



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in the Committee Rooms at East Pallant House East Pallant Chichester West Sussex on Tuesday 22 January 2019 at 14:00

Members Present

Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mrs N Graves (Vice-Chairman), Mrs C Apel, Mr R Barrow, Mr P Budge, Mr J Connor, Mr A Collins, Mr T Dempster, Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Dignum, Mrs J Duncton, Mr J W Elliott, Mr M Hall, Mrs P Hardwick, Mr R Hayes, Mr L Hixson, Mr F Hobbs, Mrs J Kilby, Mrs E Lintill, Mr S Lloyd-Williams, Mr L Macey, Mr G McAra, Mr S Morley, Mr A Moss, Caroline Neville, Mr S Oakley, Dr K O'Kelly, Mr C Page, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mr H Potter, Mrs C Purnell, Mr J Ransley, Mr A Shaxson, Mrs S Taylor, Mrs P Tull and Mr P Wilding

Members Absent

Mr G Barrett, Mr J Brown, Mr M Dunn, Mr J F Elliott, Mr N Galloway, Mr G Hicks, Mr K Martin, Mr J Ridd, Mrs J Tassell and Mr N Thomas

Officers Present

Mrs H Belenger (Divisional Manager for Financial Services), Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mrs J Dodsworth (Director of Residents' Services), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mr P Legood (Valuation and Estates Manager), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr G Thrussell (Legal and Democratic Services Officer) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

51 **Approval of Minutes**

The Chairman of the Council, **Mrs E Hamilton** (West Wittering) welcomed everyone present, Chichester District Council (CDC) members and officers, members of the public and media representatives, to the first Council meeting of 2019. Having extended New Year greetings, she explained the emergency evacuation procedure.

The Council formally received the minutes of its previous meeting on Tuesday 20 November 2018, a copy of which had been circulated with the agenda for this meeting.

There were no proposed changes to the minutes.

The Chairman sought and obtained the Council's approval for her to sign and date the minutes as a correct record.

Decision

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

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Council on Tuesday 20 November 2018 be approved as a correct record.

The Chairman then duly signed and dated as a correct record the final (thirty-fourth) page of the official version of the aforesaid minutes.

[**Note** This para and paras 52 to 68 below summarise the consideration of and conclusion to agenda items 1 to 18 inclusive but for full details of the matters summarised hereunder (save for the exempt items 17 and 18) reference should be made to the audio recording facility via the link below.

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

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

52 Late Items

There were no late items for consideration at this meeting.

53 Declarations of Interests

Declarations of interests were made by members and officers as follows.

A - MEMBERS

- **Mrs J Duncton** (Petworth) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 9: Emerging Vision Projects and Resources) as a member of the Petworth Vision Steering Group.
- **Mrs J Kilby** (Chichester East) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 9: Emerging Vision Projects and Resources) as a Chichester City Council member of the Chichester Vision Steering Group.
- **Mrs E Lintill** (Petworth) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 9: Emerging Vision Projects and Resources) as a member of the Petworth Vision Steering Group.
- **Mr G McAra** (Midhurst) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 9: Emerging Vision Projects and Resources) as a member of the Midhurst Vision Steering Group.
- **Mr S Morley** (Midhurst) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 9: Emerging

Vision Projects and Resources) as a member of the Midhurst Vision Steering Group.

- **Dr K O’Kelly** (Rogate) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 7: Expanding the Gigabit project to achieve a ‘lit up city) as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- **Dr K O’Kelly** (Rogate) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 9: Emerging Vision Projects and Resources) as a member of the Midhurst Vision Steering Group in her capacity as the West Sussex County Council member for the Midhurst Division.
- **Mr S Oakley** (Tangmere) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 6 Financial Strategy and Plan 2019-2020 (recommendation (4): localisation business rate pilot for 2019-2020) as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- **Mr S Oakley** (Tangmere) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 5: Priory Park – Phase Two Option Appraisal) as a user of Priory Park’s cricket facilities in his capacity as an umpire.
- **Mr S Oakley** (Tangmere) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 7: Expanding the Gigabit project to achieve a ‘lit up city) as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- **Mrs L C Purnell** (Selsey North) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 2: East Beach Selsey Land/Asset Opportunities) as a member of Selsey Town Council.
- **Mrs L C Purnell** (Selsey North) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 7: Expanding the Gigabit project to achieve a ‘lit up city) as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- **Mrs L C Purnell** (Selsey North) declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 10 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan (appendix 9: Emerging Projects and Resources – Selsey Haven related projects) as a member of Selsey Town Council.

B – OFFICERS

- **Mrs J Dodsworth** (Director of Residents Services) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 16 (Staffing Matters) as a member of the Senior Leadership Team, all of whom (apart from the Chief Executive) were affected by this matter.
- **Mr A Frost** (Director of Planning and Environment) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 16 (Staffing Matters) as a member of

the Senior Leadership Team, all of whom (apart from the Chief Executive) were affected by this matter.

- **Mrs J Hotchkiss** (Director of Growth and Place) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 16 (Staffing Matters) as a member of the Senior Leadership Team, all of whom (apart from the Chief Executive) were affected by this matter.
- **Mr P E Over** (Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 16 (Staffing Matters) as a member of the Senior Leadership Team, all of whom (apart from the Chief Executive) were affected by this matter.
- **Mrs L Rudziak** (Director of Housing and Communities) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 16 (Staffing Matters) as a member of the Senior Leadership Team, all of whom (apart from the Chief Executive) were affected by this matter.
- **Mr J Ward** (Director of Corporate Services) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 9 (Corporate Pay Review) as a relative of his was a member of staff who was affected by this matter.
- **Mr J Ward** (Director of Corporate Services) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 16 (Staffing Matters) as a member of the Senior Leadership Team, all of whom (apart from the Chief Executive) were affected by this matter.

54 Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman read out the names of the following members, each of whom had submitted apologies for absence:

Mr J Brown (Southbourne), **Mr M Dunn** (Westbourne), **Mr J F Elliott** (Bury), **Mr N Galloway** (Chichester South), **Mr G Hicks** (Southbourne), **Mr K Martin** (East Wittering), **Mr J Ridd** (Donnington) and **Mr N Thomas** (Plaistow).

The Chairman made two specific announcements as follows:

- She was very appreciative of the very kind goodwill messages during her illness in late 2018 (which had necessitated her absence at the last Council meeting) and she was thankful to say that she had mostly recovered.
- She was delighted to mention several recent awards received by CDC and to congratulate the members of staff whose hard work had resulted in and been recognised by those awards, namely:

(1) *South of England and Channel Islands Pride - Gold Award - CDC's Against Litter Campaign* The Chartered Institute of Public Relations judges recognised CDC's Public Relations team as having conceived and conducted the best community relations campaign of the year. They praised the strong community involvement in the campaign, the reduction

in litter and the campaign's clear message that littering was a crime and would be treated as one.

- (2) *Beautiful South Tourism Awards 2018-2019 - Tourism Event/Festival of the Year – Bronze Award – Chichester Roman Week – The Novium Museum Chichester West Sussex* The ceremony for these awards was held at The Grand Brighton on 5 December 2018 and at which The Novium Museum had received a bronze award in the Tourism Event/Festival of the Year category for the Chichester Roman Week it had arranged. This accolade was a telling testimony to the team's hard work in devising and displaying the exhibition.
- (3) *Loo of the Year Platinum Award - CDC's Public Conveniences at Little London, Florence Road and Avenue de Chartres* The assessments were made with regard to 101 criteria and the award was recognised and supported by national tourist bodies. Such awards were not only very pleasing but very important since the quality of public conveniences was one of the first and most obvious ways in which visitors formed an impression of a city or town.

55 Public Question Time

One public question had been submitted for this meeting, details of which appear below.

The text of the question had been circulated within the Council Chamber for CDC members, the press and the public prior to the start of this meeting. The Chairman invited the member of the public to come to the designated microphone in order to read out his question before an oral response was provided.

The question (with the date of submission shown within [] at the end of the text), any supplementary question and the answer given by the designated Cabinet member were as follows.

Question: Mr Andrew Relf

[**Note** The text of the question as formally submitted by Mr Relf is set out below, although (as can be heard in the audio recording) it was largely paraphrased while being asked]

'The Chichester District Council Local Plan Review - Policy DM 8

This states that any development must minimize and not create or add to problems of highway safety, congestion, air pollution or other damage.

I have a long history on the planning and construction of Fishbourne roundabout as a Consultee, and the 40 year refusal by government to upgrade the A27 across East and West Sussex. We are again met by the stubborn refusal of government to spend any money south of London.

Common sense predicts that the Fishbourne roundabout plans will not be able to cope with current traffic, the additional traffic from Whitehouse Farm whose access to the A27 is Fishbourne, the proposed new flow from the development south of the A27, Terminus Road, and future Manhood traffic together with the 2500 houses proposed for the A259.

I am told that the traffic assumption was 50 cars per 100 households, which is seriously flawed. A study of the Flavian Fields development of 97 houses in Fishbourne revealed that there were two cars per household, and 64% of the residents were working. Fishbourne already has the highest car dependency in Chichester District as we have no facilities even though designated as a service village under the plan.

There is little employment on the A259 corridor and so every worker has to leave the area, in addition to the mothers who have to drive to schools outside our area as the schools are full.

Now consider the 1000 homes planned for Fishbourne, Bosham and Chidham. Your planning assumption is 500 cars. The reality is at least 1000 cars moving at peak time. Each car is an average of 4.8 metres long, with 1.5 metre gaps between them. At very best that is 6 metres of road space per car. One thousand cars at 6 metres joining already static queues. Six kilometres is Fishbourne roundabout to Chidham.

I challenge the possibility of meeting any facet of Policy DM8 against this evidence.

My question is will the Council revisit the flawed assumptions with West Sussex and Highways England on the ability of the current road structure to handle the current and proposed traffic?

I predicted the mess that is Fishbourne roundabout in 1980, and I predict the mess if these plans are not upgraded.'

[Friday 18 January 2019]

Response: Mr J Connor (Cabinet Member for Environment Services)

'Thank you for your question. Chichester District Council (CDC) does not intend to revisit the conclusions of the Transport Study that supports the Local Plan Review as it considers that it is a robust piece of work. There may be a need to add to this work or revisit the modelling if the distribution of development changes as a result of consultation on the *Chichester Local Plan Review 2015 Preferred Approach – December 2018*. You refer to being told of a traffic assumption of 50 cars per 100 households and that this is flawed. I have spoken to the officer who advised you at the Fishbourne public consultation event and he has confirmed that he had advised you that traffic generation is approximately 50 cars per 100 households during the peak hour. West Sussex County Council and Highways England have both been consulted as part of the development of the Transport Study and there are no outstanding concerns or issues relating to the traffic modelling. Should you consider this to be a flawed assumption you are welcome to make representations as part of the current public consultation and CDC will agree a formal response. Should you still disagree with the traffic modelling assumptions you can make representations at the next stage of public consultation before the plan is submitted for examination and those would be considered by the planning inspector appointed to conduct the examination of the plan.'

Supplementary Comment: Mr Andrew Relf

The Chairman invited Mr Relf to comment if he wished on the response he had received.

Mr Relf said that the answer was as he had expected. The crucial matter was the quality of the evidence on which the assumptions had been formed. His independent extensive experience led him to say that the findings in the Transport Study must be challenged because they were flawed and had very serious implications for traffic congestion and pollution.

The Chairman thanked him for his contribution.

[Note End of Public Question Time]

56 Financial Strategy and Plan 2019-2020

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 4 December 2018, as set out in pages 33 to 37 of the agenda report and pages 1 to 19 of the agenda supplement for that meeting.

Mr P Wilding (Cabinet Member for Corporate Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by **Mr A Dignum** (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place).

Mr Wilding presented the Cabinet's recommendation. He explained that the report updated the Financial Strategy and Plan for 2019-2020 and created the framework within which the council tax base was set (agenda item 8) as well as setting the scene for approval of the budget in March 2019. The backdrop to the strategy was one of increasing political uncertainty and reducing central government funding for local government. CDC was in the fourth and final year of its agreed settlement with central government, so there was certainty over its government funding stream in 2019-2020. Retained business rates would continue to provide an increased proportion of CDC's funding. However, much of its other income, for example car parks and planning fees, was dependent on the state of the wider economy and so was much less predictable.

He drew attention to the following:

- (1) CDC's key priorities set out in appendix 1, one of which was to manage CDC's finances prudently and effectively. The Finance Strategy was linked to this specific corporate priority, as were also the key financial principles which underpinned CDC's financial planning approach listed in annex A.
- (2) The updated five-year financial model in appendix 2, which reflected the consolidated budget from the service areas, central government funding and the most up-to-date estimates for wider CDC activities including the programme boards, and other planned savings.
- (3) The risks and opportunities estimates in section 4 of appendix 1. The key assumptions were:
 - (a) An assumed £5 increase in council tax (for a band D property) for each year in the five-year financial model (equivalent to approximately 3% increase per annum). The Council would make the decision in March 2019 as to the council tax level for 2019-2020 following the local government settlement.

- (b) Recent quarterly revenue monitoring had identified some deterioration in car park and planning income and in recognition of this an adjustment of £300,000 had been built into the model for each year of the five-year period.
 - (c) A number of costs during the past year which could not be met from the Asset Replacement Programme and so were financed from reserves. An extra provision of £200,000 for asset replacement had therefore been included in the model for each year over the five-year period. A detailed review was underway and the precise amount required would be built into the annual budget.
 - (d) The provisional finance settlement for 2019-2020 and the outcome of the bids for participating in the pilot 75% Business Rates Retention Scheme for 2019-2020 were announced by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) on 13 December 2018. The draft settlement was in line with CDC's expectations, other than there having been a slight improvement in respect of New Homes Bonus. However, CDC did not rely on this source of funding to balance its budgets as it had always been viewed as being susceptible to change.
 - (e) At the time of the Cabinet report officers were still awaiting the outcome of the pilot bid for 75% retained business rates and so delegation was sought to the Director of Corporate Services to accept the bid if it were successful. West Sussex councils were subsequently notified by the MHCLG that their submission was successful, which meant that for one year only the councils would collectively retain approximately £20m of business rates for joint strategic investment across the county area. This was money which would otherwise have been paid to the government. The MHCLG required all of the councils' section 151 officers across the county area to accept or decline the offer by 10 January 2019 or lose that opportunity of additional funding. CDC's Director of Corporate Services had, therefore, accepted the offer on behalf of CDC. Accordingly recommendation (4) made by the Cabinet as set out in the Council agenda was in effect defunct and did not now need to be approved by the Council at this meeting.
 - (f) CDC was assuming no further reduction in overall local government funding but a shift to upper-tier councils (West Sussex County Council (WSCC)) to meet social care costs. It had, therefore, assumed a £500,000 reduction in government funding from 2020-2021 onwards.
- (4) The five-year financial model contained many assumptions which would become more precise with time, so it would evolve and have changed by the time the Cabinet considered the detailed budget on 5 February 2019 prior to the next Council meeting on 5 March 2019.
- (5) The anticipated resources position of CDC's reserves and assets in the medium term in appendix 3, which demonstrated that CDC remained in a sound and sustainable financial state going forward.

Mr Wilding thanked Mrs Belenger (Divisional Manager Financial Services) and her team for their efforts in compiling the Financial Strategy and Plan.

Mr Wilding and **Mr Dignum** responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail (the responses are denoted by the use of italics):

- (a) **Mr S Oakley** (Tangmere) asked whether the Financial Strategy and Plan to take into account WSCC anticipated changes in costs with regard to housing, recycling credits and the collection of food waste: *account had been taken insofar as was currently possible on the available information from WSCC.*
- (b) **Mr J Ransley** (Wisborough Green) asked whether, in view of the amount proposed to be spent on Chichester District's museum service, CDC would allocate further funds to deal with the backlog in documenting Chichester District's social history and caring for its artefacts as opposed to expenditure on the physical infrastructure: *this was a very valid point and whilst consideration would be given to addressing this issue, in view of in particular the prevailing national economic uncertainty no commitments could currently be made to this or museum infrastructure expenditure.*

Decision

On a show of hands the members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation (as amended by the deletion of para (4)) with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

- (1) That 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 detailed in appendix 2 to the agenda report be noted.
- (3) That, having considered the recommendations from the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee, the Minimum Level of the General Fund Reserves be set at £6.3m.
- (4) That the current resources position as set out in appendix 3 to the agenda report be noted.

57 Increasing the Provision of the Council's Temporary Accommodation at Freeland Close Chichester

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 4 December 2018, as set out in pages 39 to 43 of the agenda report and pages 21 to 43 of the agenda supplement for that meeting.

Mrs J Kilby (Cabinet Member for Housing Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by **Mrs E Lintill** (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services).

In presenting the Cabinet's recommendation **Mrs Kilby** said that during the preceding six months there had been an increase of more than 13% in the number of people who were homeless contacting CDC, which included many families. The existing emergency accommodation had been operating at full capacity for the past year and there had been problems trying to find suitable accommodation for larger families, with the consequent

unfortunate result that it had been necessary to resort to bed and breakfast accommodation, often outside Chichester District. This was far from ideal for those involved, especially for families with young children.

In December 2017 CDC had purchased a property adjacent to its existing temporary accommodation, since when it had been bought back into use to provide four one-bedroom flats as temporary accommodation while a full options appraisal to evaluate the most effective use of the property was undertaken. A budget of £15,000 had been approved for that appraisal and also a further £10,000 to progress the preferred option to the planning application stage. Since the Cabinet's approval of the initial project initiation document (PID) in February 2017, it had become apparent that there were greater development opportunities on the site than originally anticipated. Following the appraisal it was proposed to demolish and rebuild the existing building and to provide a flexible property asset which could provide up to 21 units of additional short-term accommodation for homeless families and single vulnerable people. As a result, consultancy costs to bring a scheme to planning permission had risen to reflect the size and scope of the development: now £40,000 rather than the original estimate of £10,000. The cost to finalise the design after a grant of planning permission was estimated at £72,000.

Accordingly it was proposed that the Council should be asked to approve the allocation of £102,000 from the Housing Investment Reserve, which would enable the scheme design to be fully developed to conduct the procurement and take all steps including seeking tenders up to the award of contract stage. Contractors' bids would be presented to the Cabinet following their receipt and analysis for an award of contract to be agreed. At that stage approval would be sought from the Council for funds to cover the costs of the redevelopment.

The preferred option set out in the PID would give CDC an opportunity to provide many more units of flexible temporary accommodation, making it easier to house larger families. This project would make a real long-term difference to homeless families in Chichester District.

Several members commended the project, which would help to address the homelessness situation within Chichester District.

Mrs Kilby and **Mrs D Shepherd** (Chief Executive) responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail (the responses are denoted by the use of italics):

- (a) **Mrs C Apel** (Chichester West) asked about the ownership of the property and the rehousing arrangements for the current tenants while the existing building was demolished and redeveloped: *the property was not owned by a housing association but purchased by CDC in 2017; there were currently four flats occupied by short-term tenants, and those families would remain there until the works (which were subject to the grant of planning permission) commenced in late 2019 and their rehousing needs would be addressed in due course.*
- (b) **Dr K O'Kelly** (Rogate) (i) mentioned the accommodation plan for the tenants who would be in occupation when the property came to be demolished and the cost involved and (ii) asked, with regard to CDC's obligations to vulnerable households, whether CDC could provide a monthly update in the *Members Bulletin* of how many families and households were being housed in temporary accommodation within and outside Chichester District and an estimate of the number of rough sleepers: (i)

the mention of the accommodation plan was noted (no specific answer was given) and the information in (ii) would be provided regularly to members as requested – the number of rough sleepers fluctuated but averaged approximately 15 per week.

- (c) **Mr G McAra** (Midhurst) commented that in his view the sale by CDC of the Tatchells site was a contributory cause to the current homelessness situation in the District: *the extent of homelessness was caused by the national housing crisis and was not exacerbated by the sale of Tatchells, which had occurred several years ago.*
- (d) **Mr R Plowman** (Chichester West) expressed the hope that the timetable for the redevelopment of the property could be expedited: *the need to commence the work sooner rather than later was recognised and the project would be expedited if reasonably practicable.*

Decision

On a show of hands the members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

That the allocation of £102,000 from the Housing Investment Reserve be approved to enable the scheme design to be finalised and submitted for planning approval.

58 Adoption of the Chichester Local Plan Site Allocation Development Plan Document

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 8 January 2019, as set out in pages 19 to 21 of the agenda report and pages 1 to 107 of the agenda supplement for that meeting.

Mrs S Taylor (Cabinet Member for Planning Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by **Mr A Dignum** (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place).

In presenting the Cabinet's recommendation **Mrs Taylor** said that the main purpose of the *Site Allocation Development Plan Document 2014-2029* (SA DPD) (appendix 1) was to deliver non-strategic residential and employment sites as set out in the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029* (CLP) adopted in July 2015 and provide guidance for the development of those sites. Once adopted it would form part of CDC's Development Plan. Housing sites included in the SA DPD related only to those parishes which either did not have an adopted neighbourhood development plan (NDP) or which had a NDP that had not reached pre-submission stage by April 2017. The SA DPD also (a) reviewed settlement boundaries and, where appropriate, recommended changes thereto and (b) identified (in accordance with the CLP) a local centre for East Wittering. The SA DPD had been submitted to a rigorous process including a number of formal consultations, culminating in an examination by a planning inspector. The SA DPD was pronounced to be sound in the inspector's report (appendix 2) subject to the inclusion of the main modifications recommended by and more minor modifications agreed with the inspector (appendix 3). The SA DPD related to the CLP and not the emerging *Chichester Local Plan Review*.

The Chairman pointed out that since the Council was not in a position to amend the SA DPD members would proceed immediately to a vote.

Decision

On a show of hands the members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

That the submitted Local Plan Site Allocation Development Plan Document 2014-2029, amended to include all the main modifications recommended by the planning inspector to make the Plan sound, together with other more minor modifications already agreed with the inspector, be adopted and published (including any consequential and other appropriate minor amendments) in accordance with regulation 26 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012.

59 Corporate Pay Review

[**Note** In accordance with his previous declaration of interest (minute 53), at the outset of this item **Mr J Ward** (Director of Corporate Services) withdrew from the table reserved for the members of the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) to the public seating area for the duration of this item]

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 8 January 2019, as set out in pages 23 to 30 of the agenda report and its appendix for that meeting.

Mr P Wilding (Cabinet Member for Corporate Services) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by **Mrs E Lintill** (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services).

In presenting the Cabinet's recommendation **Mr Wilding** said that CDC had used the current pay and grading structure for nearly 30 years. Over that time jobs and the wider employment market had evolved significantly, which had created staff recruitment and retention difficulties in certain areas or at certain pay grades. There was also the legal requirement to ensure equal jobs were rewarded with equal pay and this review would ensure CDC's compliance therewith. Since the Cabinet had first considered a report setting out the available options in September 2016, a comprehensive review of all job roles had been undertaken. All job profiles (excluding Chichester Contract Services, which was on local terms and conditions) had now been rewritten and subsequently re-evaluated to ensure that CDC maintained a fair and consistent pay structure. The current pay and grading structure had also been reviewed, using independent benchmarking (taking into account local recruitment and retention factors) to highlight specific areas requiring attention. CDC officers and the external consultants had created a new proposed pay structure (appendix 1) which addressed all of the issues identified.

The impact on staff as a result of the proposed changes was as follows:

- (a) 46% of staff would see an increase in total pay

(b) 42% of staff would see no change in total pay

(c) 12% of staff would see a reduction in total pay

Any members of staff who were negatively affected would be covered by CDC's pay protection scheme, whereby any salary reduction would be phased in over a three-year period. During November 2018 formal consultation took place with staff representatives and Unison. A detailed statistical analysis of the proposal had been undertaken by Unison, which demonstrated that the revised pay and grading structure was well-balanced and complied with equalities standards. Unison had confirmed it would support the corporate pay review scheme.

The Cabinet had previously agreed to set aside £300,000 per year to support the new pay structure; this estimate had been revised to £303,500 per year on CDC's annual revenue budget. The release of up to £360,600 from previously earmarked reserves, covering the periods 2019-2020 to 2021-2022, was also being recommended to fund salary protection costs for staff who would receive a reduced salary, although this might not need to be fully utilised since if any of those staff left CDC during the pay protection period, their successors would immediately assume the new salary grade.

Mr Wilding, Mrs J Dodsworth (Director of Residents Services) and **Mrs D Shepherd** (Chief Executive) responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail (the responses are denoted by the use of italics):

- (a) **Mr R Hayes** (Southbourne) commended the staff representatives in how they had positively approached the negotiations at the meetings of the Joint Employee Consultative Panel, which had been a very productive forum for sharing views and experience.
- (b) **Mr L Macey** (Chichester South) expressed surprise that salaries would reduce in some cases and wondered if this had been the cause of complaint: *the decreases were the result of a re-evaluation of roles in order to achieve consistent and fair pay throughout CDC and the process was conducted by Hay, which had been used by CDC for many years; in some cases decreases were due to historic factors but principally were the outcome of a very robust process which included reviews by panels, benchmarking and sampling; CDC's pay protection policy was quite generous compared with other local authorities; the corporate pay review process was to ensure in part that CDC complied with both the minimum wage and the living wage obligations.*
- (c) **Mr A Moss** (Fishbourne) commended the very robust consultation undertaken, the generous pay protection policy and those members and officers who had been involved in the process.
- (d) **Mr S Oakley** (Tangmere) asked whether there were any other prospective employment regulatory changes which might require the new corporate pay policy to be reviewed: *none was anticipated.*

Decision

On a show of hands the members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation (as amended by the deletion of para (4)) with one vote against (**Mr L Macey** (Chichester South)) and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the proposed New Reward Scheme (NRS) be adopted with effect from 1 April 2019 subject to receipt of the signed collective agreement from Unison.
- (2) That the budget allocation of £303,500 per annum to support the NRS, funded by the £300,000 annual budget that has previously been set aside to support the pay review, with the £3,500 shortfall added to the revenue base budget 2019-2020, be approved.
- (3) That the release of up to £360,600 from previously earmarked reserves to fund salary protection costs during the three-year period 2019-2020 to 2021-2022 be approved.

[**Note** The collective agreement was signed by Unison and received on 17 January 2019]

[**Note** At the end of this item **Mr Ward** returned to the SLT table from the public seating area]

60 Initial Project Proposals 2019-2020 and Corporate Plan

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 8 January 2019. The relevant Cabinet papers were as follows: (a) the agenda report at pages 31 to 34, (b) its nine appendices at pages 109 to 135 of the agenda supplement, (c) an amended version of those appendices circulated with the Council agenda (some amendments were made during the Cabinet's meeting); and (d) a summary of those amendments, which was circulated within the Council Chamber as a single double-sided sheet prior to the start of this meeting.

The agenda explained in a note the nature of the amendment mentioned in the second of the Cabinet's two recommendations, namely a deletion from para 5.2 of the agenda report of one of the Emerging Vision projects with a resulting saving of £40,000.

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and this was seconded by **Mrs E Lintill** (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services).

Mr Dignum initially presented this matter. He explained that whilst it was proposed that the Corporate Plan 2018-2021, approved by the Council in January 2018, should remain unchanged for 2019-2020, there were several new initial project proposal documents (IPPD) being recommended together with the release of funds to enable the requisite feasibility work in respect thereof to be undertaken. He referred members to the amended versions of the appendices in the Council agenda. He also drew attention to the aforesaid summary sheet which set out the amendments made by the Cabinet to the IPPDs: (a) changes prior to its meeting with respect to the IPPDs in appendices 2, 3, 5, 7 and 9 and (b) a change made at its meeting with respect to the IPPD in appendix 3.

The nine IPPDs were each considered in turn with an introduction, any proposed amendments and officers' responses to members' questions as summarised below. During the presentations of the various IPPDs members expressed their support for them.

(1) Resurfacing and Improved Drainage at Westhampnett Depot (Appendix 1)

This was introduced by **Mr R Barrow** (Cabinet Member for Residents Services).

Mr Barrow and **Mrs J Dodsworth** (Director of Residents Services) replied to members' questions and comments on points of details with respect to (a) the adequacy of the proposed foul drainage link (third bullet point in the In scope sub-section on page 35) to cope with volume and chemical content; (b) the opportunity for commercial use after installation of the foul drainage link; and (c) the need to undertake archaeological investigations as part of this project.

(2) East Beach Selsey Land/Asset Opportunities (Appendix 2)

This was introduced by **Mr J Connor** (Cabinet Member for Environment Services).

Mr J Connor replied to a member's question about CDC exploring with Selsey Town Council the potential for, say, a commercial use of the site.

(3) East Wittering and Bracklesham Vision (Appendix 3)

This was introduced by **Mrs S Taylor** (Cabinet Member for Planning Services).

Members did not ask any questions.

(4) Review of Chichester District Parking Strategy (Appendix 4)

This was introduced by **Mr Dignum**, who said that this IPPD (a ten-yearly review) was not about parking charges but parking provision ie infrastructure which would ensure that Chichester District's car parks were fit for the future.

Mr Dignum replied to members' questions and comments on points of details with respect to (a) the extent to which consultants could realistically be briefed to address future-proofing against technological innovations such as electric (self-charging) cars and automation; (b) introducing a five-year review as a decade was too long; (c) examining the scope for park and ride; (d) how to involve councillors and the community in preparing the consultants' brief (principally via CDC's Chichester District Parking Forum); (e) 'future development on underused car parks' (section 3 page 48): the city's car parks most suitable for development were in fact those most intensively used by customers; (f) the potential for a car-free Sunday in Chichester once a month: that issue was relevant to the next review of parking charges and not this project; (g) the calculation basis for the £35,000 cost quoted; (h) the need to retain well-used city centre car parks to safeguard and promote the economic welfare of the retail and tourism sectors versus conserving an historic city centre, promoting pedestrian use of streets and preserving it against additional traffic; (i) the need to take into account the results of West Sussex County Council's road space audit (especially with regard to the reduction of the turnover of on-street commuter spaces to an all-day basis) before proceeding with this IPPD and so this might affect the timescale; and (j) the selection of the consultants.

(5) Priory Park – Phase Two Option Appraisal (Appendix 5)

This was introduced by **Mr Dignum**. The café had now been excluded from the IPPD. The principal emphasis was on refurbishment of existing buildings rather than new development as well as restoration of the Coade stone statue. He would liaise with **Mr R Plowman** (Chichester West), who was the former chairman of the Friends of Priory Park and had recently addressed the Cabinet on this subject.

Members did not ask any questions.

(6) Novium – Business Plan Feasibility Work (Appendix 6)

This was introduced by **Mrs E Lintill** (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services).

In reply to a member's question about the need, as raised at the recent meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, for the IPPD to address reduction of the costs of the Novium, **Mrs Lintill** drew attention the threefold remit of the feasibility appraisals set out in section 3 of the IPPD. **Mrs Hardwick** (Fernhurst) remarked that section 7 of the IPPD covered the costs point.

(7) Expanding the Gigabit project to achieve a 'lit up' city (Appendix 7)

This was introduced by **Mr P Wilding** (Cabinet Member for Corporate Services). **Mr Wilding** and **Mrs D Shepherd** (Chief Executive) replied to members' questions and comments on points of details with respect to (a) the need to involve Midhurst and Petworth ward members in the extension of the Gigabit project to those towns in due course (this request was noted); (b) the extension of the Gigabit to the rural towns and areas in the north and south of Chichester District was imperative; (c) a pre-Council member briefing on Gigabit should be arranged; and (d) a more precise figure on the cost would be provided after the business case work had been undertaken and the PID had been prepared.

(8) Working with Hyde on Asset Management (Appendix 8)

This was introduced by **Mrs J Kilby** (Cabinet Member for Housing Services).

Mrs Kilby replied to members' questions and comments on points of details with respect to (a) the potential to examine in CDC's new strategic partnership with Hyde issues of service performance as well as asset management; (b) the need to work closely with Hyde to ensure adherence to the timescales set out in section 5 of the IPPD; (c) examine the scope for facilitating the role of community led trusts; (d) discuss with Hyde CDC's scrutiny role with respect to the mooted changes and outcomes in the last bullet points in each of sections 2 and 4 of the IPPD; and (e) raise with Hyde the issue of communication, something which Hyde itself had recognised as a matter it needed to address on a national level as well as locally.

(9) Emerging Vision Projects and Resources (Appendix 9)

This was introduced by **Mr Dignum**.

There were no questions.

Decision

On a show of hands the members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

- (1) That it be agreed that the Corporate Plan approved in January 2018 shall remain unchanged for the year 2019-2020.
- (2) That the release of £206,000 from Chichester District Council's General Fund Reserve to fund the feasibility work and small projects identified in para 5.2 (as amended) of the agenda report for 2019-2020 be approved and that £30,000 of this funding be released with immediate effect to allow for the Novium business plan feasibility work.

[**Note** Para 5.2 (f) of the agenda report had been amended by the Cabinet by the deletion of the second bullet point namely 'Branding (Chichester) - £40,000 for consultants']

[**Note** After the end of this item there was a short adjournment from 15:56 to 16:06]

61 **Questions to the Executive**

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

Question: Report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the Chichester ice rink

Mrs C Apel (Chichester West) requested, in her capacity as the chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC), for a report to be submitted to the OSC as soon as possible on the subject and issues of the temporary ice rink in Priory Park Chichester following the final day of its operation on 6 January 2019.

Response

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) said he would defer to officers for a response but he agreed that the matter should be brought to the OSC for consideration.

Question: Recent visit by the Leader of the Council to Midhurst Society public meeting

Mr F Hobbs (Easebourne) thanked **Mr A Dignum** (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) and his wife **Mrs P Dignum** (Chichester South) for their attendance by the invitation of the Midhurst Society to a public meeting in Midhurst. He asked for **Mr Dignum's** appraisal of the value of the evening and whether he would attend a similar event in the future. He also referred to the emerging Midhurst Vision and said that he felt that once it was completed it would be valuable for relevant members and officers to meet with the community to discuss how to implement the project.

Response

Mr A Dignum said that it had been a very worthwhile occasion for the airing and addressing of issues of concern to local residents. On the subject of the disposal of the land at the Grange for example, whereas inevitably some people felt unable to alter their strongly-held opinions, other people were willing to engage in discussion about the issues.

Mrs P Dignum added that she was aware that the Midhurst Society believed it had been a worthwhile event with people feeling that their voice had been heard and their point of view taken into account even if not all their hopes, views and wishes could be realised. Local people had appreciated that CDC had chosen to engage with their community. She hoped that this event would help the town to move forward towards cohesion.

Question: Need for recreational opportunities for young people in Midhurst

Caroline Neville (Stedham) described how, after the aforementioned Midhurst Society meeting which she had attended, she was approached by several people who canvassed with her the lack of opportunities for the youth in the town and a feeling that they had nowhere to go. She had previously raised this matter with a request for a venue to be provided in the town for the local youth to be able to meet after school free from disapproving scrutiny of older people who did not understand them or their need for social interaction with their peers. The town's youth club was only open during term time from 18:00 to 20:00 on Tuesdays for 11 to 13 year olds. Buses stopped running too early in the evening. Older young people had nowhere suitable for their generation to congregate. There was a drug problem. She wondered if there might be a suitable room at The Grange which could be made available. It was very important to engage with young people and encourage them to stay in their communities.

Response

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) said that the youth and bus services were within the remit of West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) and cuts were of course being made across the county to a range of services. He suggested that **Caroline Neville** direct these concerns to WSSCC. As he had said at the aforementioned Midhurst Society event, he could see no reason why she could not approach The Grange with her proposal.

Mr S Morley (Midhurst) said that he would give Caroline Neville details about the town's youth club.

Mr G McAra (Midhurst), while asking a question later during this item, remarked that he repudiated **Caroline Neville's** assessment of youth provision in the town.

Question: Withdrawal of the proposed care home at The Grange in Midhurst in favour of an alternative use for the site

Mr S Morley (Midhurst) referred to Midhurst Town Council's recent confirmation in its emerging Vision document that the town's top priority was a supermarket. The proposed care home on part of The Grange site would not help to promote the town's social and economic vitality. Midhurst needed more time to achieve the best possible outcome for the town on this site. He suggested that The Grange site should be withdrawn from the market until improved economic times or consideration be given to a mixed use.

Response

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) said that the site would not be withdrawn. The planning application would be determined by the South Downs National Park Authority and if refused CDC would then re-examine options for the site. It was essential to dispose of the site in order for CDC to defray the costs of redevelopment for The Grange.

Question: Need for an expansion of the facilities at Chichester Crematorium

Mr R Plowman (Chichester East) referred to Chichester Crematorium's single chapel and the frequent need for mourners to queue before and during services. He wondered what could be done to improve the infrastructure so that adequate cremation facilities could be provided within the city.

Response

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) noted the point. He was unsure if this was covered by CDC's adopted Local Plan or the emerging review thereof but pointed out the general supply shortage of crematorium and graveyard sites.

Question: State of readiness for a second referendum on Brexit

Mr S Lloyd-Williams (Chichester North) enquired whether CDC would organise and be ready for a second referendum on Brexit.

Response

Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) said that an assessment had been undertaken of the various risks posed to CDC by a no-deal Brexit and this included the calling of a second referendum. CDC was not unused to being ready with its experienced and well-trained staff to do all that was required to organise and oversee sudden elections, as happened for example with the 2017 general election.

Question: Prospect of a Velo South event in 2019

Mr S Oakley (Tangmere) enquired whether CDC was aware of any proposal to hold a Velo South event in 2019 in the aftermath of last autumn's abortive outcome and what notice it would receive if this was to be pursued.

Response

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) said that he was wholly unaware of any proposal to attempt to organise Velo South in 2019. It was a matter principally for West Sussex County Council as the highways authority and Sussex Police. If there were to be a repeat attempt to hold the event, CDC's logo would only feature in the publicity if the Council had first given its approval.

Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) added that there was no statutory obligation for CDC to be consulted on such a proposal and the lead authorities were those just mentioned by **Mr Dignum**. CDC had only a non-statutory safety role in such events.

Question: Need for an urgent solution to the A27 Chichester Bypass problem

Mr C Page (North Mundham) referred to a recent meeting which he (in common with CDC and West Sussex County Council (WSCC) members and **Gillian Keegan MP**) had attended in West Wittering. The issue of the unresolved problem of A27 Chichester Bypass had dominated the start of the meeting with great emphasis placed on being proactive to find an urgent solution rather than wait on Highways England. He hoped that progress could be achieved at an A27 update meeting at County Hall on 25 January 2019 between the two leaders and senior officers of CDC (including its Chief Executive) and WSCC and the Chichester MP.

Response

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) said that CDC's press release on 20 December 2018, issued after Highways England's decision to reject the new A27 Chichester Bypass options put forward by the Build a Better A27 group, (a) expressed CDC's extreme disappointment and its determination to continue to campaign for a better A27 and (b) referred to the forthcoming meeting mentioned by **Mr Page**, at which the local MP would be asked to help identify a way forward.

Question: Reorganisation of local government in West Sussex

Mr G McAra (Midhurst) enquired about the prospects of local government reorganisation within West Sussex to achieve unitary status in place of the current three-tier hierarchy.

Response

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) did not consider that there was any appetite for such a change within the county.

Question: Performance of the opera Push at Westminster

Mr A Moss (Fishbourne) drew attention to the opera *Push*, which having been performed at Chichester Cathedral and St Paul's Church in Chichester would be performed at the Speaker's House in Westminster on 28 January 2019 to mark international Holocaust Memorial Day and remember those who died in concentration camps. The production with Chichester performers retold the true story of Simon Gronowski's escape from Nazi terror. His colleague **Mrs C Apel** (Chichester West) was a member of the local organising committee and the opera had been supported and seen by many, including **Gillian Keegan**, the MP for Chichester and **Martyn Bell**, the Mayor of Chichester. He praised the production and said that its performance in London was a wonderful coup for Chichester.

Response

The Council as a whole noted the very positive commendation given by Mr Moss.

[Note End of Questions to the Executive]

62 Constitutional Amendment

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

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) moved the recommendation contained in the report and this was seconded by **Mrs E Lintill** (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services).

Mr A Dignum said that the report detailed a series of changes to be implemented as suggested by a task and finish group (TFG) which had met in 2018. The TFG consisted of four majority party and two opposition members. Its recommendations were unanimous. There were two main elements of the work undertaken by the TFG: (1) to follow through changes to CDC's Constitution resulting from the May 2019 restructuring from 48 to 36 members and (2) to look at any other updates which seemed appropriate since the previous major review of the Constitution in 2016. Appendix 1 set out the proposed changes to the committee memberships from May 2019. The TFG debated those numbers at length, ensuring that the agreed numbers were appropriate to the workloads of each committee. The remaining changes set out in the recommendations were all designed to provide transparency in one way or another. CDC's Corporate Governance and Audit Committee recently considered the first report by the Monitoring Officer (MO) outlining the minor changes to the Constitution which he was responsible for making. It was recommended that such a report be submitted annually so that members were kept aware of the MO's use of his delegated powers in this regard. The changes to the neighbourhood planning regulations, the councillor attendance calculations and the deputy section 151 officer delegations were also the subject of recommendations. The changes simply ensured that what was hitherto accepted as implied in the Constitution would now be more clearly articulated.

Mrs P Tull (Sidlesham) commented briefly on the recent consideration by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee of the MO's report, which would now be an annual occurrence.

Decision

On a show of hands the members voted in favour of the recommendation with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the membership of committees shall be amended as set out in the appendix to the agenda report from the date of the May 2019 elections.
- (2) That the Monitoring Officer be required to provide a report annually to the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee as to the use of his delegated powers to amend the Constitution.
- (3) That the wording regarding the approval of designation of neighbourhood areas in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 be amended to further state: '...and following the Director of Planning and Environment informing the appropriate Cabinet Member and the relevant ward member(s)'.
- (4) That the Monitoring Officer be directed to amend the Constitution to clarify that attendance by members for the purposes of section 85 (1) of the Local Government

Act 1972 shall be limited to the Council or a committee to which that member is allocated only.

(5) That the consideration by the Task and Finish Group of the Monitoring Officer delegations as to the Constitution and its recommendation that these remain unchanged be noted.

(6) That the delegation to the Deputy Section 151 Officer be amended such that the post-holder shall have delegation in the absence of the Section 151 Officer for all financial matters.

63 Discharge of Litter Enforcement Functions

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

The Chairman said that this was the first of two consecutive agenda items the purpose of which was to comply with a constitutional requirement to report formally certain matters to the Council meeting. This report related to the discharge of CDC's litter enforcement function. The report and its appendix were self-explanatory. Neither a discussion nor a decision was required with regard to this matter.

Accordingly on behalf of the Council the Chairman noted that this matter had been reported to the meeting in accordance with CDC's Constitution.

64 Urgent Decision: Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018

There was no written report for this item, the background to and nature of which was set out in the face of the agenda.

The Chairman said that this was the second of two consecutive agenda items the purpose of which was to comply with a constitutional requirement to report formally certain matters to the Council meeting. In consequence neither a discussion nor a decision was required by the Council. The narrative text was self-explanatory. In short, the Council was being informed of the reason for having treated as urgent a decision of the Cabinet taken on 8 January 2019 to approve CDC's response to the Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018, which meant that the call-in procedure was dis-applied.

Accordingly on behalf of the Council the Chairman noted that this matter had been reported to the meeting in accordance with CDC's Constitution.

65 Late Items

As stated by the Chairman during agenda item 2, there were no late items for consideration at this meeting.

66 Exclusion of the Press and Public

A resolution (set out below) to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during the final two agenda items, 17 (St James Industrial Estate Chichester) and 18 (Staffing Matters), was formally proposed and seconded.

Decision

On a show of hands the members voted in favour of the resolution set out below with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

That the public including the press should be excluded from the meeting on the following grounds of exemption in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 namely (a) in the case of agenda item 17 Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) and (b) in the case of agenda item 18 Paragraph 1 (information relating to any individual) and because, in all the circumstances of the case in (a) and (b), the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

67 St James Industrial Estate Chichester

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 8 January 2019, as set out on pages 61 to 66 of the exempt confidential agenda report and its two confidential exempt appendices on pages 141 to 153 of the agenda supplement for that meeting.

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and **Mrs E Lintill** (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services) seconded it.

The report was presented by **Mr Dignum**.

The matter was discussed by the Council.

Mr Dignum, **Mrs J Hotchkiss** (Director for Growth and Place) and **Mr P Legood** (Valuation and Estates Manager) responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail.

Decision

On a show of hands the members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with no votes against and two abstentions (**Mr H Potter** (Boxgrove) and **Mr J Ransley** (Wisborough Green)).

RESOLVED

That the allocation of £5,225,000 of New Homes Bonus Reserves for this project, inclusive of temporary loss of revenue as referred to in section 8.4 of the agenda report, be approved.

68 Staffing Matters

[Note Immediately prior to the commencement of this item all CDC officers present, including the members of the Senior Leadership team listed in part B of minute 53 above, withdrew from the Council Chamber for its duration (and indeed the remainder of the

meeting) save for the Chief Executive, the two advisory officers named below and the Legal and Democratic Services Officer]

The Council considered the recommendation made to it by the Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 8 January 2019, as set out in the confidential exempt report and its two appendices contained in pages 1 to 9 of the second agenda supplement for that meeting.

Mr N Bennett (Monitoring Officer and Divisional Manager Legal and Democratic Services) and **Mrs H Belenger** (Divisional Manager Financial Services) were in attendance for this item.

Mr A Dignum (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth and Place) formally moved the Cabinet's recommendation and **Mrs E Lintill** (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services) seconded it.

The report was presented by **Mrs D Shepherd** (Chief Executive)

Mrs D Shepherd responded to questions on points of detail asked by two members.

Decision

On a show of hands the members voted in favour of the Cabinet's recommendation with no votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED

That the recommendations set out in the paras 3.1 to 3.5 inclusive of the confidential exempt agenda report be approved.

[**Note** The meeting ended at 17:04]

CHAIRMAN

DATE