

Public Document Pack



Minutes of the meeting of the **Council** held in the Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on Tuesday 22 November 2022 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 J Brown, Mr A Dignum, Mrs J Duncton, Mr G Evans, Mrs J Fowler, Mrs N Graves, Mr F Hobbs, Mr T Johnson, Mrs E Lintill, Mrs S Lishman, 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 Elliott, Mrs D Johnson and Mr G McAra

Officers present all items: Mrs L Baines (Democratic Services Manager), Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), 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)

165 **Minutes**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 27 September 2022 be approved as a correct record.

166 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

167 **Declarations of Interests**

Cllr Oakley declared a personal interest in relation to agenda items 7 and 8 as a member of West Sussex County Council.

168 **Chair's Announcements**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Bowden, Cllr Elliott, Cllr Donna Johnson and Cllr McAra.

The Chair made the following announcement:

It is with great sadness that I announce the passing of John Connor and John Ridd. John Connor was a member from 2007 – 2019. He sat on Cabinet, Licensing Committees, Parking Forum, the then Environment Panel and Overview and Scrutiny Committee. John Ridd was a member from 1999 – 2019. He was also Chairman of the Council from 2005 until 2011. I will ask you all to hold a two minutes silence in memory of John Connor and John Ridd. Please will everyone who is able now stand.

A two minutes silence took place.

169 **Public Question Time**

The following question was submitted by Jane Towers and read by Democratic Services:

With ref to Agenda item 9 it is no surprise that there were only 8 responses to your request for views on evening meetings. I hesitate to call it a consultation. The only way you would have stumbled across it would have been a couple of posts popping up on social media. There was no engagement with Parish Councils on their flexibility on this. Some of the reasons given against evening meetings, by members, are quite frankly extraordinary. Those responses for, cite the, not unreasonable reasons, that having day time meetings is not conducive to attracting a diverse range of people to the Council, the difficulty for those who are working or have young families and caring duties. A start time of 4pm would do little to address this. A real opportunity ahead of the May elections has been missed.

I would like to ask the following questions:

- 1. Will you re run this as a proper consultation ie through Have Your Say, engagement with Parish Councils and other organisations, which would reach a much higher number of people?*
- 2. Can this be reviewed in May 2023 when the Council will have new members who may be a little more responsive to moving in line with practically every other council in the country?*

Cllr Lintill provided the following response:

Thank you for your question. The Council carried out a cross party exercise for some months which was made known to the public, parish councils and other organisations in the same way as many other exercises. This consultation was expanded into various social media routes to increase public awareness by the Council press team through that period. A wide range of sources of evidence were taken as outlined in the report and considered by the members involved in coming to their recommendations. It will be open to a future Council to reconsider any matter though no earlier than six months from a previous decision. Any methods of consultation could also be amended if they chose.

170 **Determination of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2023 – 2024**

Cllr Wilding introduced the item.

The recommendation was proposed by Cllr Wilding and seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Moss gave his support to the scheme but asked that further consideration be given to how more people could be supported. Cllr Lintill explained that if further support were to be provided then additional work would need to take place to look at how it would be funded.

Cllr Oakley requested clarification of how many Local Authorities have similar schemes. Mrs Rudziak confirmed that a quarter of councils have a scheme which allows a 100% reduction in Council Tax.

In response to a query of whether West Sussex County Council (WSSC) members should declare a personal interest Mr Bennett explained that in this instance it is not a strict legal requirement of members but is members choice whether to declare.

Cllr's Duncton, Oakley and Sharp then declared a personal interest in relation to the item as members of WSSC. Cllr O'Kelly asked if she should declare if she wished to speak. Mr Bennett explained that if a member were looking to influence the vote the advice would be to declare. Cllr Purnell then declared a personal interest in the item as a member of WSSC.

Cllr Sharp wished to note her thanks to the Supporting You team.

Cllr Purnell wished to commend the council for its work on the Scheme.

In a vote the following resolution was agreed:

That the proposed Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2023-2024 be approved.

171 **Financial Strategy and Plan 2023-24**

Cllr Wilding introduced the item and thanked the finance team for their hard work on the Strategy and Plan.

The recommendations were proposed by Cllr Wilding and seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Plowman wished to note his concern of the impact of inflationary costs and parking charges on businesses.

Cllr Brown noted his support for the Strategy and Plan.

In a vote the following resolutions were agreed:

- a) The key financial principles and actions set out in Appendix 1 of the 5 year Financial Strategy report are approved.**
- b) That the Minimum Level of Reserves level is set at £4m following the recommendation of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.**
- c) That the current 5 year Financial Model detailed in appendix 2 (Part 2) and the Resources Statement in appendix 3 to the Financial Strategy report be noted.**
- d) That £1.457m is transferred from the General Fund Reserve to the Investment Risk reserve to increase the mitigation held for fair value adjustments for the Council's long-term investments.**

172 **Boundary Review Panel Recommendations**

Cllr Oakley as Chair of the Boundary Review Panel introduced the item. He thanked officers for their time on the recommendations.

The recommendations were proposed by Cllr Oakley and seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Oakley outlined all the options detailed within the report. He then spoke in favour of option 2.1c as outlined in the report. He explained that it would mean that it includes the whole of the A286 from the city to Midhurst in the Chichester constituency and avoids upper Lavant valley parishes being detached.

Cllr Brown spoke in favour of option 2.1b. He referred to maps he had provided to members prior to the meeting. He spoke against the Boundary Commission proposals as it results in areas of Bognor being included in the Chichester constituency and the exclusion of the South Downs within the Chichester constituency. He explained that proposals should be kept as simple as possible. Option 2.1b is a straight swap to put Bognor areas into Arun and South Downs.

Cllr O'Kelly explained that Harting Parish Council had debated the matter. She spoke in favour of the footprint of the constituencies being in line with local authorities for collaborative work. She added that the other local authorities should all be in line in order to get the changes through.

Cllr Hobbs spoke in favour of Lodsworth remaining in Chichester constituency. He requested the council responded with a preference to option 2.1c.

Cllr Duncton spoke in favour of option 2.1c.

Cllr Potter spoke in favour of option 2.1d in order to maintain the Goodwood ward within the Chichester constituency.

Cllr Plowman agreed with Cllr Potter about maintaining the Goodwood ward within the Chichester constituency. He also commented that it would be good to maintain Lodsworth too.

Cllr Moss agreed with the comments made to bring everyone in line to the same view. He included the MP in that. He wished to support option 2.1b at this stage.

Cllr Purnell supported a combination of option 2.1b and option 2.1c in order to achieve the optimum.

Cllr Dignum supported maintaining Harting, Easebourne and Midhurst and whatever else was mathematically possible.

Cllr Moss requested comment from the Chief Executive to provide members with a solution.

Cllr Purnell explained that the Boundary Commission appeared open to change. She added that the numbers presented to the Boundary Commission would be presented in order that they are checked rather than calculated.

Cllr Sharp commented that Pagham and Bersted are better linked to Bognor Regis. She spoke in favour of option 2.1c.

Cllr Briscoe drew members attention to the recommendation which allows for a combination of the options to be put forward. He spoke in favour of option 2.1c but could support a combination of options 2.1b 2.1c and 2.1d.

Cllr Brown explained that Cllr Oakley and Mr Mildred had carried out work to establish the different number options. He wished to note that Cllr McAra who was not present had spoke in favour of option 2.1a. He requested members vote on whether to include option 2.1d and then vote between 2.1b and 2.1c. He suggested submitting both options to the Boundary Commission to have 2.1c as the preferred option with 2.1b as a second preference if 2.1c is not workable.

Cllr Lintill supported Cllr Brown's approach.

Cllr Oakley proposed that given the council's desire to include as much of the district within the Chichester constituency that options 2.1b and 2.1c be put forward with equal weighting to the Boundary Commission. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Brown.

Cllr O'Kelly raised concerns about not aligning the options with other stakeholders.

Mrs Shepherd explained that a counter proposal would have to be made in order to put forward a preferred option with a second preference.

Cllr Purnell put forward a counter motion to put forward option 2.1c as the preferred option with option 2.1b as a second preference. This was seconded by Cllr Duncton.

The Chair took a short break in order to compile the amendments.

Mrs Shepherd clarified that option 2.1d would be a separate vote. She added that of the two counter motions members would vote first on Cllr Purnell's and if that were successful then not on Cllr Oakley's counter motion however if Cllr Purnell's counter motion fell then Cllr Oakley's motion would be voted on.

The Chair clarified the two counter motions:

- Cllr Purnell, seconded by Cllr Duncton put forward that option 2.1c be put forward as the preferred option with option 2.1b as a second preference.
- Cllr Oakley, seconded by Cllr Brown put forward that options 2.1b and 2.1c be put forward with equal weighting.

Mrs Shepherd explained if both fall then the vote would be on the substantive recommendation.

Cllr Hobbs wished to add a preamble that the aim of the council is to ensure the maximum amount of the district falls within the Chichester constituency. Cllr Purnell clarified that the additional recommendation in the report would give delegated authority for Cllr Oakley and Mr Mildred to word the response and therefore that would be included. Cllr Oakley confirmed that would be the principle of the response.

Mr Bennett asked members to maintain the discipline of speaking through the Chair for all comments.

The Chair then asked members to vote on Cllr Purnell's counter motion.

The vote was tied. The Chair gave her casting vote to the counter motion.

In a vote the following resolution was carried:

RESOLVED

That option 2.1c be put forward to the Boundary Commission for England as the preferred option with option 2.1b as a second preference.

The Chair then moved to a vote on option 2.1d.

In a vote the following recommendation was carried:

RESOLVED

To recommend that the Boundary Commission for England move the whole of the Goodwood CDC ward from the Arundel and South Downs constituency into Chichester constituency. This would need to be offset by the parish of Lodsworth remaining within the Arundel and South Downs constituency rather than moving with the rest of Easebourne CDC ward into the Chichester constituency.

The Chair then moved to a vote on option 2.2

In a vote the following recommendation was carried:

RESOLVED

That it is delegated to the Chairman of the Boundary Review Panel supported by the Divisional Manager for Business Support to set out detailed proposals as appropriate and finalise the consultation response to the Boundary Commission for England.

173 Committee Calendar of Meetings May 2023 - May 2024 and Evening Meeting Trial

Cllr Purnell as Chair of the 2023 Elections Task and Finish Group introduced the item. The recommendations were proposed by Cllr Purnell and seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Cllr Moss was then invited to introduce his amendment:

That the Monitoring Officer is asked to carry out a review of meeting times in June to August 2023 to assess new councillors preferred choices of meeting times; outcomes of that review to be reported to Council.

The amendment was seconded by Cllr Brown.

Cllr Moss acknowledged that the calendar of meetings agreed would be for the period May 2023 – Annual Council 2024. He explained that following the District Elections in May new members may have views on when the meetings should be held. He therefore proposed the amendment in order that those views can be considered for meetings taking place from May 2024.

Cllr Barrett raised concerns that evening meetings would clash with parish meetings. He suggested 4pm Full Council starts in the summer months only.

Cllr Plowman suggested the debate take place after the elections.

Cllr Tim Johnson explained that 8pm cut offs would be beneficial for working councillors. 4pm – 8pm would be a compromise.

Cllr Purnell explained that a new council could bring the decision back for consideration six months after the decision is made. Cllr Oakley agreed.

Cllr Oakley explained that he did not support evening meetings due to parish meetings and long days. He noted that 4pm starts would still clash with parish meetings and the working day. He also raised concerns that an 8pm guillotine could result in additional special meetings.

Cllr Barrie supported Cllr Moss's comments and amendment. She explained that the possibility of evening meetings may help to attract a more diverse range of councillors.

Cllr Brown supported the amendment from Cllr Moss. He explained he supported the 4pm start time for the Full Council meetings. He gave example that other councils are able to manage evening meetings and if they are able to be planned for that would help. He explained he would prefer more evening meetings but accepted incremental change as a compromise. He noted that four day weeks could work for staff that are supporting evening meetings.

Cllr Hobbs explained that he felt the debate should wait for the new council following May 2023. Cllr Duncton noted that she agreed.

Cllr Graves outlined the difficulties of traveling home late at night from rural parts of the district.

Cllr Sharp spoke in favour of Cllr Moss's amendment. She spoke in favour of evening meetings to allow those who work to stand for election and attend council meetings.

Cllr Sutton explained that for those who work and have other roles evening meetings can cause clashes. This is also the case for parish meetings. He noted that during the trial some attendees left prior to the end of the meeting. He also noted that there could be issues for those wishing to attend meetings trying to get evening childcare.

Cllr Plowman requested that the Chair move to the vote on the amendment then follow with the debate on the substantive Motion.

The Chair moved to vote on Cllr Moss's amendment. Cllr O'Kelly sought a point of order as she wished to comment on the amendment. Mrs Shepherd explained that members were being asked to vote on the amendment submitted by Cllr Moss. Following the vote on that Motion further debate will be permitted on the substantive recommendation before a vote to approve Appendix A or Appendix B. Cllr Purnell asked for clarification of why the amendment would be voted on first as she viewed it as an additional recommendation. The Chair asked members to vote on the amendment first.

Cllr O’Kelly was permitted to speak to the amendment. She asked that new members be provided with a form to submit their preferences once elected.

Members then voted on Cllr Moss’s amendment Motion. A request was made to abstain having voted. Mr Bennett explained that as the Chair had not yet reached abstentions this could be permitted at her discretion. Members were reminded that members should not be voting twice. The Chair asked members to raise their hands in favour, against and abstain.

In a vote the following resolution was agreed:

RESOLVED

That the Monitoring Officer is asked to carry out a review of meeting times in June to August 2023 to assess new councillors preferred choices of meeting times; outcomes of that review to be reported to Council.

The Chair invited comments on the substantive recommendations.

Cllr Oakley commented on the daytime work that would need to take place when the officers required are available.

Cllr Tim Johnson wished to note that an employer only has to provide two working days annual leave per year. Cllr Apel noted that when she was working she used to take holiday in order to carry out her council duties.

Cllr Purnell noted that there are different views which will not please everyone whichever option is chosen.

Cllr Hobbs explained that further work should be done at a later date. He wished to have an informal conversation with Mr Bennett about the different types of councillors that may apply.

Cllr O’Kelly explained that she did not see the benefit of the 4.00pm start time for Full Council. She felt that 6.00pm would be better. She noted that 4.00pm was a small step forward but more could be done.

Cllr Bangert requested clarification of whether allowances cover childcare costs. It was confirmed that they do.

Mr Bennett explained that in response to Cllr Tim Johnson’s comments that the general rule is that employees are entitled to reasonable time off to carry out the role of a councillor.

Mr Ward clarified that when members vote if Appendix A is carried then a vote would not take place on Appendix B.

The Chair then moved to the vote for Appendix A. The vote was tied and the Chair used her casting vote to vote in favour of Appendix A.

RESOLVED

That Appendix A be approved as the Calendar of Meetings for 2023/24.

Members took a short break.

174 **Motion from Cllr Wilding**

Cllr Wilding proposed his Motion which was seconded by Cllr Hobbs.

His Motion was as follows:

There is a growing problem in this District and across the UK of speculators buying areas of farm land or woodland and then selling it on the internet in small lots. Look up Land for sale - Barney Estates. The speculators can double or treble their investment but at the same time they are permanently ruining the landscape by turning fields and woods into allotments. There are 5 instances of this happening in or near my ward in the last year. The effect can be reduced by CDC issuing an Article 4 Direction or a whole wood TPO, but this creating a huge amount of work for Enforcement and Legal.

I propose a motion as follows:

This Council deplores the practice of subdividing agricultural and forestry land into small lots for sale and asks the Leader/Chief Executive to write to the MP requesting that she lobbies Government to legislate against it.

As Cabinet member Cllr Taylor responded first. She explained that the landscape in the district is characterised in part by the network of fields and forests across our countryside. Whilst the rural landscape has been subject to change over time, fields and woodlands remains for the most part open and undeveloped, even where land is used for agricultural or forestry operations. The creation of leisure plots may result in a change of use that needs planning permission if it is used for domestic or recreational purposes, but this is not always the case if the subdivision of the land does not alter its primary use. Therefore, the local planning authority does not necessarily have control over the subdivision of fields or areas of woodland. The sub-division of fields and woodland can result in a proliferation of boundary fences, accesses, and tracks, outbuildings, and paraphernalia which is more domestic in nature, than equipment and development necessary to carry out agricultural uses or forestry operations. The subdivision of rural landscapes, the creation of leisure plots, and the development that is associated with the use is therefore often harmful to the character of the rural area.

Cllr Taylor added that an Article 4 Direction, served under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, as amended, allows a local planning authority to remove permitted development rights for some of the harmful elements that would otherwise not require planning permission. This includes means of enclosure such as fencing and hard standing for tracks. Article 4 directions are a useful tool to proactively manage what development can take place on a parcel of land. However, it is important to note that Article 4's do not prevent land from being sold or land being subdivided in terms of the ownership of the land. Seeking to control the sale of land is outside the scope of the planning system, and therefore this is beyond the remit of an Article 4 direction.

Cllr Taylor suggested that she ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities expressing the Council's

concerns about the effects of sun-division of rural land and requesting that further legislation is considered to address the problem.

Cllr Hobbs as seconder was invited to speak. He gave an example of a similar practice in Lodsworth. He added that the South Downs National Park Authority had used its statutory powers in order to help in that situation.

Cllr Moss spoke on behalf of the Liberal Democrats group and explained that the Group wished to support the Motion.

Cllr Oakley added that the practice occurs both in and out of the National Park.

Cllr Potter gave his support to the Motion.

Cllr Lintill confirmed that she was happy for the letter to be sent in her name.

In a vote the Motion was carried:

RESOLVED

This Council deplores the practice of subdividing agricultural and forestry land into small lots for sale and asks the Leader/Chief Executive to write to the MP requesting that she lobbies Government to legislate against it.

175 Motion from Cllr Barrett

Cllr Barrett proposed his Motion which was seconded by Cllr Brown.

His Motion was as follows:

Having requested data from the Councils Council Tax team I have been advised that there are currently 1,688 properties listed for Council Tax in West Wittering parish. On looking through the Government website <https://www.gov.uk/council-tax-bands> for West Wittering there were a significant number of entries where properties have had their Tax Band 'Deleted' thus do not pay Council Tax. Whilst there are a number of potential reasons for that, it may be that these properties now fall under the Business Rate structure as they are being rented out as holiday homes.

In West Wittering Parish there are currently 326 properties registered as Second Homes of which many may be let out as holiday accommodation. The Councils business rating list indicates there are 33 properties registered as holiday homes in the parish. However, it would appear that if the Rateable Value of the Business property is less than £12000 there are no charges to pay as small business rate relief is applied. In the case of holiday accommodation the Rateable Values are well below £12000, and the average in West Wittering for this type of business is £4,750, meaning that no business rates are actually paid.

It is apparent that these properties do not contribute to the Councils cost of providing services so I would like to put forward the Following Motion:

That this Council write to the Member of Parliament for Chichester to raise this matter with the Secretary of State for Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities to have

this matter addressed and propose a solution whereby Councils are reimbursed for the services they provide.

Cllr Brown as seconder was invited to speak. On behalf of the Liberal Democrats group he explained that the Group wished to support the Motion.

As Cabinet member Cllr Wilding then responded. He explained that currently there is a loophole where a property owner can claim their property is available to let for 140 days a year in order to get it assessed for business rates rather than Council Tax and, if it is small business, it will pay no rates. This applies even if it is not advertised or the rent is prohibitively high. The rules are being tightened from 1st April 2023, so rather than just being available for let for 140 days a property must also have actually been let for 70 or more days in the previous year in order to qualify for the rating list rather than Council Tax so this may result in some properties that are currently rated moving back into Council Tax. Cllr Wilding added that there is a proposal to increase the Council Tax for second homes by adding a premium of 100% (i.e. charging double the normal rate). This part of the Levelling Up Bill, but this has not passed into law yet, but even if it does pass into law, it will only apply to properties paying Council Tax. Cllr Wilding explained his view that holiday lets should not be exempt from Council Tax because they receive the same services as a property occupied by the owner. He therefore gave his support to the Motion to write to the MP for Chichester to raise the issues around some properties not contributing to local services with the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, and request that a solution is found whereby Councils are re-imbursed for the services they provide.

Cllr Purnell gave her support to the Motion and asked that the letter to the MP include reference to refuse collection from second homes. Mr Ward explained that officers were in the process of contact owners of properties being used as either Air BnB or commercial operations to explain that there refuse collection will be charged under commercial waste collection. Cllr Purnell thanked Mr Ward for the update.

In a vote the Motion was carried:

RESOLVED

That this Council write to the Member of Parliament for Chichester to raise this matter with the Secretary of State for Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities to have this matter addressed and propose a solution whereby Councils are reimbursed for the services they provide.

176 Motion from Cllr Sharp

Cllr Sharp proposed her Motion which was seconded by Cllr Brown.

Her Motion was as follows:

Everyone has the right to a warm home that is affordable to heat:

- *Improving energy efficiency is central to tackling the energy crisis & cost of living crisis;*
- *Fossil fuels should be left in the ground, & investment in energy supply should instead be targeted at renewables;*

- *All new homes & workplaces should be built to the highest possible energy efficiency standards.*

This council notes that:

- *Chichester District Council declared a climate emergency in 2019 which makes the District an inappropriate place to carry out oil and gas exploration;*
- *Buildings account for 23% of UK greenhouse gas emissions;*
- *CDC has supported energy efficiency for homes & businesses in the district, but needs far more support from central government*
- *Current UK government investment in energy efficiency is nowhere near the level required to address fuel poverty or meet our legally binding UK climate targets. To date only approximately 50 homes have been improved through Local Authority ECO3 Flex and Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery schemes.*

The council therefore calls on the Leader to write to the Prime Minister & to our MPs to call for:

- *Immediate further direct financial support to help people to manage the cost of living crisis, with most support provided to low income households;*
- *A fully funded nationwide action plan to insulate all homes & businesses as quickly as possible to improve energy efficiency & reduce bills;*
- *A commitment to keep fossil fuels in the ground, & to invest instead in developing the renewable energy technologies & businesses that are essential for our future energy security;*
- *A commitment to require any applications for oil and gas exploration, including fracking, to demonstrate a net zero impact on carbon emissions, environmental and population health and water supplies;*
- *Immediate introduction of significantly improved energy efficiency standards for new buildings.*

Cllr Brown as seconder was invited to speak. He proposed his amendments submitted in advance of the meeting as per the Motions procedure. His amendments were as follows:

Amendment A:

Change: "The Council therefore calls on the Leader to write to the Prime Minister and to our MPs to call for:"

To: "The Council therefore calls on the Leader to write to the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and to our MPs to call for:"

Amendment B:

Add the following to Bullet Point three:

"including capping the Autumn Statement's newly increased windfall tax on renewable energy to be no greater than that imposed on fossil fuels and to give the same investment allowances to renewables that are available to fossil fuel investors."

As Cabinet member Cllr Plant then responded. She explained that everyone is aware of how the cost of energy bills, energy security and climate emergency are inextricably linked together and that improved energy efficiency in housing and other buildings and investment in renewable energy will provide a way forward. She explained that the councils influence with central government is limited, but she gave her support for a call for further action and confirmed she would be happy to write to government including the local MPs on this important matter. In relation to the specific points raised Cllr Plant explained that direct financial support is a short term measure and whilst it should be targeted at those in most need the government's proposals for this are already clear and are unlikely to change in the short term. In terms of the second point, an insulation programme would be a more sustainable way of reducing energy bills. However in the current fiscal situation, a fully funded nationwide Plan for all may not amount to the most efficient use of our national resources. Nevertheless, any such plan needs to provide clear incentives for people to take action and also tackle the non-financial barriers to improving energy efficiency. With regard to the three points concerning: investment in renewably energy technologies; ensuring a net zero approach to our national energy strategy; and finally, bringing forward the planned Future Buildings standards for new builds Cllr Plant agreed that the council could and should urge government to act and request that the local MPs support them. Based on the comments made above Cllr Plant gave support to the thrust of the Motion.

Cllr Purnell requested a vote on each of the points of the Motion as she could support some of the points but not others. This proposal was seconded by Cllr Dignum.

Cllr Plowman gave his support to the Motion.

With regard to the second, third and fourth bullet points Cllr Oakley commented that members on the WSCC Planning Committee may wish to consider abstaining. He asked members to consider whether there is capacity within industry and where the materials would come from. He suggested maximising tidal energy. Cllr Apel gave her support to the suggestion.

Cllr Lintill explained that she would be happy to write on all but the first bullet point which had been superseded by the Autumn Budget Statement.

Cllr Hobbs gave his support to the thrust of the Motion. He asked whether the wording could be amendment to 'acknowledge the council's support'.

Cllr Briscoe commented on the practicalities of the Motion but explained he felt the proposals were admirable.

Cllr Barrie acknowledged what remained outside of the council's control. She spoke in support of the Motion and called for change.

Cllr Palmer explained that he would support bullet points two and five only.

Cllr Sutton commented on bullet points three and four as aspirational.

Cllr Brown explained that the Motion is to fund the creation of the action plan not the outcome of an action plan.

Cllr Moss gave his support to the Motion in full.

Cllr Hobbs asked if Cllr Sharp would consider the wording again to acknowledge the council's desire rather than committing to it. Cllr Sharp agreed if it meant the Motion could be supported.

Cllr Sharp confirmed that she had accepted the inclusion of Cllr Brown's amendments within her Motion.

Cllr Lintill explained that she would share the draft with Cllr Sharp before sending the letter.

Cllr Purnell requested more information on the wording in order to be able to vote.

Cllr Lintill confirmed that the wording would remove the word commitment and bullet point one.

Mr Bennett explained that the Leader would be required to write broadly in terms of the Motion and amendments.

Cllr Moss requested that the letter be shared with both Cllr Sharp and Cllr Brown as proposer and seconder.

Cllr Duncton explained that as a member of both the South Downs National Park and WSCC Planning Committee's she would not be voting on bullet points three and four.

Cllr Purnell then withdrew her proposal to vote on the bullet points separately.

In a vote the Motion as amended was carried:

RESOLVED

This council notes that:

- **Chichester District Council declared a climate emergency in 2019 which makes the District an inappropriate place to carry out oil and gas exploration;**
- **Buildings account for 23% of UK greenhouse gas emissions;**
- **CDC has supported energy efficiency for homes & businesses in the district, but needs far more support from central government**
- **Current UK government investment in energy efficiency is nowhere near the level required to address fuel poverty or meet our legally binding UK climate targets. To date only approximately 50 homes have been improved through Local Authority ECO3 Flex and Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery schemes.**

The Council therefore calls on the Leader to write to the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and to our MPs to call for:

- **A fully funded nationwide action plan to insulate all homes & businesses as quickly as possible to improve energy efficiency & reduce bills.**
- **Acknowledges the desire to keep fossil fuels in the ground, & to invest instead in developing the renewable energy technologies & businesses that**

are essential for our future energy security including capping the Autumn Statement's newly increased windfall tax on renewable energy to be no greater than that imposed on fossil fuels and to give the same investment allowances to renewables that are available to fossil fuel investors.

- **Acknowledges the desire to require any applications for oil and gas exploration, including fracking, to demonstrate a net zero impact on carbon emissions, environmental and population health and water supplies;**
- **Immediate introduction of significantly improved energy efficiency standards for new buildings.**

177 **Late Items**

There were no late items.

178 **Exclusion of the press and public**

The Chair announced that the Part II agenda item 16 would be heard first with the Council to then return to public session for Questions to the Executive. The Chair then read the Part II resolution in relation to agenda item 16. This was proposed by Cllr Lintill and seconded by Cllr Taylor. The Council then voted to go into part II.

RESOLVED

That with regard to agenda item 16 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.

179 **Leisure Management Contract Review**

Cllr Briscoe introduced the item.

The recommendation was proposed by Cllr Briscoe and seconded by Cllr Lintill.

Comments and questions were made by Cllr Brown, Cllr Moss, Cllr Sharp, Cllr Bangert, Cllr Apel, Cllr Barrie, Cllr Oakley and Cllr Plowman. Responses were provided by Cllr Briscoe, Mrs Hotchkiss and Mr Bennett.

In a vote the following resolution was agreed:

That recommendation 2.1 of the exempt report as set out on page 55 of the Cabinet agenda for 1 November 2022 be approved.

180 **Questions to the Executive**

The Chair announced that the meeting had returned to public session.

Questions to the Executive were as follows:

Cllr Gareth Evans asked for assurance that following the case of Awaab Ishak that the council is seeking assurances from Hyde and other social housing providers to ensure that never happens in Chichester. He requested information on what steps would be taken to resolve the very serious issues with their housing stock. Cllr Sutton thanked Cllr Evans for sight of the question in advance. He expressed sadness at the case of Awaab Ishak. He highlighted the responsibility of the district council which has a duty to keep housing conditions under review which is carried out through a housing conditions survey. As Cabinet Portfolio Holder Cllr Sutton explained he meets with officers regularly to discuss complaints brought forward by residents. Officers have approached Hyde for comment and will update all members in due course. Cllr Sutton confirmed that he would also be writing to all housing providers operating within the district to ask them about the assessment of their stock, the processes they have in place for dealing with poor housing conditions and their plan for action as required.

Cllr Apel requested an update on the response rate of Hyde following Cllr Sutton discussing the matter at a recent Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Cllr Sutton confirmed there had been improvement with quarterly meetings providing a greater focus on resolutions.

Cllr O'Kelly requested some communications for residents. Cllr Sutton confirmed he would bring forward some communications and asked Cllr Evans and Cllr O'Kelly for their input.

Cllr Sharp asked for details of the measures being taken to prepare voters for the new Voter ID system being introduced for next May's elections. Mrs Shepherd as Electoral Registration Officer and Returning Officer was asked to provide a response. She explained that Voter ID would take effect for the May elections. For those that do not have ID they will be able to apply for a Voter Authority Certificate from Gov.uk. Staff in polling stations will not be able to issue ballot papers unless they see a form of identification or a Voter Authority Certificate. There will be a large scale PR campaign from the council's PR and the Electoral Commission in the new year. A targeted awareness campaign will also be undertaking to communicate directly to groups where there may be high levels of the electorate who do not hold a valid ID such as students and care homes residents. Full guidance should be available in the new year but Legislation has been made so it would be too late to write to the Minister.

Cllr Adrian Moss asked for an update following the resolution made by the Planning Committee on 7 April 2021 that officers make an application to the Secretary of State under Regulation 7 of the Town and County Planning Act Control of Advertising 2007 for a direction that deemed consent should not apply for estate agent advertising in the Chichester Conservation Area for a period of 10 years. Cllr Susan Taylor agreed to provide a written response to all members.

Cllr Simon Oakley requested a meeting with a member of the Cabinet and Tangmere Parish Council relating to Section 106 monies which the Parish are having difficulty progressing projects to spend the funds. Mr Bennett asked that Cllr Oakley discuss operational matters with Mr Frost's officers directly. Mr Frost confirmed he would be happy to arrange a separate meeting with Cllr Oakley to discuss further.

The meeting ended at 6.19 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank