



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in the Committee Rooms at East Pallant House Chichester West Sussex on Tuesday 23 January 2018 at 14:00

Members Present	Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mrs C Apel, Mr R Barrow, Mr J Brown, Mr P Budge, Mr J Connor, Mr A Collins, Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Dignum, Mrs J Duncton, Mr M Dunn, Mr J W Elliott, Mr M Hall, Mr R Hayes, Mr G Hicks, Mr F Hobbs, Mrs J Kilby, Mrs E Lintill, Mr S Lloyd-Williams, 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, Mr H Potter, Mrs C Purnell, Mr J Ransley, Mr J Ridd, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs S Taylor, Mr N Thomas, Mrs P Tull, Mr D Wakeham and Mr P Wilding
Members Absent	Mr G Barrett, Mr T Dempster, Mr J F Elliott, Mr N Galloway, Mrs P Hardwick, Mr L Hixson, Mrs G Keegan and Mrs J Tassell
Officers Present	Mrs J Dodsworth (Head of Business Improvement Services), Mr A Frost (Head of Planning Services), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Head of Commercial Services), Mr D Hyland (Community and Partnerships Support Manager), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs L Rudziak (Head of Housing & Environment Services), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer) and Mr J Ward (Head of Finance & Governance Services)

1 **Approval of Minutes**

The Chairman welcomed everyone present to this first Council meeting of 2018 and she explained the emergency evacuation procedure.

The Council formally received the minutes of its previous meeting on 21 November 2017, which had been circulated with the agenda for this meeting.

There were no proposed changes to those minutes.

Decision

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

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Council's meeting on Tuesday 21 November 2017 be approved without amendment.

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

[Note This para and paras 278 to 295 below summarise the consideration of and conclusion to agenda items 1 to 19 inclusive but for full details of the matters summarised hereunder please refer to the audio recording facility via the link below.

<http://chichester.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=132&Mid=923&Ver=4>]

2 **Late Items**

There were no late items at agenda item 18 for consideration at this meeting.

3 **Declarations of Interests**

Declarations of personal interests were made in respect of agenda item 6 (Chichester Growth Deal 2018-2023) by the undermentioned who were members of West Sussex County Council, which was a partner with Chichester District Council to deliver the priorities and projects identified in the Chichester Growth Deal:

(1) Mrs Duncton

(2) Mr Oakley

(3) Mrs Purnell

Mr Oakley also declared a personal interest in agenda item 8 (New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Policy) as a member of Tangmere Parish Council.

[Note Hereafter in these minutes Chichester District Council is denoted by CDC]

4 **Chairman's Announcements**

The following apologies for absence had been received:

Mr Barrett, Mr J F Elliott, Mrs Hardwick, Mr Hixson, Mr Galloway, Mrs Keegan and Mrs Tassell.

Mrs Hamilton said that in addition to the many pre-Christmas events and functions she attended as Chairman, she wished to highlight two particular engagements:

(1) Visit by Her Majesty the Queen

Mrs Hamilton and Mrs Shepherd, CDC Chief Executive, were honoured to be among the dignitaries who were introduced to Her Majesty the Queen when she visited Chichester Festival Theatre on Thursday 30 November 2017. It was a very happy occasion.

(2) Paul Jarvis Deceased

On Thursday 21 December 2017 Mrs Hamilton attended the funeral thanksgiving service for Paul Jarvis, the former CDC member who had represented the North Mundham ward from May 2011 until March 2017, when he resigned due to ill-health. Mr Jarvis had borne

very bravely both the serious injuries he had sustained in a road traffic accident shortly before his first election as a CDC member and then cancer. His funeral was a memorable and well-supported service, which he had planned and it had included the poignant playing of the Beatles' song (*I get by) With a Little Help from my Friends*.

5 Public Question Time

No public questions had been submitted for this meeting.

6 Chichester Growth Deal 2017-2023

The Council considered the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 5 December 2017, as set out on the face of the Council agenda, the details in respect of which were contained in the report and its two appendices on pages 1 to 15 of the Cabinet agenda.

In her introduction Mrs Hamilton referred to the mention of 'aforesaid amendments' in the first of the Cabinet's recommendations. As the nature of these were not specified in the Council agenda, she explained they were recorded on page 5 of the minutes of the Cabinet's meeting, which were circulated with the Cabinet agenda for 9 January 2018 and consisted of two textual changes to the documents in appendices 1 and 2 as follows:

- 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'.
- 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.'

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Cabinet) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendations and this was seconded by Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services).

Mr Dignum explained that the Growth Deal which had been entered into between West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) and CDC would define the two councils' agreement on the priority projects for growth within Chichester District and the means of funding. Partnership working would focus on four major projects during 2018-2023: Chichester City Vision; Chichester Southern Gateway; Chichester Northern Gateway; and Gigabit West Sussex Fibre Broadband. CDC would lead on the second project and WSSCC on the rest. The city-related nature of the projects reflected their scale but all Chichester District's residents would benefit from economic growth of the city and improved investment returns on the land assets in the city. The Growth Board, with three representatives from both CDC (Mr Dignum, Mr Oakley and Mrs Taylor) and WSSCC, would have no executive powers; the role and existing terms of reference of the current Infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group would be subsumed within it. Any spending bids and priorities for the Community Infrastructure Levy as part of the preparation of the annual Infrastructure Business Plan would be approved by CDC's Cabinet and WSSCC's Council.

In reply to a question about what account would be taken in the Northgate Gateway project of the Grade II listed North Lodge building, Mr Dignum said that the point was noted but that such details were a matter for WSSCC to determine.

Decision

On a show of hands members present voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendations, with none against and one abstention (Mr Ransley).

The Cabinet's recommendations were, therefore, carried.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Growth Deal between West Sussex County Council and Chichester District Council as set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report be approved, subject to the aforesaid amendments in appendix A to appendix 1 and in appendix 2.
- (2) That 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 be approved.
- (3) That the Infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group be dissolved and its role and terms of reference be subsumed into the Growth Board.
- (4) That the terms of reference of the Growth Board (as amended) contained in appendix 2 to the agenda report be approved subject to comments from West Sussex County Council.

7 Financial Strategy and Plan 2018-2019

The Council considered the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 5 December 2017, as set out on the face of the Council agenda, the details in respect of which were contained in the report and its first two appendices on pages 16 to 32 of the Cabinet agenda and the third appendix in the first agenda supplement.

In her introduction Mrs Hamilton (a) referred to the note on the Council agenda stating that recommendation (3) made by the Cabinet would be the subject of an amendment proposal and (b) advised that the text of recommendation (4) would be changed in view of the unsuccessful outcome of the bid mentioned therein, as a consequence of which the words 'participates in the West Sussex 100% Business Rates Pilot for 2018-2019 if the bid is accepted by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government or' were no longer applicable and so had been deleted.

Mr Wilding (Cabinet Member for Corporate Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendations and this was seconded by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Cabinet).

Mrs Tull, the chairman of CDC's Corporate Governance and Audit Committee (CGAC) commented that the recommendation to the Cabinet made by the CGAC at its meeting on 23 November 2017 (minute 161), and which had been approved in an amended form by the Cabinet on 5 December 2017 (recommendation (3)), was now to be the subject of a further amendment as explained in the Council agenda. She confirmed her support for the additional revision.

Mr Wilding introduced the report, which updated CDC's financial strategy and plan for 2018-2019 and set the scene for the forthcoming annual budget. Whilst there was a degree of certainty due to being halfway through the four-year settlement with central

government, some elements of CDC's revenue stream were subject to the vicissitudes of the wider economy. He drew attention to the five-year financial model in appendix 2, which since 5 December 2017 had changed in certain respects. He summarised (a) what the model reflected, the council tax assumptions made and some of the more significant uncertainties and risks set out in para 4.16 of the agenda report; (b) the 13 key financial principles behind the financial strategy (appendix 1); (c) the resources position (appendix 3) which demonstrated that CDC was in a sound and sustainable financial state going forward; and (d) two key changes which had been identified while preparing the budget estimates: (i) the lower than anticipated income growth from the commercial programme board (revised down by approximately £150,000 for 2018-2019) and (ii) a general reduction in the current year planning fee income due to fewer large developments coming forward than expected (revised down by £250,000 for 2018-2019). He drew attention to and explained two other significant changes: (1) the receipt of the Draft Financial Settlement (three key factors meant there was a predicted surplus on the revenue budget of £1.4m) but subject to (2) the impact of adopting Accounting Standard IFRS9. It was the advent of (2) which had necessitated the tripartite amendment (3 (a), 3 (b) and 3 (c)) to recommendation 3. He outlined those amendments (details of which had been e-mailed by Mr Ward to all CDC members on 8 January 2018) and which he fully supported. If those amendments were approved, the projected £1.4m surplus for 2018-2019 would be reduced to approximately £0.8m, subject to the draft budget being finalised. He also explained the reason for the excision from the text in recommendation (4). In commending this prudent and conservative plan, which would continue to maintain CDC's strong financial position and underpin the emerging budget, he thanked Mrs H Belenger (Accountancy Services Manager) and her colleagues for their hard work.

Mr Wilding, Mr ward and Mr Dignum responded to questions and comments with regard to (a) the need for the £6.3m General Fund Reserve in revised recommendation 3 (a) in the context of IFRS9; (b) the case for an against whether CDC ought to bear in mind that if it increased council tax other precepting authorities would or might follow suit; (c) how the fall in planning fee income might affect the new urgent planning policy team appointments (agenda item 17).

Decision

On a show of hands members present voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendations, as amended in the case of (3) and (4), with none against and no abstentions.

The Cabinet's recommendations as amended aforesaid were, therefore, carried.

RESOLVED

That:

- (1) The key financial principles and actions of the five-year financial strategy set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report be approved.
- (2) That the current five-year Financial Model in appendix 2 to the agenda report be noted.
- (3) (a) That the £5m General Fund Reserve and £1.3m Revenue Support Reserve be combined to provide a £6.3m General Fund Reserve.

- (3) (b) That the draft 2018-2019 budget which will be considered by the Cabinet in February 2018 should provide for a £565,000 charge to revenue in respect of IFRS9 unless a statutory override is issued by the government in the meantime.
- (3) (c) That in the event that the government issues a statutory override after the budget is approved in March 2018, officers shall review these allocations at 3 (a) and 3 (b) above and make recommendations to release potentially both the £1.3m and the £565,000 back to being available for investment purposes.
- (4) That it be approved that Chichester District Council continues to participate in a West Sussex Business Rates pool for 2018-2019.
- (5) That the current resources position as set out in appendix 3 to the agenda report be noted.

8 **New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Policy**

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 5 December 2017, as set out on the face of the Council agenda, the details in respect of which were contained in the report and its two appendices on pages 33 to 40 of the Cabinet agenda.

Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Cabinet).

Mrs Lintill introduced the report, with particular reference to section 3 and para 7.1. The New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Policy (NHB) was nearing the time for renewal and the Grants and Concessions Panel (GCP), which she chaired, strongly supported its continuation for a further four years from 2018. The revisions in the updated Policy were denoted by bold font in appendix 2. The benefits this commendable scheme brought to Chichester District's communities, as outlined in section 4 of the report, were self-evident and should continue to be made available.

Members acknowledged the Policy's achievements to date and were supportive of the Policy being extended. Mrs Lintill, Mr Hyland (Communities and Partnerships Support Manager), Mrs Shepherd and Mr Dignum responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail with respect to (a) the possible reason(s) for the underspend in 2017 (table in appendix 1 on page 36); (b) the fact that underspends in a given year had not to date been rolled forward (although they were retained in the NHB reserves) did not mean that this could not happen in subsequent years and the request to start doing so was noted and would be considered; (c) the 110% maximum allocation meant that parishes had the facility to use the funds for a variety of projects including those over a wider area; (d) the availability of NHB funds was intended to reward communities which had taken development and the varied range of projects was set out in appendix 1 (page 36); and (e) the GCP viewed projects which were in the Infrastructure Business Plan in the same way as any other project ie in accordance with the rules and criteria.

Decision

On a show of hands members present voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with none against and no abstentions.

The Cabinet's recommendation was, therefore, carried.

RESOLVED

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

9 Revised Corporate Plan 2018-2021

The Council considered the recommendations made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 9 January 2018, as set out on the face of the Council agenda, the details in respect of which were contained in the Cabinet report (pages 21 to 24) and its nine appendices on pages 1 to 32 of the agenda supplement.

Mrs Hamilton pointed out that recommendation (1) stated 'appendix 1 to the agenda report (as amended)' and said that details of the amendments were given in the note at the end of this item on the Council agenda.

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Cabinet) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services).

Mr Dignum introduced the report. In commending the Corporate Plan (CP), he explained that its purpose was to set and then implement CDC's priorities for the next few years. He referred to each of the CP's five key objectives (housing, communities, environment, economy and CDC's finances) and elaborated on how each of them would be achieved. The aim was to achieve all of those objectives with one of the lowest council tax precepts in West Sussex. Approval was also sought for providing £130,000 from reserves: £114,000 for the two-year cost of CDC's 50% share of the social prescribing pilots and £16,000 for the 2019 member induction programme.

Members expressed support for an admirable CP. Their questions and comments on points of detail were answered by the relevant Cabinet member with respect to (a) how emerging government guidance on meeting environmental criteria would be taken into account in the Local Plan Review; (b) the affordable housing target; (c) a task and finish group to look at a range of practical issues in preparing for a reduction in the size of the Council eg timing of committee meetings and the period allowed for induction training; (d) the publishing each year of the performance and outcomes of the CP; (e) the need to encourage and persuade the District's residents to play their part in achieving the CP's objectives eg meeting recycling targets; (f) the external contingencies which might affect the delivery of the CP; and (g) the approval by the Cabinet on 9 January 2018 to seek the immediate recruitment of a Rough Sleep Outreach Worker did not involve setting and achieving a target of no rough sleepers which must be met because the emphasis was on working with each individual in the way most conducive to his or her circumstances, which included directing him or her to the appropriate professionals for advice and assistance eg mental health issues.

Mr Oakley proposed certain amendments to the Corporate Plan. He referred to agenda item 10 for this meeting (Supporting New and Existing Small Businesses) and the Cabinet's decision on 9 January 2018 to extend the grants programme for retail businesses to the East Wittering Local Centre on the basis that it was equivalent in importance to the other town retail centres (he referred also to Local Plan Policy 29 and the supporting para 16.19 and the Site Allocations Development Plan Document paras 1.15 and 6.4), in the light of which he sought the following amendments to the CP:

Page 1 - Our Objectives

- Third bullet point and item 5: amend to read 'Help improve our City's, towns' and local centres' accessibility and attractiveness.'
- Fourth bullet point and item 3: amend to read 'Promote the City, towns and local centres as vibrant places to do business'.

Page 5

- Item 5. title (in environments priority): amend to read 'Help improve our City's, towns' and local centres' accessibility and attractiveness.'
- Item 5. para 5.1 (in environments priority): amend by adding at the end after 'Midhurst' ', as well as help improve the East Wittering local centre.'

Page 6

- Objective 3 at top of page (local economy): amend to read 'Promote the city, town centres and local centres as vibrant places to do business.'

Mrs Taylor seconded Mr Oakley's proposed amendments.

Mr Dignum said that the amendments were very sensible and made the CP consistent with the Cabinet's decision with respect to agenda item 10 to include a reference to 'the East Wittering local centre'. He commended the amendments to the Council.

At the end of the debate the Council voted by first of all on Mr Oakley's amendments and these were approved on a show of hands unanimously.

Decision

On a show of hands members present voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendations as amended aforesaid with none against and one abstention (Mr Plowman).

The Cabinet's recommendation was, therefore, carried.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the revised Corporate Plan for 2018-2021 as set out in appendix 1 to the agenda report (as amended aforesaid) be approved.
- (2) That £130,000 from Chichester District Council's General Fund Reserve be approved to fund the two projects as set out in para 5.7 of the agenda report.

10 Supporting New and Existing Small Businesses

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 9 January 2018, as set out on the face of the Council agenda, the details in respect of which were contained in the Cabinet report (pages 35 to 39).

Mrs Hamilton pointed out that the recommendation stated that section 4.2 of the agenda report had been amended by the Cabinet and the details of the amendment were set out in a note on the Council agenda.

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Cabinet) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services).

Mr Dignum introduced the report. The Cabinet had approved a series of projects to proceed using more than £300,000 made available through the Pooled Business Rates Fund for West Sussex in the form of grants to help small businesses and retailers across Chichester District and to support a scheme which helped people to find work. Two projects had been approved: Enabling Grant and Choose Work. The third project before the Cabinet required the Council's approval: Shop Front Improvement Grant and Provision of Retail Training. It would make available £168,800 to provide specialist retail training and shop front grants for independent high street retailers in Chichester, Midhurst, Petworth, Selsey and additionally, as agreed by the Cabinet, £32,000 from CDC reserves to be used on extending the scheme to the East Wittering local centre in view of its very significant retail presence of some 70 retail units. The scheme would begin with retail workshops focussing on converting footfall into sales, followed by individual improvement sessions and in-store training to ensure that all commercial opportunities were being identified and to address the significant changes within the retail sector in recent years. After the training, participating retailers would also be able to apply for a grant up to £4,000 towards the cost of refurbishing and improving their shop front. Midhurst and Selsey had set a precedent for what was anticipated to be a very popular scheme.

Decision

On a show of hands members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with none against and no abstentions.

The Cabinet's recommendation was, therefore, carried.

RESOLVED

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 (as amended) and 4.3 to 4.5 of the agenda report supported by £168,800 allocated from the Pooled Business Rates Fund and £32,000 from reserves be approved and (b) the Head of Commercial Services be authorised to approve shop front improvement grants under the Scheme.

11 Commissioning of West Sussex Community Advice Service

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 9 January 2018, as set out on the face of the Council agenda, the details in respect of which were contained in the Cabinet report (pages 17 to 20).

Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by Mr Dignum (Leader of the Cabinet).

Mrs Lintill summarised sections 3 and 5 of the agenda report and emphasised the importance of CDC continuing to support, subject to the funding arrangements, this very valuable service to all the county's residents. It was very evident from the current usage

level and Arun and Chichester Citizen's Advice's (ACCA) recent relocation to East Pallant House (EPH) that there was a great need for this service.

During the discussion Mrs Lintill responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail with regard to (a) the numbers of clients now using ACCA in its new location in EPH (this would be ascertained) and (b) there was no indication that clients had complained or commented that the new location compromised confidentiality - there were separate consulting rooms to ensure privacy – or that they were choosing not to use the service at EPH. Members commended the excellent work done by ACCA.

Decision

On a show of hands members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with none against and no abstentions.

The Cabinet's recommendation was, therefore, carried.

RESOLVED

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.

12 Revised Local Development Scheme 2018-2021

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 9 January 2018, as set out on the face of the Council agenda supplement, the details in respect of which were contained in the Cabinet report (pages 25 to 28) and its appendix in the Cabinet agenda supplement (pages 33 to 43).

Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services).

Mrs Taylor summarised the contents of the report with regard to the nature and purpose of the Local Development Scheme (LDS) and the reasons for having to make adjustments to the LDS timetable, namely potential legislative, policy and evidence-based studies changes and resourcing issues. She drew attention to an incorrect date in the Overview table in para 6.2 on page 39 of the agenda supplement: at the end of the first sentence in the second line of the Role and Subject field, '2034' should in fact read '2035' and this would be duly amended. The timetable changes would not prevent the Local plan Review being adopted by the July 2020 deadline.

Decision

On a show of hands members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with none against and no abstentions.

The Cabinet's recommendation was, therefore, carried.

RESOLVED

That the revised Local Development Scheme 2018-2019 be approved.

13 **Site Allocations - Development Plan Document 2014-2029 - Proposed Modifications Consultation**

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 9 January 2018, as set out on the face of the Council agenda, the details in respect of which were contained in the Cabinet report (pages 29 to 31) and its two appendices in the Cabinet agenda supplement (pages 44 to 95).

Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendations and this was seconded by Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services).

Mrs Taylor summarised the report by explaining the nature and purpose of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and referring to the two categories of proposed modifications set out in the two appendices; the modifications but not the documents would be the subject of a forthcoming consultation. The planning inspector would consider all the representations received and, if necessary, hold further hearing sessions.

Mrs Taylor responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail with respect to (a) the current assessment underway into whether student housing numbers could be included in the five-year housing supply calculation (deleted from the MM11 entry in the table on page 59 of the agenda supplement); (b) the numbers in the DPD were the allocations in the current *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029* and were not new numbers; and (c) the consultation would make it clear that representations should be confined to the modifications only.

Decision

On a show of hands members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with none against and no abstentions.

The Cabinet's recommendation was, therefore, carried.

RESOLVED

- (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, subject to amending the heading to the document in appendix 1 by substituting 'Proposed' for 'Inspector's'.
- (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.

14 **Statement of Community Involvement**

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 9 January 2018, as set out on the face of the Council agenda, the details in respect of which were contained in the Cabinet report (pages 32 to 34), its two appendices

in the Cabinet agenda supplement (pages 96 to 112) and the replacement page 101 in appendix 1 to agenda report circulated with the Cabinet second agenda supplement.

Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendations and this was seconded by Mrs Lintill (Cabinet Member for Community Services).

Mrs Taylor summarised the contents of the report by explaining the nature and purpose of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and the minor amendments made to the SCI as a result of a public consultation in 2017. She drew attention to the substituted page 101 in appendix 1 which was circulated in the Cabinet second agenda supplement.

Mrs Taylor responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail with respect to (a) the fact that later in 2018 CDC would have a task and finish group (TFG) consider current consultation processes should not hinder CDC from complying now with the statutory requirement to have an up-to-date SCI, although account would be taken of any recommendations by the TFG for any future SCI consultation; and (b) the second sentence in the fifth para in appendix 1 on page 104 of the agenda supplement would be amended by the insertion of the words 'being examined' to clarify which 'document' was meant.

Decision

On a show of hands members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with none against and no abstentions.

The Cabinet's recommendation was, therefore, carried.

RESOLVED

That the Statement of Community Involvement, with (a) the diagram on page 101 of appendix 1 being replaced by the amended version in the second agenda supplement and (b) the addition of the words 'being examined' at the end of the second sentence of the fifth para on page 104 of appendix 1, be adopted.

[**Note** At the end of this item there was a short adjournment of the Council meeting between 15:51 and 15:59]

15 Questions to the Executive

The questions asked by members and the responses given were as follows:

Question by Mr Ransley: Neighbourhood Development Plans and the Five-Year Housing Land Supply

Mr Ransley asked the following question, and he indicated that he would be content to receive a written response given the relevance of the matter he was raising for local communities, including Kirdford, which had brought or were bringing forward their neighbourhood development plans (NDP):

'Given that it was confirmed at the last Council meeting that the 'Secretary of State had routinely called in at the appeal stage all planning applications which affected a NDP', is it equitable that CDC as a local planning authority undermines the housing policies of the

Kirdford NDP, by way of consideration of a potential, and I stress potential, shortfall in its five-year housing supply provision?

Are you not concerned that such direction to committee members introduces great weight leading to a resolution to compromise on a non-policy compliant planning application thereby setting aside any opportunity of the matter going to appeal?

Does this approach not represent a lower level of support for NDPs by CDC than that routinely afforded by the Secretary of State?

Response by Mrs Shepherd and Mrs Taylor

Mrs Shepherd (Chief Executive) said that it was not appropriate to seek to discuss in the Council meeting individual planning applications which had come or would be coming to the Planning Committee. **Mrs Taylor** (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) undertook to provide a written response to Mr Ransley and requested a copy of his question.

Question by Mr Shaxson: Borrowing by Local Authorities to Build Council Houses

Mr Shaxson referred to the first objective in the first priority in the Corporate Plan 2018-2021, namely: increase the supply of suitable housing in the right location. In view of the inability of registered social housing landlords in Chichester District being able to provide the required quantity and quality of such housing and also the relaxation by the government of the restrictions on councils borrowing to build council houses, he asked whether CDC was giving consideration to taking advantage of that opportunity.

Response by Mrs Kilby

Mrs Kilby (Cabinet Member for Housing Services) said that a task and finish group (TFG) was looking into the standard of housing in Chichester District but it had not as yet considered whether CDC should borrow or use funds to build council houses. Senior officers at CDC had met with their opposite numbers at Hyde for an initial discussion about current accommodation standards and how in partnership more social housing might be built. She hoped to be able to report back on the outcome of those deliberations in due course. She would discuss with her Cabinet colleagues and senior officers whether CDC should contemplate borrowing to build council housing. Once the TFG had addressed current areas of concern, it could address this specific issue.

Question by Mr Plowman: The Newly Opened Enterprise Centre

Mr Plowman referred to the very recently opened £6m Enterprise Centre (EC) in Terminus Road Chichester and sought reassurance about its ability to deliver the objectives set for it. So far, four of the 82 units were being considered. He wondered for how long the units had been marketed and how the other tenants would be secured. His concern was that the 275 new jobs which the EC would provide would very largely be taken by existing businesses relocating to the EC and leaving their current units vacant, thereby in effect resulting in few new jobs.

Response by Mr Dignum

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council) summarised the number and purpose of the units in the EC and the superb facilities provided in this very exciting development, which members would be able to visit for themselves on a special tour in due course. CDC had engaged specialist experts to advise on the marketing and operation of the EC, who typically achieved 90 to 95% occupancy rates for such centres. In the case of the EC, less than half of that trend figure was anticipated in the first year of operation but that ultimate occupancy rate was expected to be achieved by the third or fourth year. He cited examples of units in Havant and Shoreham to support his opinion that it was not unrealistic to attain such occupancy levels. An extremely good return on the £6m was expected, with a guaranteed base income of about a 5% return even if the 90 to 95% upper rate was not achieved. It was not necessarily the case that the EC would simply result in existing businesses relocating to the EC and leaving vacant their current premises: the economy was extremely buoyant and in fact two of the four units currently under consideration were being looked at by businesses outside Chichester District. He had no doubt about the prospects for the EC's eventual success.

Question by Mr Ransley: The Newly Opened Enterprise Centre

Mr Ransley commented that he thought it unlikely that the Enterprise Centre (EC) would lead to significant numbers of existing businesses seeking to move to the EC with a consequent glut of vacant premises given that such businesses would be committed to long leases.

Response by Mr Dignum

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council) agreed with **Mr Ransley's** assessment and pointed out that the month-at-a-time tenancy commitment at the EC would be attractive for new (or new to the area) small businesses. He was confident that after their visit to the EC members would share his confidence.

Question by Mr Oakley: Tangmere Strategic Development Location Compulsory Purchase Order Update

Mr Oakley referred to the mention made by Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) at the previous Council meeting on 21 November 2017 of the Tangmere strategic development location (SDL) site in the context of CDC's five-year housing land supply (FYHLS). He asked when an update report to members on progress was anticipated in view of the crucial importance of the site to CDC's FYHLS.

Response by Mrs Taylor and Mr Frost

Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) and **Mr Frost** (Head of Planning Services) advised that such a report would be considered by the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel on 22 February 2018 and then the Cabinet and the Council on 6 March 2018. It was currently intended to seek a compulsory purchase order resolution in, say, July 2018 if satisfactory progress had not previously been made.

Question by Mr Oakley: Treatment of Unspent Section 106 Interest Monies

Mr Oakley asked whether any so-called orphan section 106 interest, ie money which was left over after the principal contribution had been spent, should also be included in the New Homes Bonus Allocations scheme. Although this was likely to be a relatively small amount of money, a means needed to be found to spend it or else it would in all likelihood disappear into an accounting black hole, as at present its visibility in the section 106 ward reports was limited. He assumed that as it was interest earned while in CDC's hands and since the principal sum had been spent, it could be safely retained by CDC and was not recoverable by the developer. He hoped that a mechanism could be devised for dealing with the unspent interest.

Response by Mr Ward and Mr Dignum

Mr Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services) said that interest earned on section 106 monies should form part of the annual monitoring report which was presented to the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee. There was currently no mechanism for dealing with the unspent section 106 interest element eg by transfer to another account, and so it remained within the section 106 balance held by CDC. Mr Oakley had raised this point with officers prior to the Christmas 2017 holiday and at that time the total interest element on section 106 balances was £182,000, some of which related to ongoing section 106 deposits which had not been spent. He was unable to say at the moment how much of that sum related to orphan interest but that money would be available for CDC to use. There was no requirement to set aside section 106 interest but CDC had decided to do so in 2011 partly in order to help offset the impact of inflation on section 106 monies, which might not be spent for several years, by adding interest while those monies were being held. Mr Dignum (Leader of the Council) added that he would ask Mr Ward and Mr Wilding to look into how to produce a mechanism for treating such interest.

Question by Mrs Tull: Temporary Traffic Lights at the A27 Stockbridge Roundabout

Mrs Tull, who was supported in her remarks by **Mr Plowman**, expressed her great concern, shared by many people as revealed in the *Chichester Observer*, about the extremely dangerous risk posed to road users by the very confusing signage for the temporary traffic lights on the A27 at the Stockbridge roundabout, which was in place until March 2018.

Response by Mr Dignum and Mr Ridd

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Cabinet) said that CDC Public Relations would be responding to a request by the *Chichester Observer* for him to comment on the situation in support of the complaints and he invited Mrs Tull to pass her remarks to him for consideration as part of his media response. This was matter for Highways England although West Sussex County Council (WSCC) as the highway authority was also involved. **Mr Ridd** (Donnington) added that he was aware that the WSCC member for the Chichester South Division had been closely involved in addressing this issue given the potential for serious road traffic accidents created by these traffic lights.

Question by Mr Morley: Enterprise Centre for North of the Downs

Mr Morley said that in view of the apparent lack of appetite to address employment-related issues and the case for an enterprise centre in the South Downs National Park by

the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), he wondered if CDC might look into the case for having one.

Response by Mr Dignum

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Cabinet) said that one of the difficulties was identifying an appropriate site, which had not been allocated by the SDNPA. He felt that CDC should first of all prove the success of the newly-opened Enterprise Centre in Terminus Road before looking further afield. Midhurst, Petworth, Selsey and East Wittering would be the obvious candidates for consideration.

Question by Mr Dunn: Inspection of Industrial Estates in Westbourne and Southbourne

Mr Dunn invited **Mr Dignum** to make a visit to (a) a large industrial estate in Cemetery Lane Westbourne which did not have the benefit of planning permission and (b) a very successful industrial estate in Southbourne.

Response by Mr Dignum

Mr Dignum (Leader of the Cabinet) said that the Westbourne site should be referred in the first instance to CDC's Development Management section and he would be happy for **Mr Dunn** to show him the Southbourne site.

[**Note** End of Questions to the Executive]

16 **Amended Appointments to Committees 2017-2018**

The Council considered the report circulated with the agenda for this meeting.

Mrs Hamilton said that the report was short and self-explanatory and she proposed that its recommendations should be accepted. Her proposal was seconded by Mrs Graves.

In reply to a member's question about whether Cabinet members were precluded from sitting on CDC committees, Mrs Shepherd advised that this was not the case in principle (save for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee) or in practice, for example the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee, and that the position for each committee was governed by CDC's *Constitution*.

Decision

On a show of hands members voted unanimously to make the appointments in the resolution below, with none against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

That the following two appointments be approved:

- (1) Mrs S Taylor replaces Mr N Thomas on the General Licensing Committee and the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee.
- (2) Mr M Dunn replaces Mrs J Tassell on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

17 **Planning Policy Team Resources**

The Council considered the report circulated with the agenda for this meeting.

Mrs Hamilton pointed out that the agenda report for this item was for the Council only to note the urgent decision made to recruit two new principal planning officer posts and one additional planning officer post to the Planning Policy team prior to the annual budget-setting process being considered by the Cabinet and the Council.

The report was presented by Mrs Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services), who explained the position by summarising sections 3, 4, 6 and 8.

In reply to a member's question about what response had been received to any advertisement yet placed, Mrs Taylor said that one officer had been appointed and the other two posts were being publicised.

On behalf of the Council Mrs Hamilton confirmed the formal noting of the urgent decision which had been made to recruit two new principal planning officer posts and one additional planning officer post to the Planning Policy team prior to the annual budget-setting process being considered by the Cabinet and the Council.

18 **Late Items**

There were no late items for consideration at this meeting.

19 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no restricted Part II items for consideration at this meeting.

[**Note** The meeting ended at 16:25]

CHAIRMAN

DATE