

# Public Document Pack



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in Virtual on Tuesday 2 March 2021 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, Mrs N Graves, Mr F Hobbs, 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:** Mr K Hughes

**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)

## 74 **Minutes**

With reference to page 4 of the Full Council minutes for 19 January 2021 Cllr Brown wished to noted as seconding the motion rather than Cllr Bowden.

With regard to the minute 60 from 19 January 2021 Highways England should be referenced.

Cllr Brown also requested a supplement including the voting of the recorded votes where that is appropriate within the Constitution.

## **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 19 January 2021 and 29 January 2021 be approved subject to the above amendments.

## 75 **Urgent Items**

One urgent item had been accepted which is detailed below.

76 **Amendment to Constitution on Vice Chairman authority**

Mr Bennett was invited to introduce the report. Cllr Lintill then moved the recommendation which were seconded by Cllr Taylor.

Cllr Oakley proposed an amendment to amend the line to add 'change with the consent of the Chairman'. This was seconded by Cllr Brown

Members voted virtually on the recommendation which was carried.

**RESOLVED**

That the Monitoring Officer be directed to amend the Constitution to remove the requirement that a Vice Chair may only chair a meeting in the absence of the Chairman to that meeting subject to the above amendment.

77 **Declarations of Interests**

A number of declarations of interest were made however the related items were subsequently deferred.

78 **Chair's Announcements**

Cllr Apel confirmed that Cllr Hamilton had asked if she could Chair the meeting which she had agreed to do. She then explained that she would take the Budget and Council Tax items first, then the part II items and then if time permitted return to the agenda proper.

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Hughes.

79 **Public Question Time**

Cllr Apel explained that supplementary questions would not be allowed on this occasion and should instead be sent to Democratic Services. The following questions were asked:

**Question from Maureen O'Grady:**

*Would the CDC give serious thought to establishing a Climate Forum: comprising of remaining interested members of the Climate Assembly, established by the Sortition Foundation, plus volunteers from Eco-chi?*

**Answer from Cllr Plant:**

*Thank you for your question. Within the Climate Emergency Action Plan, the Council has committed to setting up a Climate Assembly later this year and there was much support for this idea when we consulted on the draft action plan last Autumn.*

*The Council is yet to procure an external organisation to support this action, however, the aim is that those participating in the Assembly will be residents who have been selected to reflect the demographic profile of the District and we hope to engage with a wide range of residents who vary in their understanding of and engagement with climate change issues.*

*The members of the Citizen's Assembly will make informed recommendations to the Council on the delivery of the Climate Emergency Action Plan and therefore I would not wish to pre-empt the findings of the Assembly. However, on the same point, I would not wish to rule out a Climate Forum as a possible outcome.*

*The Council, in this first detailed action plan, has focused on delivery of carbon savings that largely fall within its remit of control. However we will also continue to support existing district wide initiatives, such as Gillian Keegan's, MP, Conference on Climate Change, as well as engaging with local groups where these support the actions in the plan, such as the new and existing working groups. These will provide further opportunities for individuals and organisations to work together to develop practical solutions to reduce greenhouse emissions across the District.*

#### **Questions from Andrew Kerry-Bedell:**

1. Given CDC has only added four small new sites to its Brownfield register in 2020, and there are none on the list with no planning permission, how can the Council assure residents that every single possible site in the whole district has been fully reviewed for the latest Brownfield register?
2. Parishes like Southbourne have a Council allocation of 1,250 houses that they have agreed to and are putting into a new Neighbourhood Plan, so why is it on the 5YHLS CDC has only 300 houses listed for Southbourne?
3. Can the Council confirm that it will review the whole December 2020 list of 9,579 houses, listed in major allocations and individual parish housing allocations, to include them on the last 5YHLS?
4. What date will the new 5YHLS be issued to the public?

#### **Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*Thank you for your questions. I will answer each in turn*

*1. The latest Brownfield Register update included a review of all sites submitted for the HELAA 2020 and any sites submitted for inclusion on the register via our webpage or through Member submission. To be included in the register the site must meet a number of criteria, including over a size threshold, considered suitable for development under Local Plan policy, and available for development. Some of the brownfield sites included in the HELAA 2020 are not included on the register because they are located outside of a settlement boundary and therefore not considered appropriate for residential development under Local Plan policy.*

*2. The five year land supply can only include development which is reasonably expected to be delivered within 5 years. With regards to Southbourne, the most recent housing supply position statement included a proportion of the dwellings which have planning permission. It did not include delivery of the remainder of the 1,250 dwellings envisaged at Southbourne because there was insufficient evidence at that time that any further dwellings would be delivered within 5 years. Since then, the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan has progressed further and the next housing supply position statement will be able to take this into account. However, as with all sites, it is critical to remember that it is what we can demonstrate is likely to be delivered within 5 years – not the total amount of development envisaged on a site.*

3. *The figure of 9.579 homes mentioned in the question is not recognised. However, I can confirm that it is intended to undertake a full review of the housing supply position with specialist advisors, to ensure the Council has a robust and defensible position on housing supply.*

4. *It is anticipated that the next update to the 5 year housing supply statement will be prepared with a base date of 1 April 2021, and be available around July 2021.*

**Question from Richard Weavis (on behalf of SOSCA):**

Given that the Local Plan is unlikely to be adopted for at least another two years does the Council have a District wide strategy for approving housing development applications that will support the housing numbers in the emerging Local Plan, and will any such strategy require that approved developments will not be inhabited until all adequate off-site supporting infrastructure is complete, as pledged by the Conservative Party Manifesto.

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*Thank you for your question.*

*In addition to the adopted Local Plan which remains an important part of the Development Plan for the area and is the starting point for assessing planning applications, the Council has prepared an Interim Position Statement for Housing Development (IPS). This Statement provides a mechanism for the Council to provide clarity and confidence in relation to how planning applications for housing should be determined in the period that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing and until the Local Plan Review is adopted. The IPS applies to the Local Plan area and not to the part of Chichester District which is within the South Downs National Park, and seeks to ensure appropriate opportunities for housing development in locations which are sustainable.*

*The IPS requires proposals submitted under the IPS to set out how necessary infrastructure will be secured, having regard to a number of evidence documents including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the Surface Water and Foul Drainage Supplementary Planning Document, and the Approach to securing development contributions to mitigate additional traffic impacts on the A27 Chichester Bypass Supplementary Planning Document. The timing of delivery of significant infrastructure is frequently a complex matter and the Council is guided on this by the relevant statutory consultees.*

**Question from Carey Mackinnon:**

How confident is the Council that these current plans will not receive the same level of objections and that there will be no further unwanted delay to preparing the Plan?

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

*Thank you for your question.*

The Local Plan must show how development can proceed without unacceptable traffic impacts. In the absence of a national road scheme for the A27, this means the onus is on the Council to investigate further whether the development needs the Council is expected to address can be met in full, and that includes confirming if the package of measures set out alongside the *Preferred Approach* Local Plan are deliverable.

It is clear that any transport mitigation package arising from the emerging Local Plan will be linked to the wider public debate around the future of the A27. That is unfortunate, but appears unavoidable. Once the technical work for the Local Plan is complete we will have a full understanding of the relative merits or otherwise of this proposal and the Council will be presented with a report in order to consider this important matter in the summer.

**Question from Sarah Cunliffe:**

I am a local international film-maker and biologist. Given the proposed delay of the Local Plan to 2023, I believe it is vital that sufficient protection is in place to prevent irreversible damage to the unique environment around Chichester caused by the current developer free-for-all. The status of the Chichester Harbour SSSI is in critical condition per the Natural England report published on 23<sup>rd</sup> February. It is now classed as 90% unfavourable condition, 80% unfavourable declining. Susan Taylor has publicly argued that a moratorium is not possible or desirable. I argue that a delay on ALL significant planning applications is CRITICAL to properly assess the environmental impact on the area and to properly assess failing infrastructure such as Southern Water's sewage works. There is precedence. Natural England brought about a "moratorium" of sorts on all new development in the Solent area in 2019 post the 2018 judgement from the Court of Justice of the European Union (the 'Dutch Case'). The Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) estimates as a result some 4,500 dwellings are currently in a backlog awaiting consent both solely and/or principally because of the ongoing nitrate issues in the Solent. The Chichester Harbour also has a massive nitrate problem. I would like to ask if the Council, based on the clear legal precedence of the Dutch Case and what is happening in the Solent, if they will work together with the key regulators and government to action a delay on planning applications as a priority.

**Answer from Cllr Taylor:**

Thank you for your question. Can I firstly reassure you that we work closely with Natural England, the Environment Agency, Southern Water and other relevant agencies in relation to water quality on an ongoing basis, including through the Chichester Water Quality Group. Since the Dutch Case we have also been working closely with the PfSH authorities through the PfSH Water Quality Group to identify solutions to the nitrates issue, including jointly funding an officer working on mitigation options across the Solent area, including Chichester Harbour.

All relevant planning applications currently have to demonstrate that they do not add nitrates into the Harbour, providing mitigation where this is an appropriate solution. Impacts are assessed through Habitats Regulations Assessment and this would need to demonstrate that there was no adverse impact on the protected areas. Applications that cannot meet this requirement will not be granted planning permission. Relevant agencies are consulted through the development management process, and applications would not be permitted if Natural England raised an objection.

We also work closely with Southern Water and the Environment Agency in relation to waste water treatment and there is already an adopted Position Statement in place limiting new waste water connections to Apuldram WWTW.

These measures taken together, and agreed with relevant statutory agencies, are designed to ensure that developments that are allowed do not have an adverse environmental impact on the water quality of Chichester Harbour. They do not equate to a “moratorium” on development, and without clear advice and objections to all relevant planning applications from Natural England and the Environment Agency that this is necessary, such an approach would not be justified or appropriate. Natural England and other agencies, including government departments MHCLG and DEFRA (who are currently developing a Solent Nitrate Trading Pilot) , are working closely with local authorities including Chichester to find solutions to ensure that appropriate housing development can continue across the Solent area.

### **Questions from Jane Towers:**

*Earlier in the month the Cabinet Member for Planning was reported across many media outlets as saying the Local Plan Review was the top priority for the District Council and that no difficulties were being hidden. What was not reported was the fact that the timetable has slipped yet again. The current timetable puts the Plan TWO years behind the original date of March 2020. In the meantime, Parishes have been struggling to complete their Neighbourhood Plans and the Council can no longer demonstrate a five-year supply of housing leaving communities being inundated with speculative developers which could result to hundreds of homes being built in inappropriate and unsustainable locations. This is a major failure on the part of the District Council.*

*Chichester Harbour is in particular danger of serious harms through recreational disturbance and water quality. Planning applications in Chidham and Hambrook alone stand at 460 houses, 300 of them in close proximity to the AONB.*

- 1. How can this possibly lead to (I quote) ‘an opportunity to create a better future for our residents and businesses’ and ‘creating a fairer, healthier and greener district’ when agricultural land is built over, traffic increased and the environment and ecology of the area damaged beyond repair?*
- 2. You say that measures are in place to protect the local plan area from inappropriate speculative development but how confident can we be that those measures, such as the Interim Position Statement are robust enough.*
- 3. Would our communities not have been better protected from speculative planning applications if the new green field sites in the 2020HELAA had been fully assessed for deliverability and sustainability?*
- 4. Is it the case brownfield sites are excluded from the Brownfield Site Register if they are outside the settlement boundary, as defined by the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan, but a green field site outside the settlement boundary is considered suitable?*

### **Answers from Cllr Taylor:**

Thank you for your questions. I will answer each in turn.

In answer to question 1, it is acknowledged that the proposed timetable represents a significant extension, however there are complex strategic issues which must be resolved before the Local Plan Review can be concluded, and which are critical for the Council to be able to demonstrate that it has prepared a sound plan. I must also emphasise the point that making effective and rapid progress on the plan is reliant upon proactive engagement by statutory agencies (e.g. Southern Water and Highway England) and so is not wholly

within the council's control, despite our widespread requests to those agencies and to the Government for further and timely support.

At the examination into the Local Plan Review, the Council will be expected to demonstrate that it has done all that it reasonably can to meet the housing and other development needs identified by government. Whilst I appreciate the concerns being raised, we have no option therefore but to complete the evidence gathering work, although we do intend to take stock of the evidence and consider our options going forward via reports to Cabinet and Council in July.

In the meantime, the Council must continue to determine applications on their own merits, in the context of national and local policy, which includes, for example, the consideration of development impacts on infrastructure and the environment.

In terms of question 2, the Council is currently not able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing as required by national policy, meaning there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and the Council is at risk of receiving speculative applications. The Council has prepared the Interim Position Statement for Housing (IPS) to draw together adopted and emerging plan policies to provide clarity to applicants to guide development to the most appropriate and sustainable locations in the Plan area, requiring applicants to consider criteria including locational sustainability, for example, the proximity of a proposed site to settlement boundaries. Whilst the IPS does not form part of the adopted development plan, it is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, and has been in use since July 2020. It is worth noting the Council has recently been supported on appeal by an Inspector on the grounds that a small residential development proposal would be out of keeping with the character of an area – showing that where harm can be demonstrated in planning terms, refusal of planning permission can be justified.

In response to question 3, the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) is a technical document which assess the availability, deliverability and developability of sites for housing or economic development. The Local Plan Review process has identified updated housing and economic needs as well identifying constraints to development that affect the Plan area strategically, for example flood risk associated with climate change, transport, and wastewater capacity. The 2020 HELAA takes a broad view of suitability in order to present the widest range of options for potential development.

It is worth noting that the HELAA does not dictate how any subsequent planning applications are dealt with. Discounting a site in the HELAA process would not of itself protect a site from development. Of more importance is the underlying reasons. The 2020 HELAA is based closely upon the criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, enabling the Council to ensure that the Plan is prepared considering the full range of available options.

In response to your fourth question, in order for sites to be included on the Brownfield Land Register, they must be available for residential development, and must meet the criteria set out in government guidance, which includes considering whether the site is appropriate under the policies of the development plan, which includes the adopted Local Plan, Site Allocations Development Plan Document and made Neighbourhood Plans. In this respect, sites that are detached from the settlement boundary are not considered to be

appropriate for residential development and cannot be included on the Brownfield Land Register. Greenfield land is also not suitable for inclusion on the Register.

#### 80 **Model Code of Conduct**

This item was deferred.

#### 81 **Reduction in Number of Parish Councillors on Rogate Parish Council**

This item was deferred.

#### 82 **Budget Spending Plans 2021-22**

Cllr Wilding was invited to introduce the report. Cllr Wilding then moved the recommendations which were seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Brown then introduced his amendment motion detailed in the agenda pack which was seconded by Cllr O'Kelly.

Cllr Wilding as Cabinet Member for Finance responded to the proposal first. He asked whether pension and employee costs had been considered and if they had whether they had been benchmarked. He explained that a PID could be brought forward at any point once the proposal had been fully costed.

Cllr Plant as Cabinet Member for the Environment then responded. She noted that the proposal contained some good ideas. She explained that a consultant was already instructed to consider all of the council owned properties and a new post would need further consideration by the Environment Panel and Cabinet. She added that consideration should be given to where the proposal overlaps with work being undertaken, where the proposals rely on central government funding and where the proposals relate to discretionary spending items which would need to be discussed under the Future Services Framework.

Cllr Plant proposed the following counter motion:

*That these motions be passed to the Environment Panel for its detailed consideration and for Environment Panel to subsequently advise Cabinet on the way forward.*

The counter motion was seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Plowman explained he supported the amendment motion as it addressed the need to take action on Climate Change.

Cllr Hobbs explained that he supported the counter motion as the Environment Panel would be able to work on the proposals and put forward a PID if required.

Cllr Elliott asked that the salary of proposed posts be reconsidered in order to attract someone with the right skill set.

Cllr O'Kelly explained that she supported the amendment motion as it would give the Environment Panel a clear steer on its focus.

Cllr Bowden explained that he supported the amendment motion as allocating funding demonstrates support for action on the Climate Emergency.

Cllr Donna Johnson explained that she saw the proposal as an investment rather than an expense.

Cllr Sharp explained that the amendment motion would support the need for behaviour change.

Cllr Briscoe explained that the amendment motion was premature in being brought before Full Council.

Cllr Lintill explained that she agreed with Cllr Hobbs and supported Cllr Plant's counter motion. She added that Cllr Elliott's salary comment could then be addressed by the Environment Panel.

Cllr Purnell explained that she felt the amendment motion should be allocated to the Environment Panel and worked up to a full Business Plan before being considered any further by Cabinet or Full Council.

Cllr Sutton explained that he did not oppose the amendment motion in principle but that it would be better placed discussed by the Environment Panel. He added that consideration needed to be given to where the funding would come from and the impact that would have on other areas the council funds.

Cllr Oakley aired caution in overcommitting to something which the council has no power over. He also explained that there would be potential overlap with the West Sussex County Council projects.

Cllr Bangert gave her support to the amendment motion.

Cllr Brown responded and explained his disappointment in the amendment motion not being supported by members of all political parties.

Cllr Lintill responded and explained that the proposed referral to the Environment Panel was not dismissing the ideas.

As legally required a recorded vote was carried out. The vote for Cllr Plant's counter motion was as follows:

Cllr Apel – Against  
Cllr Bangert – Against  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – Against  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – Against  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – Against  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – Against

Cllr Fowler – Against  
Cllr Graves – For  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Hughes – Absent  
Cllr Donna Johnson – Against  
Cllr Tim Johnson – Against  
Cllr Lintill – For  
Cllr Lishman – Against  
Cllr McAra – For  
Cllr Moss – Against  
Cllr Oakley – For  
Cllr O’Kelly – Against  
Cllr Page – For  
Cllr Palmer – For  
Cllr Plant – For  
Cllr Plowman – Against  
Cllr Potter – For  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – Against  
Cllr Sharp – Against  
Cllr Sutton – For  
Cllr Taylor - For  
Cllr Wilding – For

The vote was carried 20 votes to 15 with one absent member.

## **RESOLVED**

That the amendment motions submitted by Cllr Brown be passed to the Environment Panel for its detailed consideration and for Environment Panel to subsequently advise Cabinet on the way forward.

Cllr Moss then introduced his amendment motion explaining that since its submission he had been in conversation with Cllr Dignum and Cllr Sharp individually and was agreeable to combining all points raised. The amendment motion therefore reading:

*That Full Council agrees to remit the motion to the Economic Recovery Group for further consideration and subsequently to bring back a report to the June 2021 meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The plans and strategies to comply with the aims set out in CDC’s Climate Change Declaration and support an inclusive and socially just recovery.*

The amendment motion was seconded by Cllr Plowman.

Cllr Plowman explained that he was in support of the motion as it gives the opportunity to look at the recovery as a whole.

Cllr Dignum acknowledged Cllr Moss accepting his proposed amendment and explained that he had since invited Cllr Moss to join the Economic Recovery Group.

Cllr Donna Johnson explained the importance of building a brand for the district.

Cllr Moss responded and explained that he had sought advice of senior officers and was therefore prepared to work further on the figures included in the amendment motion.

Cllr Sharp thanked Cllr Moss for including her amendment to the end of the motion.

Cllr Lintill and Cllr Hobbs then both gave support to the amendment motion.

Cllr Bell explained that he was minded to support the amendment motion but did not support the last sentence proposed by Cllr Sharp. Cllr Moss confirmed that he had agreed the inclusion of the sentence.

As legally required a recorded vote took place on the amendment motion as amended submitted by Cllr Moss. The vote was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – Abstain  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – Absent during vote  
Cllr Graves – For  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Hughes – Absent  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Tim Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – For  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – Abstain  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – Abstain  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – Abstain  
Cllr Palmer – For  
Cllr Plant – Abstain  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – Abstain  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – Abstain  
Cllr Taylor – For  
Cllr Wilding - Abstain

The vote was carried by 26 votes with 8 abstentions and two absent members.

## RESOLVED

That Full Council agrees to remit the motion to the Economic Recovery Group for further consideration and subsequently to bring back a report to the June 2021 meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The plans and strategies to comply with the aims set out in CDC's Climate Change Declaration and support an inclusive and socially just recovery.

Members then turned to the substantive recommendations. Mr Ward explained that recommendation D was no longer required and therefore recommendation E would become recommendation D.

As legally required a recorded vote took place with the vote as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – Against  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – Against  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – Absent during vote  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Hughes – Absent  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Tim Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – For  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – For  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – For  
Cllr O'Kelly – Against  
Cllr Page – For  
Cllr Palmer – For  
Cllr Plant – For  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – For  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – For  
Cllr Sharp – Against  
Cllr Sutton – For  
Cllr Taylor – For  
Cllr Wilding - For

The vote was carried by 30 votes to 4 with two absent members.

## **RESOLVED**

- a) That a net budget requirement of £15,041,200 for 2021-22 be approved.
- b) That Council Tax be increased by £5.00 from £165.81 to £170.81 for a Band D equivalent in 2021-22.
- c) That a contribution from the General Fund Reserve of £2,099,300 be approved to help fund the 2021-22 budget.
- d) The capital programme, including the asset renewal programme (appendix 1c and 1d of the agenda report) be approved.

## **83 Council Tax Resolution**

Cllr Wilding was invited to introduce the report. Cllr Wilding then moved the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Lintill. Mr Ward confirmed that he had nothing to add as no amendments had been made effecting the recommendations.

As legally required a recorded vote was carried out. The vote was as follows:

Cllr Apel – For  
Cllr Bangert – For  
Cllr Barrett – For  
Cllr Barrie – For  
Cllr Bell – For  
Cllr Bowden – For  
Cllr Briscoe – For  
Cllr Brown – For  
Cllr Dignum – For  
Cllr Duncton – For  
Cllr Elliott – For  
Cllr Evans – For  
Cllr Fowler – For  
Cllr Graves – For  
Cllr Hamilton – For  
Cllr Hobbs – For  
Cllr Hughes – Absent  
Cllr Donna Johnson – For  
Cllr Tim Johnson – For  
Cllr Lintill – For  
Cllr Lishman – For  
Cllr McAra – For  
Cllr Moss – For  
Cllr Oakley – For  
Cllr O’Kelly – For  
Cllr Page – For  
Cllr Palmer – For  
Cllr Plant – For  
Cllr Plowman – For  
Cllr Potter – For  
Cllr Purnell – For  
Cllr Rodgers – For

Cllr Sharp – For  
Cllr Sutton – For  
Cllr Taylor - For  
Cllr Wilding – For

The vote was carried unanimously by 35 votes with one absent member.

## **RESOLVED**

That having considered the Cabinet's budget proposals from their meeting of 16 February 2021 Full Council approves the Council Tax Resolutions as set out in Appendix A of the Cabinet reports from that date.

### **84 Beach Management Plan 2021-2026**

This item was deferred.

### **85 Consideration of Consultation Responses Received on Chichester District Council's Draft Infrastructure Business Plan 2021-2026**

This item was deferred.

### **86 Housing Standards Financial Assistance and Enforcement Policy 2020-2025**

This item was deferred.

### **87 Local Plan Review Preferred Approach: Part 2 Development Management Policies, Policies Map, Habitats Regulation Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal**

This item was deferred.

### **88 Revised Local Development Scheme 2021-2024**

This item was deferred.

### **89 Section 106 Allocation for Chichester Community Development Trust**

This item was deferred.

### **90 Senior Staff Pay Policy 2021/22**

### **91 2021-22 Treasury Management & Investment Strategy and Capital Strategy update**

This item was deferred.

### **92 Questions to the Executive**

This item was deferred.

93        **Late Items**

No late items were considered at this stage of the meeting.

94        **Exclusion of the press and public**

Cllr Lintill proposed that the meeting went into part II in relation to agenda items 21, 22, 23 and 24. This was seconded by Cllr Taylor.

The Council then voted to go into part II.

**RESOLVED**

That with regard to agenda items 21, 22, 23 and 24 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.

95        **Leisure Management Contract 2021-2022**

Please note that this item was taken in part II. A video recording was made of the full debate.

Cllr Briscoe introduced the report. Cllr Briscoe then moved the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Questions and comments were received from Cllr Purnell, Cllr Bowden and Cllr Oakley. Cllr Briscoe provided responses.

Members then voted virtually on the recommendations which were carried.

**RESOLVED**

That the proposed Cabinet recommendations as set out in sections 2.1a and 2.1b of the Cabinet report for 16 February 2021 as amended and circulated as an addendum to Full Council be agreed.

96        **St James Industrial Estate Chichester**

Please note that this item was taken in part II. A video recording was made of the full debate.

Cllr Dignum introduced the report. Cllr Dignum then moved the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Questions and comments were received from Cllr Plowman, Cllr Oakley, Cllr Sutton, Cllr Sharp and Cllr Oakley. Cllr Dignum, Mrs Hotchkiss, Mr Bennett, Mrs McKay and Mr Gregory all provided responses.

Members then voted virtually on the recommendations which were carried.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the proposed Cabinet recommendations stated at 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of the Cabinet report for 2 March 2021 be approved.

#### **97 Stray Dog Kennelling Services**

Please note that this item was taken in part II. A video recording was made of the full debate.

Cllr Plant introduced the report. Cllr Plant then moved the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Questions and comments were received from Cllr Lintill, Cllr Donna Johnson, Cllr Moss and Cllr Tim Johnson. Mr Ballard provided responses.

Members then voted virtually on the recommendations which were carried.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the proposed Cabinet recommendations stated at 2.1 of the Cabinet report for 2 March 2021 be approved.

#### **98 Coastal and Land Drainage Engineering Service**

Please note that this item was taken in part II. A video recording was made of the full debate.

Cllr Plant introduced the report. Cllr Plant then moved the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Questions and comments were received from Cllr Purnell, Cllr Taylor and Cllr Moss. Mrs Stevens provided responses.

Members then voted virtually on the recommendations which were carried.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the proposed Cabinet recommendations stated at 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 of the Cabinet report for 2 March 2021 be approved..

Cllr Apel confirmed to members that another meeting would be called to receive the deferred items at 9.00am on 12 March 2021.

The meeting ended at 6.01 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank