERSONAL INTERESTS

*Agenda Items 6 and 14
Chichester City Council*

- (1) Mrs Apel
- (2) Mr Budge
- (3) Mr Dignum
- (4) Mr Hixson
- (5) Mrs Kilby
- (6) Mr Macey
- (7) Mr Plowman

*Agenda Item 9
South Downs National Park Authority*

- (1) Mrs Duncton - West Sussex County Council appointed member
- (2) Mr Dunn - Chichester District Council appointed member

B - PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS WITH DISPENSATIONS

*Agenda Item 11
Midhurst Town Council*

- (1) Mr McAra – Member of Midhurst Town Council
- (2) Mr Morley - Member of Midhurst Town Council

As to the dispensations granted to Mr McAra and Mr Morley with respect to their aforementioned prejudicial interests, Mrs Hamilton read out the following statement:

'I refer Council to the item relating to the recommendation to Council as to Midhurst Parish Council from the Boundary Review Panel. A dispensation has been granted to Mr McAra and Mr Morley following formal consultation with myself as Chairman of Council in accordance with the constitutional requirements. This dispensation has been granted by the Monitoring Officer Mr Bennett who has provided me with a full legal analysis of his thinking in this matter. Mr McAra and Mr Morley are entitled to speak and move any proper motions through myself and may vote on this item.'

232 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mrs Hamilton mentioned the following apologies for absence:

Mr Collins, Mr Dempster, Mr Galloway, Mrs Hardwick, Mr Hayes, Mr Hicks, Mrs Lintill, Mr Lloyd-Williams, Mr Potter and Mrs Tassell.

All other Council members were present.

Mrs Hamilton said she was very pleased to be able to present the following two awards which had recently been made to Chichester District Council (CDC) staff

(1) Chichester District Council Car Parks Services

Mrs T Murphy (Parking Services Manager) and many of her colleagues who worked in her team were in attendance for the presentation.

Mrs Hamilton explained that this award was one of the Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London (Patrol) Awards 2015-2016. These national awards promoted and shared best practice amongst councils in the production of annual parking reports. The award was presented to Mrs T Murphy (Parking Services Manager) and her team at a House of Commons reception sponsored by David Rutley MP on 11 July 2017, which was also attended by Eileen Lintill and Gillian Keegan MP. The team had worked incredibly hard to make parking easier for customers and had improved the way they worked and so it was commendable and very well-deserved that this had been recognised externally.

To applause by members, Mrs Murphy received the award from Mrs Hamilton and said that she was delighted to receive this accolade on behalf of the Parking Services team, all of whom she invited to stand. She and her colleagues were committed to improving the service for customers, whose feedback had been sought and given careful consideration. This was a nationally recognised award and out of 70 authorities which had applied there had been a shortlist of nine. It was a great privilege to attend the House of Commons for the formal presentation of the award. One of the benefits of this success was that CDC was now viewed by local authorities as a leader in parking matters and other councils would be visiting CDC to learn about best practice. The award was a great credit to her staff. She and they appreciated being invited to attend the Council meeting.

Members acknowledged this achievement with a further round of warm applause.

*(2) Chichester District Council Pelle Team:
2017 Chichester Triathlon Series Adult Sprint Distance*

Mrs Hamilton explained that CDC had entered more than one team for this competition, which was sponsored by Nature's Way, and it had been won by the Pelle Team on Sunday 9 July 2017. At her invitation Eleanor Caldwell (Wellbeing Officer) came forward to receive the award and members acknowledged the team's success with appreciative applause.

Mrs Hamilton concluded her announcements by saying that she had recently begun to send tweets about what she was doing as the CDC Chairman, using @CDC_chair. She was grateful to CDC Public Relations for assisting her in doing this.

233 Public Question Time

No public questions had been submitted for this meeting.

[**Note** Minute paras 234 to 245 below summarise the consideration of and conclusion to agenda items 8 to 17 inclusive but for full details please refer to the audio recording facility via this link:

<http://chichester.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=132&MId=735&Ver=4>]

234 Approval of the Vision for Chichester City Centre

The Council considered the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on 11 July 2017 as set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes), the details in respect of which were contained in the report on pages 11 to 15 of the agenda for that meeting and also in the three appendices to the report on pages 1 to 38 of the first agenda supplement. All Chichester District Council (CDC) members had received a copy of the Cabinet agenda and the first agenda supplement.

A second agenda supplement had been published which circulated in electronic format for online viewing only the current draft version of the *Vision for Chichester Centre (Vision)* document (copy attached to the official minutes). As stated on the front cover of the draft document, the layout and illustrations had yet to be finalised and so were subject to amendment and change. The draft version was indicative of how the text would appear in the context of the document as a whole.

Mr Dignum (the Leader of the Council) formally moved the recommendations of the Cabinet and this was seconded by Mrs Taylor (the Cabinet Member for Planning Services).

Mr Dignum said that members had agreed in discussion with officers on the need for a vision for the future of the city of Chichester. It was essential that such a vision was supported by the city's stakeholders, the three local authorities based in the city, businesses and residents. Accordingly a steering group had been established by a Project Partners Group, developed with many stakeholders and with a number of surveys. This collaborative work had culminated in a six-week public consultation, the results of which revealed overwhelming support for the *Vision*. The aims were to agree a clear definition of 'what do we want Chichester City Centre to be' ie what is to be the future form and

function of the city centre. This would include (1) defining Chichester city centre's offer as a vibrant and attractive commercial and cultural focal point serving residents, workers and visitors, across all demographics; (2) identifying development opportunities realisable without damaging the heritage and in partnership between the private sector and others in the public sector (the Southern Gateway was a prime example aimed at attracting significant new inward investment into the city, thereby generating economic growth and the creation of jobs); and (3) creating a well-managed, well-coordinated, and well-promoted city centre to attract visitors.

A central objective had been a drive to generate new ideas and to provide the key data required to take an informed view. The proposals in the *Vision* had, therefore, been shaped by field research, reviews of previous plans and strategies, facilitated workshops attended by representatives of community and business organisations, and a comprehensive range of studies including (a) research into comparable towns and cities and (b) qualitative and quantitative studies into usage of and satisfaction with the city and its facilities among residents, businesses, workers and visitors.

In short the *Vision* aimed to develop the city thus: 'Attractive, distinctive, and successful ...Embracing its heritage and creating opportunity for all, Chichester's City Centre will be inspiring and welcoming, and at the heart of one of the UK's leading visitor destinations.'

Three major themes were established during the development process:

- *'Living' - An Accessible and Attractive City Centre*

To achieve this, Chichester city centre will:

- Be easily accessible but with less traffic, less pollution, further pedestrianisation and well-co-ordinated public transport
- Give more priority for walking and cycling
- Have attractive streets and open spaces
- Be attractive and welcoming to students and young people, while enhancing life for older people
- Encourage more city centre living with a range of accommodation for all demographics
- Be a 'smart' city that is digitally connected ensuring access to digital services to all

- *'Working' - A Vibrant and Growing Economy*

Chichester will have homes for all ages and will be a prestige city where entrepreneurs, employers and employees wish to be. Chichester City Centre will achieve this by:

- Being a city centre that pursues well-co-ordinated development opportunities making better use of public sector land
- Attracting and retaining businesses from a wide range of high earning sectors
- Being a centre of learning
- Retaining graduates and developing a skilled workforce to meet the needs of the city's economy

- *'Visiting' - A Leading Visitor Destination*

Chichester city centre will be a leading centre of artistic, cultural and heritage excellence at the heart of one of the UK's leading visitor destinations, which will by day be bustling with shoppers enjoying the best retail experience in the South.

Once the *Vision* had been approved and adopted, a delivery plan and timetable would be produced and it was proposed to establish a Chichester Vision Delivery Steering Group (CVDSG). The action plan and the governance arrangements for the CVDSG would be brought to the Cabinet for approval in October 2017.

He referred members to the online colour version of the draft *Vision* document. The Council was being asked to approve the final text and not the design illustrations. Comments from West Sussex County Council (WSCC) were awaited.

During the ensuing discussion (full details of which are available via the audio recording on CDC's web-site) members made comments and asked questions about various matters and received where appropriate answers from Mr Dignum, Mrs Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mrs J Hotchkiss (Head of Commercial Services) who was present as an observer. The subjects included:

- (a) The omission of (i) a proposal to construct a level crossing flyover or tunnel for vehicles and (ii) any reference in the engineering report to the tunnels found in 1994.
- (b) The need to address urgently the poor state of repair of the city's pavements – this was recognised but it was a historic city and the funds required by WSCC as the responsible authority to carry out appropriate repairs were not available - Mr Dignum and Mr Plowman were pursuing the point.
- (c) The *Vision* document needed to be and would be sufficiently robust to cope with the additional housing planned for the city (a figure of 'some 3.500' was cited in the second para on page 8 of the first agenda supplement) and there was also the issue of how to address the additional traffic such development would generate.
- (d) The approach to prioritising the various competing aspirations and projects would inevitably be influenced by the limited resources. The main priority would be to exploit development opportunities. CDC would lead on the Southern Gateway project and WSCC on the Northern Gateway. Priorities would begin to be addressed when the CVDSG met later in the year. It was intended that the *Vision* would inspire CDC's other projects and objectives such as its proposed litter strategy to benefit the city and the whole of Chichester District.
- (e) The need (i) to include in the *Vision* the concept of community values for the whole of the city in order to deliver the benefits of the *Vision* for everyone and to carry the support of the community for it and (ii) for the *Vision's* component parts such as the masterplanning for the redevelopment of Southern Gateway to cohere satisfactorily with the aspirations contained in the *Vision* – the *Vision* was an over-arching umbrella strategy which did in fact address the concerns felt by all city's residents eg with regard to accessibility, public transport, cycling, open spaces, appropriate housing and other development, dealing with litter and sufficient scope for facilitating city centre living.

- (f) The consultation response rate was rather low at less than 2% of the city's population, raising a question about whether the consultation engagement process was adequate compared with responses for neighbourhood development plans or those undertaken in other cities or perhaps the public was simply not sufficiently interested – CDC's Communities team in fact considered the response rate to be high for a consultation of this nature, it was not dissimilar to that for the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029*, there were workshops with a whole range of people, CDC consulted far and wide and the results were validated by research.

Mr Dignum and Mrs Hamilton each acknowledged the hard work by Mr Oates (Economic Development Manager) in preparing the *Vision*.

At the end of the debate the following decision was made by the Council.

Decision

The Council voted with respect to the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet and on a show of hands it was in favour of making the resolutions set out below, with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the final text for the Chichester Vision document be approved.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Economic Development Manager following consultation with the Leader of the Council to enable minor amendments to be made to the document after any further comments from project partners.

235 Chichester District Council Annual Report for 2016-2017

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on 11 July 2017 as set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes), the details in respect of which were contained in the report on pages 16 to 17 of the agenda for that meeting and also in the appendix to the report on pages 39 to 83 of the first agenda supplement. All Chichester District Council (CDC) members had received a copy of the Cabinet agenda and the first agenda supplement.

Mr Dignum (the Leader of the Council) formally moved the recommendations of the Cabinet and this was seconded by Mrs Kilby (the Cabinet Member for Housing Services).

Mr Dignum remarked that whilst it was customary for the Cabinet at its meeting not to review the report in detail, the hard work put into producing it was to be commended. Members were encouraged to familiarise themselves with the report which detailed the wide-ranging work carried out by CDC and the many achievements delivered on behalf of the District's communities. He thanked Mr Mildred and all officers for their extensive efforts in preparing the report.

During the discussion (full details of which are available via the audio recording on CDC's web-site) members made comments and asked questions about various matters and received where appropriate answers from Mr Dignum. The subjects included:

- (a) The names of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman ought to appear before the Cabinet members on page 43 in the first agenda supplement – this would be amended.
- (b) The report ought also to cover what CDC had attempted but failed to achieve and work or projects which were ongoing, for this would make the report not only more comprehensive but useful – this would be raised with officers.
- (c) The report ought to include in the Planning Services section starting on page 80 of the first agenda supplement a review of the Development Management (DM) service provided by CDC on behalf of the South Downs National Park Authority – this would be raised with DM officers by Mrs Taylor.
- (d) The report ought to include in the Planning Services section on page 80 of the first agenda supplement a reference to the Tangmere strategic development location site in the 'Key areas of work for 2017/18:' section – Mrs Taylor would ask officers to add that site.
- (e) The report ought to include in the Building Control part of the Planning Services section on page 81 of the first agenda supplement a reference to the terms of performance eg compliance within the stipulated timescale – this was a good idea which would be raised with officers by Mrs Taylor.

At the end of the debate the following decision was made by the Council.

Decision

The Council voted with respect to the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet and on a show of hands it was in favour of making the resolutions set out below, with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

That the Chichester District Council Annual Report for 2016-2017 be received.

236 Making the Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on 11 July 2017 as set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes), the details in respect of which were contained in the report on pages 18 to 19 of the agenda for that meeting. All Chichester District Council members had received a copy of the Cabinet agenda.

Mrs Taylor (the Cabinet Member for Planning Services) formally moved the recommendation of the Cabinet and this was seconded by Mr Dignum (the Leader of the Council).

Mrs Taylor summarised section 3 of the Cabinet report and stated the result of the referendum which had taken place on 18 July 2017 as follows: the turnout was 24% and 86% of those who voted were in favour of the neighbourhood development plan (NDP), the majority threshold being 50%. The recommendation related to the Chichester Local Plan area ie that part of Chichester District which lay outside the South Downs National Park

Authority's (SDNPA) jurisdiction. The SDNPA's Planning Committee would consider whether to make the Lavant NDP at its meeting on 10 August 2017.

Mr Hall and Mrs Taylor commended all those involved for their hard work in preparing and producing the Lavant NDP. Members gave audible assent to that sentiment.

There was no discussion of this item.

At the end of the debate the following decision was made by the Council.

Decision

The Council voted with respect to the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet and on a show of hands it was in favour of making the resolution set out below, with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

That following the successful referendum on 18 July 2017 the Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan be made part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

237 South Downs National Park Authority - Development Management Agency Agreement

The Council considered the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on 11 July 2017 as set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes), the details in respect of which were contained in the report on pages 20 to 27 of the agenda for that meeting and also in the appendices to the report on pages 84 to 178 of the first agenda supplement (pages 176 to 178 of which, being appendices 2 and 3, were confidential Part II material). All Chichester District Council (CDC) members had received a copy of the Cabinet agenda and the first agenda supplement.

Mrs Taylor (the Cabinet Member for Planning Services) formally moved the recommendations of the Cabinet and this was seconded by Mr Dignum (the Leader of the Council).

Mrs Taylor summarised the history from 2011 to date of the legal agreements between CDC and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) for the delivery by CDC of a development management service on behalf of the SDNPA. She explained the principal change namely how payments would be calculated in the new agreement, which could operate for up to five more years with effect from October 2017. The new arrangements for determining payment levels were set out in paras 6.4 to 6.11 of the report. The draft section 101 agreement was in appendix 1; its four schedules were summarised in para 6.1 of the report, which also mentioned certain matters were still being negotiated and it was expected that these would be satisfactorily resolved. Para 6.7 summarised the details in the two confidential Part II appendices. The justification and benefits of entering into the new agreement were set out in sections 5 and 7 of the report. Section 9 reported the views expressed by CDC's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) at its meeting on 23 June 2017, which included two recommendations to the Cabinet in paras 9.3 and 9.4.

During the discussion (full details of which are available via the audio recording on CDC's web-site) members made comments and asked questions about various matters and

received where appropriate answers from Mrs Taylor and Mr Dignum and also Mr A Frost (Head of Planning Services), Mrs Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services). The subjects included:

- (a) The development management agency agreement was very desirable in order to ensure that CDC retained influence within the whole of its geographical area including that part which lay within the SDNP.
- (b) The need for CDC members whose wards were within the South Downs National Park to be consulted better than they were by the SDNPA in order that they could advise and answer their constituents' concerns and questions.
- (c) The importance of proper liaison between the two local planning authorities regarding those matters which did not clearly fall into the remit of either local planning authority – this would be pursued with the SDNPA and CDC was actively engaging with SDNPA to address all relevant issues, including (i) the preparation of its local plan in respect of which the SDNPA's Chief Executive had been asked by Mrs Shepherd to arrange a briefing session for CDC members and (ii) the development by the two authorities of a communications protocol for district and parish councillors.
- (d) The SDNPA was not provided with building control services by CDC, which had to compete with private companies offering that facility.
- (e) The Development Management team at CDC for the SDNP was currently at full strength with no vacancies. There was no compulsion exerted on CDC by the SDNPA to fill staff vacancies on the National Park team before CDC planning posts and CDC would recruit in the normal way.
- (f) The financial risk of the agency arrangement had been carefully considered in a thorough costing exercise which had involved for example a very detailed time analysis undertaken over a long period of time and an assessment of overheads.

During the debate Mr Ransley proposed that the press and the public be excluded from the Council meeting in order to discuss some of the details in the Part II exempt appendices 2 and 3. His concern related to defining the financial risk associated with this agency agreement (see (f) above). His proposal was seconded by Mr Shaxson. On a vote then being taken there were only 12 members in support thereof. The proposal was not, therefore, carried and the debate continued within Part I.

Mr Dignum concluded the debate by saying that the agency agreement was a good one which would ensure that the development management service was brought closer to CDC's residents because it involved elected members representing the SDNPA area. CDC dealt with 97.6% of SDNPA planning applications. This was a long-term arrangement and while CDC could not make a profit from the agreement it would be able to recover a significant amount of its overheads. For these reasons he commended the agreement to the Council.

At the end of the debate the following decision was made by the Council.

Decision

The Council voted with respect to the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet and on a show of hands it was in favour of making the resolutions set out below, with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

- (1) That a new Agreement be entered into with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) under section 101 of the *Local Government Act 1972* to enable Chichester District Council to continue to provide a development management service to the SDNPA for up to three years initially until 30 September 2020 and, subject to a further report to the Cabinet and the Council, for a further two years up until 30 September 2022 if the arrangements are working effectively and agreeable to both authorities.
- (2) That the Head of Planning Services be authorised to conclude negotiations on the section 101 Agreement including the Service Level Agreement and related Protocols and complete the Agreement.
- (3) That the proposed basis for payments set out in appendix 1 and 2 for the delivery of a development management service to the SDNPA be agreed.

238 Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2016-2017 Annual Report

The Council considered a report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) at its meeting on 13 June 2017 and the first appendix thereto namely the OSC 2016-2017 Annual Report which contained a recommendation to the Council (copies attached to the official minutes).

At Mrs Hamilton's invitation the recommendation was proposed by Mrs C M M Apel, the OSC chairman, and seconded by Mrs N D Graves, the OSC vice-chairman.

Mrs Apel presented the Annual Report, the contents of which were self-explanatory. She thanked Mrs B Jones (Principal Scrutiny Officer) and Mr S Hansford (Head of Community Services) for their work in advising and assisting the OSC and also she thanked all of the OSC members. The OSC had had a very full year, which had included inviting the Cabinet members to attend to explain their respective portfolios. She emphasised the importance of scrutiny.

During a short discussion:

- (a) In reply to a member's request that the OSC should consider the way public consultations were conducted by CDC with a view to seeing how they might be improved, Mrs Shepherd (Chief Executive) said that this should be raised with Mrs Apel and that it was for the OSC and not the Council meeting to set its annual work programme.
- (b) In reply to comments made about the quality standards of social housing within Chichester District, Mrs J L Kilby (the Cabinet Member for Housing Services) said that a task and finish group had been established by the OSC and it had agreed that all local registered social housing providers should be requested to provide

evidence to CDC for a wide-ranging review now underway of its Housing Allocations Scheme.

Mrs Hamilton proposed that the recommendation on the face of the agenda be approved by the Council.

Decision

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

RESOLVED

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Annual Report 2016-2017 be noted.

239 Community Governance Review - Midhurst

The Council considered the first of four recommendations relating to community governance reviews (CGR) made to it by the Boundary Review Panel (BRevP) at its meeting on 6 July 2017, the text of which was set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

At Mrs Hamilton's invitation the recommendation was proposed by Mr J Ridd, the BRevP chairman and seconded by Mr J Ransley, a BRevP member.

Mr Ridd presented the recommendation. He explained that contrary to the usual boundary governance issues the BRevP was used to considering, this matter was both unusual and even inappropriate having regard to the BRevP's terms of reference. It was in the BRevP's opinion principally a planning matter. The request by Midhurst Town Council (MHTC) for a community governance review related to a piece of undeveloped land in the adjacent parish of Cocking, which MHTC considered was suitable for housing development. There was no allocated housing need for Cocking parish and the site was outside its development area. The BRevP felt that MHTC should pursue its objective by for example seeking to have a neighbourhood development plan and in any event since the site lay within the South Downs National Park it should liaise with the South Downs National Park Authority, which was in the process of preparing its local plan. These two points featured in the two reasons contained in the BRevP's recommendation.

There was no discussion of this item.

Mrs Hamilton proposed that the recommendation on the face of the agenda be the subject of a vote by the Council.

Decision

The Council voted on a show of hands in favour of making the resolution set out below with no votes against and two abstentions (Mr G V McAra and Mr S F Morley).

RESOLVED

That a community governance review of the parish arrangements for Midhurst and Cocking should not be undertaken at the current time for the following reasons:

- (1) The planning process (including the option of having a neighbourhood development plan) is the more appropriate basis for Midhurst Town Council to achieve its objective and
- (2) The South Downs National Park Authority is the local planning authority for the land which is the subject of Midhurst Town Council's request and is currently producing its local plan and it would not be appropriate for Chichester District Council to interfere with that process by acceding to that request.

240 Community Governance Review - Reduction in the Number of Councillors for Woolbeding with Redford Parish Council

The Council considered the second of four recommendations relating to community governance reviews (CGR) made to it by the Boundary Review Panel (BRevP) at its meeting on 6 July 2017, the text of which was set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

At Mrs Hamilton's invitation the recommendation was proposed by Mr J Ridd, the BRevP chairman and seconded by Mr G V McAra, the BRevP vice-chairman.

Mr Ridd presented the recommendation. He briefly summarised the reasons why Woolbeding with Redford Parish Council considered that having regard to its very small electorate of 121 a reduction in the number of councillors was justified. A CGR had been undertaken. The BRevP had agreed with the rationale of the request and having regard to the outcome of the CGR it supported the requested reduction.

There was no discussion of this item.

Mrs Hamilton proposed that the recommendation on the face of the agenda be the subject of a vote by the Council.

Decision

The Council voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the resolution set out below with no votes against or abstentions.

RESOLVED

That following a community governance review consultation there be a reduction in the number of parish councillors on Woolbeding with Redford Parish Council from seven to five members.

241 Community Governance Review - Increase in the Number of Councillors on Westhampnett Parish Council

The Council considered the third of four recommendations relating to community governance reviews (CGR) made to it by the Boundary Review Panel (BRevP) at its meeting on 6 July 2017, the text of which was set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

At Mrs Hamilton's invitation the recommendation was proposed by Mr J Ridd, the BRevP chairman and seconded by Mr G V McAra, the BRevP vice-chairman.

Mr Ridd presented the recommendation. He briefly summarised the reasons why Westhampnett Parish Council had contended in a comprehensive submission the case for a CGR to be undertaken seeking a modest numerical increase of two in the number of parish councillors. This was unanimously supported by the BRevP.

Save for a brief comment by a member, there was no discussion of this item.

Mrs Hamilton proposed that the recommendation on the face of the agenda be the subject of a vote by the Council.

Decision

The Council voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the resolution set out below with no votes against or abstentions.

RESOLVED

That a community governance review be undertaken with a view to there being an increase in the number of parish councillors on Westhampnett Parish Council from seven to nine members.

242 Community Governance Review - Chichester

The Council considered the fourth of four recommendations relating to community governance reviews (CGR) made to it by the Boundary Review Panel (BRevP) at its meeting on 6 July 2017, the text of which was set out on the face of the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

At Mrs Hamilton's invitation the recommendation was proposed by Mr J Ridd, the BRevP chairman and seconded by Mr G V McAra, the BRevP vice-chairman.

Mr Ridd presented the recommendation. He explained that this CGR request by Chichester City Council (CCC) arose in consequence of boundary changes which would be brought into effect after electoral reviews of the Chichester District Council (CDC) and West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) local government areas. In short the CCC boundaries were now no longer co-terminous with the CDC and WSSCC boundaries. CCC had decided to realign its boundaries to achieve co-terminosity by having four city wards with four members each and one ward with two members, which would result in reduction of two councillors from the current 20 to 18 members. The BRevP supported CCC's request for a CGR. It should be noted that in the event after a CGR consultation the changes were agreed the consent of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) would first be required, which the LGBCE would not unreasonably withhold, before the changes could be brought into effect.

During a short discussion of this item Mr Dignum (the Leader of the Council and a CCC member) and Mr R E Plowman (who was also a CCC member) expressed their gratitude to the BRevP for making its supportive recommendation. Clearly the absurdity of voters having to vote in two different polling stations on the same day for CCC and CDC and/or WSSCC elections had to be avoided by means of a CGR. Without casting aspersions on the basis of the BRevP's reasoning and recommendation in this case, Mr J Brown and Mr Ransley remarked that it was important when CGRs were undertaken that the outcomes did not undermine effective representation of communities by their elected councillors ie by

smaller areas being subsumed within larger ones, in particular rural areas becoming part of urban areas.

Mrs Hamilton proposed that the recommendation on the face of the agenda be the subject of a vote by the Council.

Decision

The Council voted on a show of hands in favour of making the resolution set out below with no votes against and one abstention.

RESOLVED

That a community governance review be undertaken to assess:

- (i) the parish warding arrangements and
- (ii) the number of councillors

for the Chichester City Council administrative area.

- (2) That the review be publicised to allow persons or bodies who may be interested to be able to make representations.
- (3) That the review be concluded within 12 months and that the consent for any recommendations be sought from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.
- (4) That it be noted that any review recommendations could not be implemented without express consent of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

[Note At the end of this item there was a short adjournment between 15:43 and 15:55]

243 **Questions to the Executive**

Mrs Hamilton invited members to indicate if they wished to ask questions of the Cabinet and the names of those so desiring were noted. She reminded members that a maximum of 40 minutes was allocated for this item.

The questions asked and the responses given were as follows:

Question by Mrs Apel: Installation of a Sprinkler System at the New Academy Selsey

Mrs Apel expressed her concern to **Mr Dignum** (the Leader of the Council) about the construction of the new Academy Selsey which was apparently not going to include a sprinkler system. She felt that this was an extraordinary and very worrying decision and omission, especially in the light of the recent Grenfell Tower fire tragedy.

The point was supported also in brief comments by other members. **Mrs Duncton**, who was also a West Sussex County Council (WSCC) member, said that the same concern had been expressed at WSCC's Council meeting the previous Friday but WSCC had little influence to exert since an academy was involved. **Mr Hixson** thought that there was still time to intervene. **Mr Connor** hoped that the Chief Executive could contact the West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service to make it aware; **Mrs Duncton** advised that had already been done.

Response by Mr Dignum and Mrs Shepherd

Mr Dignum (the Leader of the Council) said that this issue did not lie within Chichester District Council's (CDC) responsibility and he deferred to Mrs Shepherd (Chief Executive).

Mrs Shepherd (Chief Executive) said that whilst neither CDC at all nor WSCC in the case of an academy had statutory responsibility for fire safety matters, she would of course raise members' concerns by writing to the chief executive of The Kemnal Academies Trust and the Head of the Academy Selsey. Members would be kept informed about the correspondence.

Question by Mr Shaxson: Briefing for CDC Members on the South Downs National Park Draft Local Plan

Mr Shaxson referred to CDC and its members being involved in the preparation by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) of its pre-submission draft local plan and whether, as he had heard, CDC members were to be given a briefing by the SDNPA.

Response by Mr Frost

Mr Frost (Head of Planning Services) said that the consultation on the SDNPA's pre-submission draft local plan would start in early September 2017.

Question by Mr Morley: Marketing of the Site adjacent to The Grange Centre in Midhurst

Mr Morley said that questions had been raised by constituents recently about a temporary landscaping project on this site pending its final disposal, which was supported by Midhurst Town Council. He asked if this was CDC's intention.

Response by Mr Over

Mr Over (Executive Director) advised that it would not be wise to allow a temporary use of site when the marketing of its sale was significantly advanced because, for example, that use could attract local support and then be difficult to discontinue. It was preferable to avoid short-term solutions in such cases. Offers to purchase the site were under consideration and CDC would be liaising with the bidders in the next few weeks prior to a report being submitted to the Cabinet.

Question by Mr Brown: CDC's Position on the A27 Chichester Bypass Improvement Works Options

Mr Brown mentioned the briefing for CDC members which had taken place the previous afternoon to explain the current position regarding the revived opportunity to consider the available options to carry out improvement works for the A27 Chichester bypass. He said

that in view of the concerns expressed about a lack of information it had probably been unwise to have conducted a straw poll among the members about the options, not least because it could create a perception by the public of a 'stitch-up'. He invited **Mr Dignum** (the Leader of the Council) to state at this meeting that CDC was not committed to a particular option and sought more information and contribution to the debate by members of the public. At a public meeting which had been held the previous evening after the CDC member briefing there was an evident suspicion that the process was a *fait accompli*.

Response by Mr Dignum

Mr Dignum (the Leader of the Council) said that it had been no more than a straw poll. CDC officers led by **Mrs Shepherd** (Chief Executive) would be meeting in the next few weeks with their opposite numbers at West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) with a view to agreeing a suggested solution which could be presented to Highways England (HE). Any such proposal would of course be submitted to the Council meeting for approval before being presented to HE so that a detailed design could then be made the subject of a public consultation. CDC was not committed to any outcome or proposal. The process now as in 2016 was to examine in detail the issues with each of the available options (not all the possible options were part of the consultation in 2016) and to ascertain a possible way forward. Members and the public would be consulted.

Question by Mr Oakley: Clarification of CDC's Position on the A27 Chichester Bypass Improvement Works Options

Mr Oakley referred to the previous evening's build a better A27 community workshop at which **Mr Dignum** as the Leader of the Council had made a statement where he seemed to intimate that CDC had decided to agree on a proposed scheme of improvement works for the A27 Chichester bypass. He invited **Mr Dignum** (the Leader of the Council) to clarify the status of the previous afternoon's meeting of CDC members and to confirm whether any of his proposed adjustments to Option 2 had any professional, technical work carried out to support them, since neither of his proposed single direction flyovers at the Whyke and Portfield roundabouts had appeared in any previous Highways England (HE) consultations or studies. He also asked what weight could be placed by CDC on any intimations made by HE during a one-hour meeting in response to proposals presented to it to adjust the previous A27 options.

Response by Mr Dignum

Mr Dignum (the Leader of the Council) affirmed that no decision had been taken by CDC and that the previous afternoon's vote on a show of hands had been merely a straw poll which did not commit CDC in any way at all. Each of the diagrams shown in the slides at the CDC member meeting had featured in HE's consultation document in 2016 and members had only been presented with a montage of images from that document. Parts of Options 1 and 3 had been taken to add to option 2 in order to achieve the objective of minimising objections raised during the previous consultation. When he had put to HE's Chief Executive the possibility of a flyover for south of the A27, the indication was that it could be accommodated at a cost of £10-20m. The idea of a flyover at the Whyke roundabout (which HE had said was feasible but would need to be assessed) had merely been mooted. HE's Chief Executive and South East Region Director were familiar with the 2016 options and were able therefore to respond to the proposals to adjust those options.

Question by Mr J F Elliott: Telephone Contact with CDC Officers at East Pallant House

Mr J F Elliott described his experience of failing on most occasions to speak with officers using their direct dial numbers and having to endure a wait of between five to ten minutes to be dealt with by the Contact Centre. He felt that the problem was deteriorating.

Response by Mr Wilding and Mr Over

Mr Wilding (the Cabinet Member for Business Improvement Services) said that the assumption ought to be made that if officers did not answer the telephone they were away from the desks. **Mr Over** (Executive Director) explained that the telephony system was a fairly recent installation and a number of training workshops had been held for staff. The system afforded flexibility with working location but it had taken some time for staff to adjust to it. The system enabled officers to transfer calls to their mobiles or to a colleague's telephone. Nevertheless senior officers were aware of the complaint made by **Mr Elliott** and this was being addressed.

Question by Mr Barrett: Progress with Community Land Trusts

Mr Barrett remarked that there was very little available information about setting up community land trusts (CLTs) and he sought information from **Mrs Kilby** (the Cabinet Member for Housing Services) about progress to date in managing these groups and feedback from the rural housing week.

Response by Jane Kilby

Mrs Kilby (the Cabinet Member for Housing Services) stated that before the rural housing week there were six groups in rural and semi-urban very keen to establish CLTs. There was a lot of interest in CLTs and officers were considering whether to publicise them on the CDC website.

Question by Mr Plowman: Southern Rail Disruption

Mr Plowman referred to the ongoing disruptive impact of the Southern Rail dispute and its detrimental effect on Chichester. He invited **Mr Dignum** (the Leader of the Council) to join him in writing to the Secretary of State for Transport Chris Grayling MP to request that the franchise be removed from Govia and he proposed making a motion to that effect at this meeting. He believed that Chichester residents looked to their local councillors to give a lead in this matter and the letter he proposed would help to demonstrate members were concerned about how so many people were being adversely affected by this dispute and that members desired to see action taken.

Response by Mr Dignum and Mrs Keegan

Mr Dignum (the Leader of the Council) declined **Mr Plowman's** invitation and did not consider that a motion would be appropriate. He alluded to a rail expert's finding that the trade union was principally to blame but others were also responsible eg the Aslef train drivers' overtime ban. The Secretary of State had offered to meet with the unions with a view to achieving a settlement and the overtime ban had been suspended. It was the unions' attitude and not the franchise holder which was the issue. The facts needed to be analysed. He was willing to write a letter and he would ask **Gillian Keegan MP** to assist with the wording of the letter and how to publicise CDC members' concerns.

Mrs Keegan MP said that she had met with West Sussex MPs, Aslef and the Secretary of State for Transport and the overtime ban had been lifted. It was a complicated situation which required careful involvement but the need to alleviate the suffering of residents was important to achieve.

Question by Mr Dunn: Alternative Solutions to A27 Chichester Bypass Improvement Works

Mr Dunn expressed pessimism at resolving the A27 Chichester bypass traffic congestion problems and said that other options should be considered. He mentioned that the Mayor of Paris had declared a large part of that city traffic-free. Consideration should be given to promoting car-sharing and re-opening the case for a park and ride facility at Chichester.

Mr Budge and **Mrs Apel** pointed out that traffic congestion in the city was markedly reduced during school holidays.

Response by Mr Dignum

Mr Dignum (the Leader of the Council) said that he did not share **Mr Dunn's** pessimism. The objective was to identify a feasible A27 Chichester bypass solution by the deadline in September 2017 (unless extended). CDC was developing a parking strategy and would be considering West Sussex County Council's road space audit.

Question by Mr Ransley: Community Land Trust Case Studies

Mr Ransley followed up the earlier question by **Mr Barrett** about community land trusts (CLTs) and asked about the availability of case studies from other local authorities which could assist CDC. His ward of Kirdford would welcome some funding for CLTs.

Response by Mrs Kilby and Mr Dignum

Mrs Kilby (the Cabinet Member for Housing Services) said that such case studies could be provided. **Mr Dignum** (the Leader of the Council) said that CDC had substantial funding of £1.4m to use for CLTs.

[**Note** Questions to the executive are hereby concluded]

244 **Late Items**

As announced by the Chairman of the Council at agenda item 2 (see minute 230 above) there were no late items for consideration at this meeting.

245 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

In the absence of any Part II items on the agenda for this meeting a resolution to exclude the press and the public was not required.

[**Note** The meeting ended at 16:28]

CHAIRMAN

DATE