

Public Document Pack



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in Committee Rooms - East Pallant House on Tuesday 21 September 2021 at 2.00 pm

Members Present: Mrs E Hamilton (Chairman), Mr H Potter (Vice-Chairman), Mrs C Apel, Mrs T Bangert, Mr G Barrett, Miss H Barrie, Mr M Bell, Mr B Brisbane, Mr R Briscoe, 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, 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, Mrs C Purnell, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp, Mr A Sutton, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

Members not present: Rev J H Bowden, Mr J Brown and Mrs S Lishman

Officers present all items: Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Ms P Bushby (Divisional Manager for Communities), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Mrs L Grange (Divisional Manager for Housing), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services Manager), Mr D Hyland (Community and Partnerships Support Manager), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

42 Minutes

Cllr Brisbane wished to have it noted that he had asked a question regarding unauthorised encampments. Mr Bennett clarified that the 20 July 2021 Full Council meeting had been formally closed at the time however a note would be made in the minutes of this meeting to acknowledge the discussion.

RESOLVED

1. That the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 20 July 2021 be approved.
2. That the minutes of the All Member Session held on 29 July 2021 be approved.

43 Urgent Items

There were no urgent items.

44 Declarations of Interests

Declarations of interest were declared as follows:

- Item 6 – Cllr Duncton declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council

- Item 6 – Cllr Donna Johnson declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council
- Item 6 – Cllr Oakley declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council
- Item 6 – Cllr O’Kelly declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council
- Item 6 – Cllr Sharp declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council
- Item 8 – Cllr Briscoe declared a prejudicial interest as a member of Westbourne Parish Council and agreed not to speak or vote on the item
- Item 9 – Cllr Plowman declared a personal interest at the Chairman of the Priory Park Society
- Item 11 – Cllr Oakley declared a personal interest as a member of West Sussex County Council

45 **Chair's Announcements**

Apologies were received from Cllr Bowden, Cllr Brown and Cllr Lishman.

The Chair welcomed Carley Lavender, the new Democratic Services Officer to the meeting.

The Chair announced that she had recently received a letter from the hospital to confirm that she is clear of cancer. Those present gave a round of applause.

46 **Public Question Time**

The Chair explained that a member of the public, a local resident submitted a long and technical question which they indicated they would prefer to be addressed by a written response. The question and its response have therefore been included in the minutes for this meeting but at the request of the questioner and with the approval of the Chair the question was not read out.

The question and answer were as follows:

Question from James Rank:

Dear Chair

The public have been told 'the Chichester Local Plan is unlikely to meet the full housing targets set by the Government due to a lack of external funding for infrastructure improvements', specifically 'improvements to the A27 Chichester Bypass, including the Stockbridge Link Road.'

In 2018 The Government consulted on the creation of the Major Roads Network with a view to a specific new funding stream dedicated to improvements on MRN roads.(1).

The objectives of this funding were to 'reduce congestion', support economic growth', 'support the Strategic Road Network' and 'support housing delivery' (2).

For roads to qualify for MRN funding certain criteria needed to be met. The A286 South of Chichester was included in the DfT MRN Consultation (3) and recommended for inclusion

in funding which would include major road enhancements such as 'structural renewals' and 'missing links'.

Given the SLR appears to already meet the criteria for MRN funding, given the recommended DfT funding contribution for MRN projects of £20m-£50m would appear to equal the shortfall in funding identified by CDC for infrastructure improvements, and given the Planning Inspector needs to see that this Council has investigated every single option (4) then my questions are (a) can The Leader confirm whether an application for MRN funding has been made to the DfT (5) and if not, what were the reasons? and (b) would the Council consider working with WSCC and the MP to ensure the A286 South of Chichester is included at the 5-yearly review of qualifying MRN roads and a future application for funding made?

(1) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/major-road-network-and-large-local-majors-programmes-investment-planning/major-road-network-and-large-local-majors-programmes-investment-planning-guidance>

(2)

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/765665/creation-of-the-major-road-network-government-response.pdf

(3)

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/670527/major-road-network-consultation.pdf

(4) <https://www.chichester.gov.uk/article/35707/Funding-gap-for-infrastructure-improvements-means-that-the-Chichester-Local-Plan-is-unlikely-to-meet-Governments-housing-targets>

(5) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/major-road-network-and-large-local-majors-programmes-investment-planning>

Thank you for considering this question.

James Rank

Answer from Cllr Taylor:

Thank you for your question. Given your reference to MRN funding, West Sussex County Council which is responsible for the A286 has assisted in this response. The Major Road Network (MRN) was created by the Department for Transport (DfT) to facilitate upgrades to the most strategically important local roads to support the strategic role of the National Strategic Road Network (i.e. motorways and trunk roads). The A286 is not a strategic road and passes through a number of rural communities so the County Council's strategy is to manage this as a local road and facilitate more use of active travel (i.e. walking and cycling) and buses, rather than to upgrade it to facilitate an increase in general traffic. In its response to the DfT consultation on creation of the MRN, the County Council requested that the A286 was not included because traffic flow and the proportion of Heavy Goods Vehicles on the A286 did not meet the DfT's criteria for roads on the MRN and that remains the case today.

If the volume and composition of traffic on A286 were to change in the future (or DfT change the criteria), then it may be possible to request that the A286 is added to the MRN at a future review which would potentially make the Stockbridge Link Road eligible for MRN funding (as it would be designated A286). However, it should be noted that in order to apply for MRN funding, improvements to the A286 would need to be prioritised above other priorities across the County. There are already more aspirations for improvements

on the MRN than the County Council is likely to be able to deliver, at least in the next 5-10 years, so a funding application cannot be guaranteed. Furthermore, at the present time it is also unclear what level of funding may be available for the DfT's MRN programme in the future as this is currently subject to the outcome of the Government's Spending Review.

In conclusion, in respect of your first question, WSCC as local highway authority has not, for the reasons outlined, made an MRN funding application for the A286 and/or Stockbridge Link Road and in answer to your 2nd question, the potential for a future funding application to be justified, appears at this stage to be unlikely but will be kept under future review. In light of this, MRN funding is not considered to be a source of funding that is available to support delivery of the Stockbridge Link Road.

47 Commissioning of West Sussex Community Advice and Support Service

Cllr Briscoe proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Briscoe then introduced the item.

Cllr Bangert requested clarification of how the service is different to that run by Chichester District Council (CDC) and how the service will be run. Cllr Briscoe explained that the service is designed to complement CDC. He confirmed that the Wellbeing team had this week returned to offering face to face appointments.

Cllr O'Kelly requested a referral pathway diagram for members. Cllr Briscoe suggested this be raised at Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

RESOLVED

That Council agrees the continuation of the Funding Partnership to commission a Community Advice and Support Service across West Sussex for up to seven years from April 2022 with West Sussex County Council as the lead authority.

48 Housing Grants

Cllr Sutton proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Sutton then introduced the item.

Cllr Apel and Cllr Bell then declared personal interests as trustees of Stonepillow.

Cllr Moss requested clarification on whether the Government grants are restrictive or whether CDC can apply flexibility. Cllr Sutton confirmed that there are some restrictions set which have to be followed. Mrs Shepherd added that there can be some flexibility where the funding is spent within a category of work.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

RESOLVED

That delegated authority is given to the Director of Housing and Communities in consultation with the Cabinet member for Housing and Communities to spend the grant funding received from Government set out in para 3.1 to 3.8 of this report in accordance with the terms of the grant.

49 **Making the Westbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan**

Further to his declaration Cllr Briscoe did not participate in this item.

Cllr Taylor proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Taylor then introduced the item.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

RESOLVED

That Council agrees to make the Westbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

50 **Motion from Cllr Plowman**

Cllr Plowman proposed his amended motion which had been circulated prior to the meeting. This was seconded by Cllr Bell. The motion was as follows:

The construction and dismantling of the large stage for the BEL Events in Priory Park on July 30th and 31st caused serious damage to fabric of Park similar to the damage caused by the operation, construction and dismantling of the Ice rink. The weather was a contributing factor but with climate change, this will become more severe and unpredictable.

- 1. In the light of this and recognising the Events Strategy and Policies for Chichester District 2020-2025 are evolving documents, Council require Cabinet to consider the following addition of a third bullet point is proposed to Page 5 under the heading CDC hire of land to recognise the limitations of Priory Park.**

The district has its challenges when it comes to hosting events, the following needs to be recognised in order to manage expectations:

- CDC Hire of Land

- We have limited number of suitable spaces for events to take place, with the majority of these being in Chichester City Centre***
- The largest spaces and most suitable spaces are close to residents and a major tourist destination, both of which impact the number, size and type of events we are able to host***
- Priory Park has limitations in terms of access and the dual role as a war memorial making it unsuitable for Headline and large scale feature events involving construction of major temporary buildings***

or structures which have the potential to damage the fabric of this historic Park.

- 2. Council also requests that any Events Policies affected by this addition are reviewed by Officers, The Cabinet Member for Events and local District Council Members.**
- 3. That Cabinet set up a Task and Finish group to look at the operation, management and future-Priory Park particularly given the poor state of the buildings with the exception of Fenwick's Café and the Guildhall.**

Cllr Bell endorsed Cllr Plowman's Motion and thanked Cllr Briscoe and Sutton for their positive involvement.

Cllr Sutton thanked Cllr Plowman and Cllr Bell for their engagement. He explained that the Events Policy is a living document. He outlined that Cllr Briscoe had apologised for the damage caused during a statement he had made during Public Questions at the September 2021 Cabinet meeting. He then explained that the remaining cricket fixtures had been played before treatment on the ground commenced in time for regrowth to occur before the next cricket season. He then gave his support to the amended Motion.

Cllr Oakley gave his support to the amended Motion. He asked who would set the Terms of Reference for the Task and Finish Group and whether it would include discussion on Chichester City Council managing the Park. Cllr Sutton confirmed that the Cabinet would be agreeing the Terms of Reference.

Cllr Brisbane raised concerns regarding noise complaints he and Cllr Lishman had received over the Battle of the Bands weekend. Reports were made to the Councillors that the council's emergency phone line was not working. Mrs Shepherd agreed to look into the issue. Cllr Briscoe explained that four official complaints had been made to the council about the event.

Cllr Bangert wished to note the need for suitable events to be considered as the Park also provides history of the war

Cllr Apel requested clarification on why the Task and Finish Group would be the Cabinet and not Overview and Scrutiny Committee as originally stated in the Motion. Mr Ward explained that since any changes to the Events Policy would require Cabinet approval so the change to it being a Cabinet T&F group had been agreed Cllr Plowman and Cllr Bell.

Cllr Graves suggested a separate application form for Priory Park events.

Cllr Oakley suggested a member of CDC staff be present at all large scale events.

Cllr Sharp asked whether the Task and Finish Group would be able to progress the building works in the Park. Mrs Shepherd explained that there are some projects already looking at the Park but members should also consider the prioritisation exercise regarding the Future Services Framework as not all projects can be funded.

Cllr O'Kelly requested the Overview and Scrutiny Committee look at the Park. Mrs Shepherd explained that would be a choice for the Chair of that Committee.

Cllr Lintill noted the cooperation between members working on the Motion.

Cllr Plowman was then invited to sum up.

In a vote the motion as amended was carried.

RESOLVED

The construction and dismantling of the large stage for the BEL Events in Priory Park on July 30th and 31st caused serious damage to fabric of Park similar to the damage caused by the operation, construction and dismantling of the Ice rink. The weather was a contributing factor but with climate change, this will become more severe and unpredictable.

4. In the light of this and recognising the Events Strategy and Policies for Chichester District 2020-2025 are evolving documents, Council require Cabinet to consider the following addition of a third bullet point is proposed to Page 5 under the heading CDC hire of land to recognise the limitations of Priory Park.

The district has its challenges when it comes to hosting events, the following needs to be recognised in order to manage expectations:

- *CDC Hire of Land*
 - o *We have limited number of suitable spaces for events to take place, with the majority of these being in Chichester City Centre*
 - o *The largest spaces and most suitable spaces are close to residents and a major tourist destination, both of which impact the number, size and type of events we are able to host*
 - o *Priory Park has limitations in terms of access and the dual role as a war memorial making it unsuitable for Headline and large scale feature events involving construction of major temporary buildings or structures which have the potential to damage the fabric of this historic Park.*
- 5. Council also requests that any Events Policies affected by this addition are reviewed by Officers, The Cabinet Member for Events and local District Council Members.
- 6. That Cabinet set up a Task and Finish group to look at the operation, management and future-Priory Park particularly given the poor state of the buildings with the exception of Fenwick's Café and the Guildhall.

51 Delegation to Chief Executive - Local Plan Review Update

The Chair explained that when discussing agenda item 15 from the Full Council meeting held on 20 July 2021 members made the following resolution:

To give an administrative delegation to the Chief Executive to enact all decisions from the remote session of Councillors on 29 July 2021, and to report that enactment to the next Full Council.

The Chief Executive reported that the enactment had been completed. She explained that an email had been sent to all members to confirm that was the case and that an All Member Session would be arranged in October to update members on progress.

The report did not require a vote however the Chair invited members to comment.

On behalf the Council the Chair noted the update.

52 Questions to the Executive

The following Questions to the Executive were received:

Cllr Purnell asked Cllr Plant why most of Selsey had not received textile bags for the Electrical/Textile recycling trial and whether it could be considered that when the bags are collected another bag is provided. Alternatively could the libraries or Parish Council's hold the bags. Cllr Plant explained that this was under investigation as the council had used a third party to distribute the bags. She added that the Depot had been affected by the HGV Driver shortage with some rounds being missed.

Cllr Apel asked Cllr Lintill for an update on the help provided to Refugees and Asylum Seekers from Afghanistan. Cllr Lintill explained that CDC had offered accommodation to West Sussex County Council, who were leading the programme. Mrs Shepherd added that if any member knows of anyone who is able to offer a house to put them in touch with the council.

Cllr Bangert asked Cllr Dignum whether following the announcement of the move of the Covid-19 Vaccination Site from Westgate to Northgate Car Park whether the volunteers could be offered free parking. Cllr Dignum explained that parking for volunteers is a matter for the NHS as that is who the volunteers provide a service for.

Cllr O'Kelly asked Cllr Plant about Electrical Vehicle Charging Points and whether there is a district wide plan for public charging points and whether the viability of those charging points in rural areas had been considered. She also asked whether there are figures for the number of Points currently in the district and where they are located. Cllr Plant explained that the Points that had been installed in the council's car parks had seen less than 10% usage. Currently CDC is waiting on the further information from West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) before deciding whether to join their contract.

Cllr Oakley asked for clarification of whether Parish Council's should refer to CDC or WSSCC regarding Electric Vehicle Charging Points. Cllr Plant confirmed it should be WSSCC. Mr Frost added that Mr Ballard at CDC could also be contacted.

Cllr Plowman asked Cllr Lintill whether she could include an article about the Southern Gateway in her Chichester Observer column. Cllr Lintill agreed to take on board the suggestion and invited members to contact her with any other suggestions too.

Cllr Duncton asked Cllr Taylor whether there was an update regarding the water extraction issue which could be fed back to the Parish Council's north of the downs. Cllr Taylor deferred to Mr Frost who explained that officers were working with Horsham and Crawley Councils on possible mitigation options. A report would be taken to DPIP in due course and then subsequently information could be placed on the council's website to update the Parish Council's.

Cllr Brisbane asked Cllr Plant whether local residents would receive finalised proposals following the public consultation meeting regarding unauthorised encampments. Cllr Briscoe explained that item 13 on the September 2021 Cabinet agenda outlined the approach of the project. Mrs Shepherd clarified that residents would be able to read the update report online which would be going to the October 2021 Cabinet meeting and would also be informed when the planning application is submitted.

Cllr Sharp asked Cllr Taylor whether the council could write a response to the Gatwick Runway Consultation. Cllr Taylor confirmed that the council would engage in a response. Mr Frost added that it is likely a proposed response would be reported to Cabinet.

Cllr Barrett asked Cllr Taylor who is responsible for the maintenance of the water course on an unadopted site. Cllr Taylor explained that if there are specific requirements made as planning permission conditions then failure to comply would result in planning enforcement measures.

Cllr Moss on behalf of Cllr Brown asked what the impact on the budget would be from the government's hike to Employers' National Insurance. Following on from that, when would the impact be felt. Cllr Wilding explained that there would be no impact on the current year's budget followed by a £160,000 increase anticipated thereafter.

Cllr Oakley asked Cllr Taylor whether the Planning Committee would be provided with advice on determining applications south of the bypass. Cllr Taylor explained that the council was engaging in specialist planning legal advice from a planning QC and the council's Planning Lawyer would be present at the next DPIP meeting. Mrs Shepherd added that the council awaited a confirmed timeline from the external lawyers but hoped to provide members with an update in the next week.

Cllr Moss asked if all members could be sent the DPIP invitation for the September 2021 DPIP meeting.

(Post meeting note: this was sent as the meeting finished.)

Cllr Moss asked Cllr Dignum when he had last engaged with Henry Boot regarding Southern Gateway. Cllr Dignum could not provide a date.

53 **Late Items**

There were no late items.

54 **Exclusion of the press and public**

There was no requirement to exclude the press or public.

The meeting ended at 4.02 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank