

FURTHER ELECTORAL REVIEW OF CHICHESTER DISTRICT

PROPOSAL ON COUNCIL SIZE

by Chichester District Council

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the last electoral review of Chichester District in 2002, a number of changes have occurred which suggest that the current number of 48 members is now more than is needed for the Council to fulfil its functions effectively. The Council has undertaken a forward-looking analysis of the role of councillors in governance and decision-making, scrutiny and representing their communities. It proposes a reduction in the number of councillors to 35 or 36, to be implemented for the district council elections in 2019.

INTRODUCTION

1. Description of Chichester District

- 1.1. The district of Chichester is the most westerly in West Sussex. Covering an area of almost 800 sq.km, it is geographically the largest of the seven districts and boroughs within West Sussex. It extends from the Surrey border with Waverley Borough southwards to the sea at Selsey Bill. It extends eastwards from the Hampshire border to the neighbouring West Sussex districts of Arun and Horsham.
- 1.2. Chichester District is a very special place. From the “jewel in the crown” of a city centre, with its stunning cathedral, bustling shopping streets and well renowned higher education, arts and cultural scene, it includes the sweeping South Downs, the newest National Park in England, and the breath-taking coastline, incorporating part of the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is this high quality environment that underpins and supports the local economy. It serves to attract prestigious global brands and attracts new entrepreneurs to establish their businesses here. These attractive qualities and features taken together, offer a unique and rich experience for people who choose to live, study, work and visit here. In turn, this generates an increasing requirement for homes, jobs and leisure opportunities. The attractive environment and proximity to London mean that house prices are high and the affordability gap between average house prices and household incomes is one of the largest in the country.
- 1.3. The district is predominantly rural, with a total population of 113,800 (Census 2011), a 6.85% increase from 106,500 in 2001. The cathedral city of Chichester is the main settlement with a population of nearly 27,000. The city has main road and rail transport links running east-west across the district – the A27 trunk road connecting to Portsmouth and Southampton in the west and Worthing and Brighton in the east, and rail links along the south

coast and to London. Much of the development potential lies along this corridor which also includes the settlements of Tangmere (pop: 2,600) and Southbourne (pop: 6,300). To the south lies the Manhood Peninsula, which includes Selsey, the second largest town in the district with a population of around 10,700, and some smaller seaside resorts. To the north of Chichester is an extensive sparsely populated rural area, with Midhurst (pop: 4,900) and Petworth (pop: 3,000) being the largest settlements.

2. Chichester District Council

- 2.1. Chichester District Council is a shire district council within the county of West Sussex. The area is entirely parished with 67 parishes, including Chichester City. Eight parishes have no parish council, but only a parish meeting.
- 2.2. The District Council has 48 members, elected from 29 wards, four of which make up the city of Chichester and two the town of Selsey. Five of the wards return three councillors; nine are represented by two councillors, with the remaining 15 being single-member wards.
- 2.3. These current electoral arrangements have applied since the last review by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) in 2002. That review focussed on correcting electoral imbalance, and was too soon after the Local Government Act 2000 required a change in governance arrangements (in Chichester's case to a Leader and Cabinet system) for the impact of the new political management structure to be fully taken into account. That review was based on a district electorate of 84,227 in February 2001. The electorate has increased to 92,185 by June 2014. Electoral forecasts to 2021 will be produced at a later stage in the review process.

3. The request for a review

- 3.1. There has for some time been a widespread feeling among members of the Council of all political groups that, given the changes that have happened since 2002, the current Council has too many members.
- 3.2. In summary some of those changes are:
 - Reduction in the amount of business councillors need to transact at the council offices, through a streamlining of decision-making and committee structures.
 - The volume of ward work in the community has reduced so that councillors can accommodate larger caseloads. The transfer of the Council's housing stock in 2001 made a major difference.
 - Reductions in the number and size of committees.
 - A number of members not being truly engaged and not attending committee meetings and other events.

- Difficulty in recruiting candidates for election, especially to reflect the local population: most councillors are at the top end of age and socio-economic ranges.
- New ways of working in the digital environment.
- Outsourcing of services, especially housing, with the potential likelihood of future reductions in in-house service provision.
- Two thirds of the area of the District is now covered by the South Downs National Park, with the South Downs National Park Authority now being responsible for certain functions (such as preparation of a Local Plan) in the National Park that were formerly the responsibility of the District Council.
- A smaller managerial and officer organisation needs to be matched by reduction in councillors.

3.3. In March 2014, the Council's Boundary Review Panel considered a report (Appendix 1), which explained the process and timetable involved in an electoral review, and the criteria which would be taken into account. The Panel's recommendation was to request a review with a view to reducing the number of members elected to the Council at the 2019 and subsequent District Council elections.

3.4. Shortly before the Council meeting at which this recommendation was to be considered, officers contacted the LGBCE's Director of Reviews. He explained that it was highly unlikely that the Commission would agree to commence a review of this Council before the 2015 elections, with a view to implementing any changes in 2019.

3.5. The Council, therefore, resolved:

- (1) That inclusion of an electoral review of Chichester District in the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's programme of electoral reviews be sought, with the objective of a significant reduction in the number of councillors by the 2019 elections, subject to confirmation by the Council after the 2015 elections that it wishes the review to proceed.
- (2) That the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive be authorised to meet representatives of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to discuss the process and a potential review timetable.

3.6. The meeting between representatives of the Council and the LGBCE took place on 9 September 2014. The LGBCE suggested that the first step in the review process, the preparation of a submission on Council size, could be undertaken by the current members, before the 2015 election. This would mean that the proposal would have the benefit of input from experienced members and would be in place without needing to wait for the new Council to gain the experience and the opportunity to consider the matter.

3.7. As a result, the Council decided to set up a Task and Finish Group, comprising seven members nominated by party group leaders, to develop a proposal on council size, for submission to the LGBCE after approval by the Council, that would allow a future Council to take decisions effectively, manage the business and responsibilities of the council successfully, and provide effective community leadership and representation. The Task and Finish Group was asked to report to Cabinet in February, with a view to a proposal being approved by the Council at its meeting in March 2015.

4. The LGBCE's expectations and the Council's approach to this task

4.1. The LGBCE's guide on Council Size states that the Commission expects to consider "locally-generated proposals which are underpinned by sound evidence and reasoning". This proposal has been designed to conform to that expectation.

4.2. The Guide goes on to state that the Commission "has no preconceptions about the right number of councillors to represent an authority" and always seeks that the proposed council size is appropriate for the individual characteristics of the local authority in question. However, it does look to CIPFA's "Nearest Neighbours" model to compare a council's proposals with statistically similar authorities. A current comparison with Chichester's "nearest neighbours" statistically is provided in Appendix 2. A number of these councils have recently been reviewed by the Commission, with resulting reductions in size of similar proportions to that proposed here. Examples are South Hams, Suffolk Coastal, Cotswold and Stratford-on-Avon.

4.3. Acting on informal advice from the Commission, the Council's approach has been to conduct a functional analysis of the full role of councillors at Chichester District Council, including the governance, scrutiny and representational roles. The time horizon for the review looks back to the last review in 2002, but also looks forward to the kind of council we expect to be in 2019. In doing so, no account has been taken of the impact on ward boundaries – that comes at a later stage in the review.

4.4. The Task and Finish Group started by undertaking a PEST analysis:

Political
Economic/Financial
Social
Technological

This considered the impact of changes over the last dozen years and explored forward trends in order to clarify the underlying assumptions for the review and identify options for the future. After this initial analysis, attention was turned to the helpful list of questions in the LGBCE guide on:

- governance and decision-making
- scrutiny functions
- representational role of councillors

THE PEST ANALYSIS

5. Political

- 5.1. It is assumed that Chichester will continue to be a shire district council, operating with a county council and parish councils, in a three-tier system of local government. There are no plans to be involved in a voluntary merger of local authorities, which is the only circumstance in which the present Government will consider local government re-organisation. If an incoming government proposes to re-organise the area on unitary lines, this review becomes irrelevant.
- 5.2. The main change in local government structure that has affected this Council in the last twelve years is the creation of the South Downs National Park. This has reduced some of the Council's responsibilities, for instance the draft Local Plan relates only to that part of the district outside the National Park. However, the Council has an agency agreement with the National Park Authority, whereby the Council provides most development management functions on their behalf. This means that members whose wards cover the National Park continue to pay attention to planning applications and the Planning Committee determines most applications in the National Park that are not delegated to officers. That agency agreement is expected to continue, although it is reviewed every three years. It is expected that the involvement of members in development management will continue, although there is the possibility of reduction if the agency arrangement is revoked. Similarly, because the Council will be a consultee on the Local Plan for the National Park and related documents, members with wards in the National Park may be expected to take an interest.
- 5.3. Apart from that, the Council's functional responsibilities are expected to remain broadly similar to those at present. However, the way in which those functions are delivered may change through alternative means of delivery or sharing of services with another authority.
- 5.4. The Large Scale Voluntary Transfer of the Council's housing stock to Martlet Homes (now part of the Hyde group) in 2001 brought a substantial reduction in councillors' involvement in housing management and tenants' issues. Although, no further outsourcing on this scale is planned, the Council is testing the market for the future management of its leisure functions. Outsourcing of services tends to reduce councillors' roles to one of occasional scrutiny, because officers are responsible to Cabinet Members for contract management and monitoring.
- 5.5. Some services are already shared with other authorities, most notably with Arun District Council. These tend to be small scale or 'back office' functions and have had little impact on members' roles. Examples are: coast

protection, procurement, and printing, and consideration is being given to aspects of ICT, revenues and benefits. There are no proposals for the integration of management and staff structures with another council, of the type undertaken by Adur and Worthing to the east and, partially, by East Hampshire and Havant to the west.

- 5.6. The political composition of the Council throughout the last 12 years has comprised a dominant Conservative group and a minority Liberal Democrat group. There are also a small number of independents who have banded together in a political group for the purpose of allocation of places on committees. There have been and are good relations between the party groups. For example, the chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has consistently been drawn from the minority party, as currently is the chairman of the Planning Committee.
- 5.7. It is not known what impact the 2015 or 2019 elections may have on this situation, but it is assumed that political control will remain the same, and that the role of a councillor is likely to be broadly similar irrespective of party.
- 5.8. It is also assumed that the Leader and Cabinet form of executive will continue. There is currently no widely held appetite for a change to a system of governance with decision-making committees. Therefore the majority of members are not involved in the day to day business of the Council.
- 5.9. Other aspects of the committee structure are considered below (see section 9)

6. Economic/Financial

- 6.1. The local economy has weathered the recession reasonably well and remains in good shape. However, public sector spending is still set to reduce for the foreseeable future. The fall and slow recovery in real discretionary household spend has had significant impact on income from fees and charges, many of which represent discretionary spend.
- 6.2. The Council has benefitted from the New Homes Bonus (NHB). This is not new funding, but is paid from local government funding that would otherwise have been distributed to councils. It is paid as a grant in respect of each new domestic dwelling coming into the tax base. There is a risk that the NHB may be amended or replaced following the General Election. The Council has not, therefore, relied on NHB long term to balance its budget, and have only committed it after receipt. NHB is also used to make grants for community and other uses, predominantly in communities where development has taken place.
- 6.3. Despite the Government's business rates retention scheme, introduced in 2013, the various tariffs and levies applied to it mean that the Council is permitted to keep only about £2m of the £42m business rates collected and to retain only 20% of growth in business rates income.

- 6.4. With council tax increases being effectively capped, and income from fees and charges having fallen (although beginning to recover), the Council remains dependent on Government grant, which is also set to fall sharply for the foreseeable future. Therefore, budget savings have been made for five years and the Council is in the second year of a deficit reduction plan, alongside a rolling five year financial strategy. That plan has resulted in a significant slimming down of the senior management structure as well as other cost reductions, increases in discretionary fees and charges, and a continued programme of land sales and acquisitions to turn capital receipts into revenue income streams.
- 6.5. The current coalition Government has pursued a very clear fiscal policy which has resulted in significant funding reductions for local government. Whatever political party (or parties) take power after May 2015, it seems clear that this trend will continue for the foreseeable future. It is currently predicted that Chichester's Revenue Support Grant will continue to be progressively withdrawn, from £2.2m in 2014/15 to just £0.6m by 2019/20.
- 6.6. The size of the Council should generally take account of this shrinking in the size of the organisation. However, a reduction in the costs of democracy is not a driver for this review.
- 6.7. The average age of Chichester District councillors is 66 and they are predominantly from higher socio-economic groups. Most are retired or self-employed. Only half a dozen are in employment, either in the public or voluntary sector or in positions where they have a large degree of autonomy over their diaries. Councillors who are employed in more modest positions find it difficult or impossible to fulfil expectations of attendance at meetings.
- 6.8. It would be desirable for the Council to be more representative of the community it serves, with more younger and working councillors. The Council and its committees meet in the daytime, given the fact that some members live an hour's journey away from the council offices. The Council has experimented with evening meetings to help working councillors, but with no success. A large majority of existing members prefer daytime meetings. Those evening meetings that were held did not attract much improved attendance from working councillors and reduced attendance from others. Although some councils in urban areas meet in the evenings and at weekends and have younger members (especially in London), other councils in West Sussex who do hold evening meetings have a similar profile to Chichester's.
- 6.9. It is therefore regretfully concluded that current difficulties, experienced by all parties, in recruiting candidates to stand for election, and especially in recruiting younger working councillors, will continue. The Council believes that increasing members' allowances to a level that would provide living remuneration would be neither desirable nor acceptable to the public.

6.10. In consequence, any reduction in the size of the council should not be of such a scale that it precludes councillors in employment from playing a part. However, a reduction in size would ease the difficulties in attracting sufficient high quality candidates for election.

7. Social

7.1. Paragraphs 1.3 and 2.3 above set out the increases in population and electorate since 2001.

7.2. The district's population is below the national average in the 15-44 age group, but significantly above the national average in the over 65 age group. As an area with high house prices, the population tends to be affluent, well-educated and ageing, with a large proportion of the population commuting outwards to work elsewhere or not working, although there are pockets of deprivation and lower income households as in any affluent area. This trend is likely to increase unless future population increase is matched by local economic growth. Although some people do retire to the area with a good investment income, earlier expectations of a reduction in retirement age have switched to later retirement, although with greater healthy life expectancy.

7.3. The result is that fewer people have time for the sort of activism that is implied in being a councillor. It is possible to attract people to take part in short-term single-issue local activities, such as neighbourhood planning, but less easy to attract people to take on the four year commitment of being a councillor.

7.4. Parish councils are even more affected. The number of non-contested parish council elections was:-

2003 – 47

2007 – 47

2011 – 53

7.5. Councillors comment that people are grateful to them for taking on the job, but are not willing to contemplate doing it themselves.

7.6. The current local demography is unlikely to change greatly over the next four or five years. A smaller proportion of the population is dependent on public services than in more deprived areas, although the Council will continue to provide for them.

7.7. Councillors report that their caseloads have declined over the past decade, so that many describe it now as minimal. There has been a move away from being the first port of call for the electorate's problems, to being a trouble-shooter and facilitator. This does depend on the characteristics of the ward, such as the number of active local organisations and degree of affluence or

deprivation. For example, although both are three-member wards, Chichester South generates a higher workload for its councillors than Chichester North. Big events can generate a short-term intense workload in any ward, e.g. fracking or other controversial planning proposals, traveller incursions, infrastructure issues and flooding.

- 7.8. When re-drawing ward boundaries at a later stage of the review, the LGBCE will work to the principle of equality of representation, so that all wards should have as near as practicable the same electorate (or multiples of it for multi-member wards), irrespective of the fact that some types of electorate produce a higher workload than others. That means the proposed number of councillors must not produce an unmanageable workload in any wards. Furthermore, they must not make councillors remote from the electorate.
- 7.9. The Council believes that larger wards resulting from a reduction in council size of the scale proposed in this submission are unlikely to produce a significant increase in regular caseload. Any increase in ward work is likely to be manageable within the remaining capacity.

8. Technological

- 8.1. The past dozen years have seen a technological revolution. Communications are faster. There has been a shift from paper to electronic communication and from phone to email. Improvements in the Council's website have increased the amount of information and number of transactions with the council that customers can access directly, without using a councillor as an intermediary, contributing directly to the point made in 7.7 above. The Council has plans to take this work further and faster.
- 8.2. Councillors' use of ICT, and the provision for it, has not quite kept up with the pace of change, although there are plans for improvement in connectivity, access via a wider range of devices, and better indexing and search facilities from May 2015, backed by commensurate training. Most councillors make little use of social media for council business at present, although this is expected to change as time moves on.
- 8.3. Technological change has reduced the amount of work councillors need to do, and made it easier to carry it out at a time and place of the councillor's choosing. It has also eased and speeded up the provision of information to councillors about policy issues and proposed decisions. These trends are expected to continue, and there are likely to be two and a half further cycles of technological change before the results of this review are implemented.
- 8.4. One unintended consequence of these changes is that councillors spend less time together with fewer opportunities for informal networking. What remains of this face to face contact needs to be retained.

THE COMMISSION'S QUESTIONS

9. Governance, decision-making and scrutiny

- 9.1. The full Council meets six times a year, ever since a governance review in 2010 when it was decided to stop having monthly meetings. The main items on the agenda are to approve recommendations from the Cabinet and other committees and to enable members to question members of the Cabinet. The Council no longer receives minutes of committees and the list of documents in the Policy Framework, which require approval by the full Council is about the statutory minimum, although controversial policy matters are still reserved to full Council. Because members generally commit to being present at these meetings, they are often preceded by a presentation (often by an outside speaker) on a topic of interest and an opportunity for councillors and senior managers to network. The average length of the five ordinary Council meetings to date in 2014 was just over 1½ hours, compared with nearly two hours for the eleven meetings in 2002.
- 9.2. The Council operates a Leader and Cabinet executive. There are seven portfolios, including the Leader's, the size of the Cabinet having reduced over time from the initial ten. Nearly all decisions are taken collectively, at monthly Cabinet meetings. Some Cabinet members represent the Council on external organisations at national or regional level (See Appendix 8). Cabinet roles vary: they are generally seen to be substantial but "not quite full-time". It is expected that this state of affairs will continue.
- 9.3. The Cabinet normally meets monthly, except in August. The average meeting in 2014 lasted just under two hours and considered ten reports. This compares with 2002, when the average meeting lasted nearly four hours and considered 20 reports.
- 9.4. In 2013 the Council moved from having two area development management committees to a single planning committee. This was reviewed a year later and confirmed, with the committee being reduced in size from 18 to 15 members as from the 2015 election. Most planning applications are delegated to officers, with the following exceptions:
- Applications (other than 'householder' applications) to which the parish council or the Chichester Harbour Conservancy have objected, where the officer recommends permit (at 67% in 2013/14 the most common reason)
 - Applications which a councillor requests should be referred to the committee (the 'red card') (16%)
 - Applications where the Council, a member or employee (or their spouse/ partner) is the applicant (11%)
 - Applications where the decision would be significantly contrary to Local Plan policy (7%)
- 9.5. The Council deals with about 2,500 planning applications a year, of which only about 100 are referred to the Committee. The Planning Committee

meets every four weeks and meetings often take up most of the working day. In its first year the Committee dealt with an average of 9.2 planning applications at each meeting.

- 9.6. The Council nominally has two Licensing Committees (a General Licensing Committee and an Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing Committee). This is because they operate under different legislation. In effect they operate as one committee, with the same 15 members, including chairman and vice-chairman, and meeting on the same day. The committees meet about three times a year to discuss policy issues, with most day-to-day decision-making being conducted by officers. The committees also form a pool from which sub-committees of three or four members are drawn to hear and determine applications and appeals. After a peak in 2005 when there were over 50 hearings due to new legislation, there are now about five sub-committee meetings a year usually to conduct one hearing each.
- 9.7. The Council has one Overview and Scrutiny Committee of 15 members, meeting six times a year, usually for about 2½ hours. This compares with two Policy Review Committees in 2002. The workload of the committee is carefully managed by the Committee drawing up an annual work programme for approval by the Council. Some of the committee's work is carried out through Task and Finish Groups consisting of a small number of members (not necessarily all from the parent committee) who meet to discuss a given topic of importance and report back to the committee. The use of the Committee's call-in powers is extremely rare, emphasis being placed on consultation and scrutiny before, rather than after, executive decisions.
- 9.8. The Council also has a separate Corporate Governance and Audit Committee of 10 members, meeting five times a year, and a Standards Committee of seven members (with three parish councillors co-opted in a non-voting capacity and two independent persons invited in an advisory capacity). The Standards Committee may only meet once or twice in the lifetime of the Council, but also provides a pool from which sub-committees of three members are drawn to assess and hear complaints against district and parish councillors. In the two years since these arrangements were put in place under the Localism Act 2011, there have been five sub-committee meetings.
- 9.9. There are also a number of Panels – advisory sub-committees. Of these, the Development Plan Panel is expected to meet less frequently after the adoption of the Local Plan and related documents, expected during 2015. The Boundary Review Panel and IT Advisory Group meet infrequently, as and when required.
- 9.10. There is an extensive schedule of delegation to officers, set out in Part 3 of the Constitution (Appendix 3)
- 9.11. Appendix 4 sets out the current structure and membership of committees and panels, and members' workload in attending them. The current

structure contrasts with the structure in 2003/04 (the first year after the new Council size of 48 was in operation) which is summarised in Appendix 5. The considerable reduction demonstrated by comparing these is one of the main factors underlying this review.

9.12. Even so, the current size of committees reflects the number of members available. Without wishing to pre-empt decisions by a future Council, it is felt that further reductions in size of committees are possible, without increasing the workloads of individual committee members, if the size of the Council itself is reduced:

- Overview and Scrutiny – could be reduced to 10 to 12
- Corporate Governance and Audit – could be reduced to 8
- Licensing Committees – could be reduced to 12 or even less

10. Demands on time

10.1. A description of the role and functions of councillors is set out in Article 2 of the Constitution (Appendix 6). A less formal description of the members' role, skills they need and support available was produced for the "Become a councillor" recruitment campaigns in 2011 and 2015 (Appendix 7).

10.2. Members are appointed to 46 places on 42 external organisations (Appendix 8). Few of these are very demanding, except the member appointed to the South Downs National Park Authority, who was subsequently elected as Chairman of their Planning Committee. This special case is substantially more than is involved in representation on the Chichester Harbour Conservancy, which could be up to one day a month.

10.3. Appendix 9 sets out statistics on members' workload drawn from two sources – the LGA Census of Local Authority Councillors 2013 and a survey carried out by the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel in 2011. These agree in putting the average number of hours per week spent on council business at just under 16 hours per week, rather less than the national average for a shire district of 20.6, reinforcing the conclusion in paragraph 7.9 above that an increase would be manageable. The 2011 survey, however, shows that there is a very wide range (18-160 hours a month), making the application of an average misleading. Members who receive special responsibility allowances (Cabinet members and committee chairmen) do substantially more than the average.

10.4. In their ward work, hardly any councillors have found it worthwhile to run surgeries, and only two or three write a blog or maintain a website.

10.5. 21 members are also members of their parish council or equivalent. Members are encouraged to maintain good relations with parish councils in their wards and to attend their meetings. One councillor's ward (Stedham) comprises six parish councils; another (Bury) has five and a parish meeting; another (Boxgrove), four and two parish meetings. In other large rural wards

there are two members who can share this role between them. It is generally true that parish councils in the most rural wards meet less frequently than the larger parish councils. Members receive a monthly members' bulletin, which many make use of in reporting to parish councils.

10.6. The Council holds two "all parish meetings" a year, where representatives of parish councils are invited to a meeting for briefing on and discussion of topical issues. In addition, there are five community forums, meeting quarterly, where all the district councillors in a defined area meet representatives of parish councils for more locally focussed discussions.

11. Conclusion

11.1. If committee sizes are reduced along the lines suggested in paragraph 9.12, there would be no more than 57 unique regular places to fill, excepting the seven Cabinet places (with their ex officio places on panels and external organisations) which each provide a sufficient workload for any member. It would seem reasonable for most members to be able to fulfil two of the 57 roles, without needing to attend more than two meetings a month. This suggests a council size of 35 or 36, the precise number being determined on the basis of the best fit with new ward boundaries.

11.2. This assumes that, in addition, members would continue to have a manageable representational role in their wards, accommodating an increase in ward electorates.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Report to Boundary Review Panel - 20 March 2014
2. Nearest neighbours relevant statistics
3. Constitution Part 3 – Responsibility for functions
4. Membership of committees 2014/15
5. Membership of committees 2003/04
6. Constitution Article 2 – Members of the Council
7. Member role profile, skills and support
8. Appointments to external organisations
9. Members' workloads

(Note: The appendices listed above are available on the Council's website <http://www.chichester.gov.uk/article/24645/Current-consultation>, but are not printed with the agenda)