

Public Document Pack



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in Virtual on Tuesday 24 November 2020 at 2.00 pm

Members Present: Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mrs C Apel (Vice-Chairman), Mrs T Bangert, Mr G Barrett, Miss H Barrie, Mr M Bell, Rev J H Bowden, Mr R Briscoe, Mr J Brown, Mr A Dignum, Mrs J Duncton, Mr J Elliott, Mr G Evans, Mrs J Fowler, Mr F Hobbs, Mr K Hughes, Mrs D Johnson, Mr T Johnson, Mrs E Lintill, Mrs S Lishman, Mr G McAra, Mr A Moss, Mr S Oakley, Dr K O'Kelly, Mr C Page, Mr D Palmer, Mrs P Plant, Mr R Plowman, Mr H Potter, Mrs C Purnell, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp, Mr A Sutton, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

Members not present: Mrs N Graves

Officers present all items: Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services Manager), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

31 Minutes

The Chair made the following statement:

I would like to take the opportunity to clarify that at the last meeting of Full Council I made a decision not to take some public questions submitted by Mr Dicker. In error that decision was not listed to my papers to be reported at full Council. Mr Dicker has since written in raising a complaint about that error. A formal response was sent by the Chief Executive. However I would like to take this opportunity to confirm that I did reject the public questions under my powers to do so as Chairman under my general duties to manage meetings.

Mr Dicker has re-submitted the questions, along with some new questions. Again, I considered the meeting agenda including the significant business we are debating today some of which the Council is required to complete to comply with legal duties such as the membership of committees. I also considered the large number of other public questions being submitted by persons which will be responded to today. I also considered the future right of Mr Dicker to raise questions in respect of the Local Plan through its statutory processes in the future.

I have therefore decided not to take Mr Dickers questions again and instead am asking that officers respond in writing to his questions. The questions he submits, and a copy of the answer, will be placed on the public questions folders for public examination in the same way as if they had been heard at the meeting.

To give a second perspective on this decision I did consult with the Vice Chairman, Clare Apel, who agreed with my decisions on this matter.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 22 September 2020 be approved.

32 Urgent Items

There were no urgent items.

33 Declarations of Interests

The following declarations of interest were made in respect of agenda item 6:

- Cllr Apel declared a pecuniary interest as a Trustee of Stonepillow and left the virtual room during the item.
- Cllr Bell also declared a pecuniary interest as a Trustee of Stonepillow and left the virtual room during the item.

The following declarations of interest were made in respect of agenda items 7 and 16:

- Cllr Duncton declared personal interests as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- Cllr O'Kelly declared personal interests as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- Cllr Oakley declared personal interests as a member of West Sussex County Council.
- Cllr Purnell declared personal interests as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Cllr Briscoe also declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 16 as a Chichester District Council appointed member to the Police Crime Commissioner Panel.

34 Chair's Announcements

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Graves.

The Chair announced that the motion submitted by Cllr O'Kelly had been withdrawn at this stage. She then explained that she would be taking the part II item prior to the review of political balance and committee amendments, motion submitted by Cllr Bowden and Questions to the Executive.

35 Public Question Time

The Council received the following public questions and answers:

Question from Lucia Barbato:

Do you agree that our current high food standards benefit both our local farmers and consumers and if so will you write to our MP to ask her to lobby Parliament and the

Government to ensure that they are maintained in law - including in any new trade deals - and that no food that is produced beneath them will ever be permitted in schools, hospitals or other public places that offer food in the district?

Answer from Cllr Plant:

In West Sussex, WSCC Trading Standards have a key role in ensuring food complies with food standards law together with DEFRA's Animal and Plant Health Agency which support the food and farming industry. The Animal and Plant Health Agency role is to safeguard animal and plant health for the benefit of people, the environment and the economy. The District Council's role is one of ensuring food safety through its statutory food hygiene work and therefore it is not within the Council's area of expertise to comment on whether high food standards benefit our local farmers and consumers.

The UK has some of the highest food standards and the Government's new Agriculture Bill, which is currently passing through Parliament, continues this with a key policy objective of ensuring high standards of animal health and welfare. DEFRA's "Farming for the future" document, Feb 2020, outlines a priority for a productive, competitive farming sector – one that will support farmers to provide more home grown, healthy produce made to high environmental and animal welfare standards. The District Council and its food safety team supports the continued high food safety and welfare standards as is outlined in the Government's policy documents. Should these not be incorporated into the new National Food Strategy, due to be published winter 2020, the Council through the policy consultation process will, within its remit, respond by calling for continuation of existing standards.

Question from Bruce Garrett:

Many of you can very probably bear witness to the terrible consequences of traffic and other accidents on the A27. A large lorry jackknifing across all 4 lanes early on Friday 9th October created chaos for very close to twelve hours.

My concern is that progress on rerouting the A27 and ridding it of dangerous roundabouts appears to reveal the inability of all the concerned bodies, statutory and others, to sit down and hammer out a plan of action.

Housing targets and fragile infrastructure are the talk of the day, almost every day. What is the status and what is the timeline for the A27 project please?

Answer from Cllr Taylor:

Thank you for your question. The first thing to say is that the A27 forms part of the strategic road network and so is the responsibility of Highways England rather than the District Council.

I can however advise that the A27 Chichester Bypass is identified as a 'pipeline' project in national Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2). This does not mean that funding for a future national scheme is guaranteed, but the project is earmarked by government to go through the early stages of the development process for potential allocation in RIS3 and potential funding post-2025. We intend working closely with Highways England and WSCC to ensure that a major scheme to improve this key part of the strategic road network is included in RIS3.

I should add that in the absence currently of a government funded scheme for the A27, there is a need for the Council to demonstrate how the housing and employment development that is to be brought forward in the Local Plan review can be delivered without unacceptable traffic impacts. It should be noted that the draft Local Plan scheme included in the Council's published 'Preferred Approach' Local Plan is required only to mitigate against the impact of new development and not to provide significant additional capacity as a government funded scheme might do. The timescale for preparation of the next stages of the Local Plan are under review and are intended to be the subject of a report to Cabinet and Council in January 2021.

Supplementary Question submitted post meeting from Bruce Garrett:

My supplementary question relates to the A259 which is deemed to be a "resilient" road when the A27 is non-functioning for whatever reason. Specifically, latest crashmap data shows the A27 is not the only although it is the major problem. 1,200 houses have already been built along the length of the A259 West of Chichester in the last decade and as a result deaths and serious injuries on this now very busy road have increased by some 40% in the same ten year period.

Given Council's plans to impose a further 3,250 houses along the same stretch of road in the period 2020-2035, what are the Council's plans to reduce the dangers for cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles on the A259 both during normal usage and when the A27 is closed and the A259 has to move enormous articulated lorries and trucks?

Answer from Cllr Taylor:

Dear Mr Garrett

I am writing in response to your supplementary question to Full Council on 24 November, particularly with regard to the Council's plans to improve the safety of cyclists and walkers along the A259. I understand you have already received a response to your first question, regarding the A27.

The first point to note is that whilst we have a responsibility to prepare a Local Plan to accommodate identified development needs, matters relating to highway capacity and safety are for West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) as the Highway Authority, rather than for Chichester District Council (CDC) to consider. WSSCC is a statutory consultee on the Local Plan in relation to highway related issues and therefore, will need to be satisfied that development growth can be delivered in a way which maintains road safety. As you are probably aware, the Local Plan is subject to several rounds of formal consultation. At each stage, both HE and WSSCC are consulted on the proposals. However, given the significance of transport issues to the development of the Local Plan, we also engage with both bodies on a regular basis, between consultations. This is to ensure that all of the data inputs, modelling, methodology and assumptions are agreed by all parties so that the Transport Assessment, which will help inform the Local Plan, provides a robust part of the evidence base. Finally on this point, we also meet with colleagues from neighbouring authorities, including Havant Borough Council, to ensure that relevant information relating to proposed development and the road network is agreed and exchanged. This means that development outside the Chichester Plan area, but which also uses the A259, is accounted for.

As you are aware, there is a high housing need in the Chichester Local Plan area. We are currently looking at how best to address this need, by directing development to the most

sustainable locations while also seeking to reduce the impact on designated areas, such as the Chichester Harbour AONB and areas most at risk of flooding. The next version of the development strategy will be sent to key stakeholders and infrastructure providers, for their consideration. This will include HE and WSCC and we will be asking them to specifically identify any highway constraints which could affect the delivery of the proposed strategy. This will include any issues associated with safety and any with the existing or future capacity of the road network.

The Council is highly aware of the importance of the A259 corridor in relation to walking and cycling and is working towards realising its potential in that regard. The route is broadly flat and connects Chichester to Emsworth in a desire-line driven manner. As such this is a great opportunity to encourage cycling and walking amongst both the existing community and future residents, with safety being at the core of the design principles. WSCC is the Highway Authority responsible for the A259 and their Draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) lists the route as one of the six priority schemes for the whole of West Sussex. Earlier this year Highways England funded a feasibility study for the scheme and are currently progressing a preliminary engineering design for April 2021. HE is the project lead and WSCC is the relevant Highway Authority with CDC's involvement relating strongly to its statutory role as the Local Planning Authority. HE have submitted bids to their designated funds programme for funding of the design and construction phases. The scheme will need to be affordable and offer good value for money as it will be competing against other projects nationwide for a share of a limited pot. CDC will consider bids to their planning and development related Community Infrastructure Levy funding on their merits and against other bids made to that money at that time. CDC remains supportive of this work, has on-going sight of the process and anticipates seeing the preliminary engineering design proposal from HE in due course.

CDC is also looking to enlarge the cycling network in Chichester. To this end CDC has recently commissioned an independent consultant to provide a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan for Chichester. This document was the subject of a recent public consultation and is due for adoption by the Council in early 2021. The document provides an evidence based approach to enlarging Chichester's cycle network and augments WSCC's LCWIP and other schemes that WSCC have proposed through their Sustainable Transport Package and Local Transport Improvement Plan.

The Local Plan process is on-going and the issues you have raised will continue to be addressed as the plan progresses. Further information relating to both the Local Plan and its evidence base, which includes transport related matters, can be found here: [Chichester Local Plan Review](#).

Questions from Andrew Kerry-Bedell

Question 1:

It has been well over a year since the Hampshire PUSH group published its nitrate neutral house building policy. Everyone agrees nitrate neutral house building is essential, yet there is no clear consensus on how to deliver it. Neither Council suggestion of housing development nitrate mitigation on sites outside the parish, nor financial contributions in lieu of nitrate mitigation, are acceptable to Chichester's Parish Councils. Given we've already had developers in our own parish (Chidham and Hambrook) proposing nitrate mitigation sites in the South Downs National Park, as well as another county altogether, how are

parish concerns about the policy around the highly sensitive issue of Nitrate neutral house building going to be consulted on and incorporated into Chichester Council Policy?

Answer from Cllr Taylor:

A policy requiring nitrate neutrality, as requested by Natural England, will be included in the proposed submission (Regulation 19) version of the Local Plan Review which will be subject to full consultation.

The policy itself is unlikely to be prescriptive about how nitrate neutrality is achieved, given there is a range of solutions, including the identification of mitigation land, or potentially contributions to a nutrient mitigation scheme which may be employed if appropriate. What is important is whether the impact upon sensitive environments such as Chichester Harbour is satisfactorily dealt with – not the particular location or method of mitigation employed. Chichester District Council is working closely with PFSH and other affected authorities – and has contributed towards funding an officer to work on setting up a scheme across the wider Solent area. National government has also announced funding to set up a nutrient trading platform for the Solent area and it is expected the new officer will seek to bring these 2 projects together.

Supplementary Question submitted post meeting from Andrew Kerry-Bedell:

What work is still remaining for Chichester Council to do in order to finish its nitrate neutral house building Policy, how will the Council be engaging with Parishes to ensure they all have adequate contribution to the final policy, and when will the policy be made public?

Answer from Cllr Taylor:

Officers are currently preparing a strategic nitrate budget at the whole plan level, and drafting a policy requiring all relevant development to be nutrient neutral as advised by Natural England. Policy wording for the Local Plan Review will be published as part of the Reg 19 consultation. We need to consider appropriate mechanisms for mitigation. This may include our own scheme, if necessary.

We are also working with the Partnership for South Hampshire authorities to ensure that Chichester is included in any Solent wide scheme and to this end are joint funding an officer resource to work up a pilot scheme. This should also tie in with any MCHLG/DEFRA funded scheme. Any planning application that requires mitigation would be subject to the usual consultation.

Question 2:

Using calculation methods agreed with CDC officers, and analysing Southern Water data via the Environment Agency and results validated by them, Thornham Water Treatment works has less than 300 houses capacity. Yet there are over 3,000 new houses in total in Chichester and Havant Local Plans both feeding into Thornham, and 1,000 new houses likely to be built by 2025, based on CDC HELAA phasing and conversations with Emsworth Parish. How does Chichester Council justify its own 1,750 new houses currently in the Local Plan for Southbourne, Chidham, Hambrook and Nutbourne, especially when there will be no water treatment capacity left at all once Emsworth housing development starts in early 2021?

Answer from Cllr Taylor:

Officers are working closely with Southern Water, the Environment Agency and colleagues in Havant Borough Council in line with the Duty to Cooperate. Both the Environment Agency and Southern Water were consulted upon the previous distribution of development as set out in the Preferred Approach Plan and neither stated that new development cannot be served. However it is agreed that improvements to the capacity of the waste water infrastructure will be required. Initially Southern Water is expected to consider options for rerouting connections to works with more capacity although additional overall capacity may also be required within the Plan period. Southern Water will need to identify whether sufficient necessary improvements/ changes can be made which will inform consideration of whether phasing of development is required. As well as informing the Local Plan Review, work will inform preparation of Southern Water's next Business Plan, which will form the basis of funding bids to OFWAT to allow them to undertake any necessary works.

Supplementary Question submitted post meeting by Andrew Kerry-Bedell:

Managers at Southern Water confirmed today no work is proposed at Thornham from 2020 to 2025 to increase water treatment capacity. So can the Council confirm, after the 750 houses of current capacity is used up (likely end 2022), that there will be no more planning approvals for new housing that uses Thornham, from 2023 until 2026 at the earliest?

Answer from Cllr Taylor:

The capacity for Wastewater Treatment Works to accommodate further foul flows from residential development is part of the assessment process for major development proposals. Both Southern Water and the Environment Agency are consulted on planning applications for a net increase of 10 units or more, consideration is given to the capacity for further foul flows in the network at that time, and a response provided to the Local Planning Authority. If those consultees consider that there is insufficient capacity to deal with the Wastewater from a given development (taking account also of all known other development commitments) and that additional capacity cannot be provided prior to occupation of the proposed housing, this will likely result in an objection from either or both of the consultees, and the application would then be determined on this basis.

Questions from Jane Towers:

In the 2018 HELAA all available land was assessed as to suitability and subsequently rejected if it failed to meet the criteria. The 2020 HELAA has deemed all available land north of the A259 from Fishbourne to Southbourne as developable on the basis that it is available, regardless of constraints which made them unsuitable for development in 2018 eg land at the end of bridle paths with no vehicular access at all. Nothing in the interim has changed on those sites.

This is a nonsense and is giving carte blanche to developers to use the 2020 HELAA to justify their outline planning applications.

The Interim Policy Statement has policies which would render the sites that have been designated developable as unsuitable.

1. *Why did CDC not carry out updated assessments and what actual value does the HELAA have?*
2. *Will the IPS be robust enough to counteract the arguments put forward by developers that sites in the HELAA are suitable and sustainable?*

Answer from Cllr Taylor:

Thank you for your questions.

In response question 1, all sites in the 2020 HELAA were assessed against the updated methodology. Many sites were re-submitted with new information or updated as part of this process. The HELAA looks at potential for development in principle including whether constraints could be overcome, such as the formation of a new access. The HELAA is a technical study that forms part of an extensive evidence base used to inform the preparation of the Local Plan Review. Its principal purpose is to identify the quantum and location of available land for housing or economic development over a 15+ year period. All the evidence will be used in combination to identify the most sustainable locations for development to meet the needs of the plan area over the forthcoming plan period.

In response to question 2, the HELAA is a technical study that undertakes an assessment of land availability, and is one of the evidence base studies that will inform the Local Plan Review. The identification of housing sites within the HELAA does not imply that the Council will grant planning permission for residential development. The IPS is a material consideration for planning applications at this time, however, the acceptability of planning proposals will be assessed on a case by case basis, in relation to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of the proposals, whilst having regard to all elements of the proposal, policies in the adopted development plan, national planning policy, consultation responses and any other material considerations.

36 Allocation of Commuted Sums to Deliver Affordable Housing

As per their previous declarations Cllr Apel and Cllr Bell were placed in the virtual waiting room for the duration of the item and did not participate in the item or its vote.

Cllr Sutton was invited to introduce the report.

Cllr Sutton then moved the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Members voted virtually on the recommendations which were carried.

RESOLVED

1. The allocation of commuted sums of £100,000 to Stonepillow to enable the acquisition of a property in Chichester to provide move-on accommodation for Rough Sleepers.
2. The allocation of commuted sums of £100,000 to Chichester Greyfriars Housing Association to support the construction of five one bedroom flats at Royal Close, Chichester.

37 Determination of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2021-2022

Cllr Apel and Cllr Bell returned from the virtual waiting room.

Cllr Wilding was invited to introduce the report.

Cllr Wilding then moved the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Members spoke in favour of the Scheme.

Members voted virtually on the recommendation which was carried.

RESOLVED

That the proposed Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2021-2022 be approved by Full Council.

38 Covid Recovery Grants

Cllr Briscoe was invited to introduce the report.

Cllr Briscoe then moved the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Members voted virtually on the recommendation which was carried.

RESOLVED

That the merge of the Community Recovery Grants Fund and Economic Recovery Grants Fund be approved.

39 Revised Statement of Licensing Policy 2020-2022 - Licensing Act 2003 & Revised Sex Establishment Policy 2020-2025 - Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982

Cllr Bowden had to temporarily leave for part of this item.

Cllr Sutton was invited to introduce the report.

Cllr Sutton then moved the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Members voted virtually on the recommendations which were carried.

RESOLVED

1. That the revised Statement of Licensing Policy for the period 2020-2022 and revised Sex Establishment Policy for the period 2020-2025 be approved and referred to Council for consideration on 24 November 2020.
2. That, subject to consideration of any comments referred by Cabinet, the revised Statement of Licensing Policy for the period 2020-2022 and revised Sex Establishment Policy for the period 2020-2025 is approved for subsequent publication.

40 **Exclusion of the press and public**

Cllr Lintill proposed that the meeting went into part II in relation to the Southern Gateway agenda item which was seconded by Cllr Taylor.

The Council then voted to go into part II.

RESOLVED

That with regard to the Southern Gateway agenda item the public including the press should be excluded from the meeting on the grounds of exemption in Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 namely Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Members took a short break.

41 **Southern Gateway Regeneration Project**

Cllr Dignum was invited to introduce the report.

Cllr Dignum then moved an amended recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Dignum, Mrs Shepherd, Mrs Hotchkiss, Mr Frost and Mr Bennett responded to questions and comments from Cllr Brown, Cllr Moss, Cllr Plowman, Cllr Hughes, Cllr Oakley, Cllr Apel, Cllr Tim Johnson, Cllr Sharp, Cllr Briscoe and Cllr Lintill.

Members voted virtually on the recommendation which was carried.

RESOLVED

That the proposal as set out in section 4.10 as amended be approved.

Cllr Sutton then proposed that the meeting return to public session. This was seconded by Cllr Lintill. No members objected.

42 **Motion submitted by Cllr Bowden**

Cllr Bowden was invited to read his motion as follows:

This Council has serious concerns about the performance of the Statutory Wastewater Company for this District, Southern Water, and in particular:

- *Currently, in the light of known Wastewater Treatment capacity limitations at seven of the District's ten Wastewater Treatment Works, about Southern Water's normal response to Planning Application consultations, that it can connect the proposed unplanned developments, without apparent regard to the cumulative capacity effect of developments already permitted and planned, including those in neighbouring Districts (Havant and Arun) that share two of the Works;*
- *In the immediate future, the Council therefore has well-founded doubts about the capability of Southern Water (whether financial or otherwise) to build in good time*

the greatly enhanced wastewater treatment capacity that will be required to provide for the needs of the District's new residents foreseen, and required by HM Government, in the Local Plan Review;

- In the medium term, 1) five of the ten Wastewater Treatment works will be at risk of inundation from rising sea-levels due to Climate Change, and 2) there is a clear risk of outflow of Nitrates to Pagham Harbour; but the Council has no evidence of any plan by Southern Water to address either of these risks;*
- and accordingly the Council requests the Leader and Chief Executive Officer to write to OFWAT to detail our concerns and call on the Regulator to intervene.*

The motion was seconded by Cllr Potter.

Cllr Brown was then invited to put forward his amendment as follows:

To add to the original motion:

This Council notes that the Chichester Water Quality Group (a multi-agency meeting hosted by CDC Planning and Chaired by the Environment Agency) currently includes representatives from:

*CDC Planning Policy; CDC Environment Team
The Environment Agency
Natural England
Chichester Harbour Conservancy
West Sussex County Council (as Lead Local Flood Authority), and
Southern Water*

To further the “transparent scrutiny of evidence and decision making”, that comprises part of the Group’s Terms of Reference, this Council calls for:

- A) The publication of the minutes of its meetings (noting that they may need to be ‘Part II’ confidential documents with viewing restricted to elected members), and*
- B) A representative elected by members of the Council to be afforded observer status for meetings of the Group.*

The amendment was seconded by Cllr Bangert.

Cllr Taylor as Cabinet Member for Planning was invited to respond first. Cllr Taylor agreed that writing to OFWAT was a good idea and as such she supported Cllr Bowden’s motion. With regard to Cllr Brown’s amendment Cllr Taylor explained that the Group is not chaired by the council and as such members would only be able to make a request. She explained that the Development Plan and Infrastructure Group gave members the opportunity to ask officers for progress updates of that nature.

Cllr Apel suggested the letter to OFWAT be copied to the two local MP’s and the Minister for Local Government.

In response to Cllr Brown's amendment Mrs Shepherd agreed to look into the concerns raised by members about the effectiveness of the water quality group and would report back to members with her findings and way forward to address members' concerns.

Members then gave their broad support to the principles of each motion.

Cllr Sutton proposed a curtailment motion given the level of support that had been given to the original motion. This was seconded by Cllr Purnell however the Chair used her discretionary right to refuse the motion and allow the debate to continue.

Cllr Brown then withdrew his amendment on the basis of advice from Mrs Shepherd.

Following a virtual vote the motion was carried as follows:

RESOLVED

This Council has serious concerns about the performance of the Statutory Wastewater Company for this District, Southern Water, and in particular:

- Currently, in the light of known Wastewater Treatment capacity limitations at seven of the District's ten Wastewater Treatment Works, about Southern Water's normal response to Planning Application consultations, that it can connect the proposed unplanned developments, without apparent regard to the cumulative capacity effect of developments already permitted and planned, including those in neighbouring Districts (Havant and Arun) that share two of the Works;
- In the immediate future, the Council therefore has well-founded doubts about the capability of Southern Water (whether financial or otherwise) to build in good time the greatly enhanced wastewater treatment capacity that will be required to provide for the needs of the District's new residents foreseen, and required by HM Government, in the Local Plan Review;
- In the medium term, 1) five of the ten Wastewater Treatment works will be at risk of inundation from rising sea-levels due to Climate Change, and 2) there is a clear risk of outflow of Nitrates to Pagham Harbour; but the Council has no evidence of any plan by Southern Water to address either of these risks; and accordingly the Council requests the Leader and Chief Executive Officer to write to OFWAT to detail our concerns and call on the Regulator to intervene. The letter to be copied to the two local MP's and the Minister for Local Government.

43 Motion submitted by Cllr O'Kelly

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

44 Review of Political Balance and Committee Appointments

Mr Bennett was invited to introduce the report. He confirmed that the document that had been circulated as an appendix to the report had been agreed by the Group Leaders in advance of the meeting.

Cllr Lintill then moved the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Taylor.

Members voted virtually on the recommendations which were carried.

RESOLVED

1. That the review of political balance arrangements as set out in the report be approved.
2. That the calculations set out in this report be applied in making appointments to committees.
3. That membership of committees and sub committees including their Chair's and Vice-Chair's as set out in the appendix to the report be approved.

45 Questions to the Executive

The Chair invited Questions to the Executive.

Cllr Oakley asked Cllr Taylor the reasons for continuing with the Local Plan Review. Cllr Taylor responded by explaining the importance of working as quickly as possible to ensure a co-ordinated approach to securing the required infrastructure to support new development and preventing speculative development without certainty.

Cllr Apel asked for information on the local Test and Trace numbers. Mrs Shepherd responded and explained that Cllr Apel would need to contact the NHS for that information as it is not provided to the council.

Cllr Duncton asked Cllr Lintill for information on the new Covid Marshalls. Cllr Lintill explained that the Covid Marshalls are there to inform rather than enforce. The Covid Marshalls are made up of BID Rangers. All have security training and are DBS checked and have been advised on procedures for reporting inappropriate behaviour and rule breaking.

Cllr Evans asked Cllr Sutton about how to handle Hyde issues in his ward. Cllr Sutton explained that there are procedures in place which would be recirculated to members. He also asked members to contact him directly if they were struggling to seek a resolution for their residents.

Due to the time of the meeting the Chair asked that any further questions be submitted to Democratic Services for written response. The responses would then be collated and published online with the Council papers.

Cllr Sutton asked to wish Cllr Bangert a very happy birthday on behalf of all the members.

46 Late Items

There were no late items.

The meeting ended at 5.40 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank