



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 1 - East Pallant House on Tuesday 8 September 2015 at 9.30 am

**Members Present:** Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr B Finch, Mrs P Hardwick, Mrs G Keegan and Mrs S Taylor

**Members not present:**

**In attendance by invitation:**

**Officers present all items:** Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services) and Mr P Coleman (Member Services Manager)

### 37 **Statement from the Leader on Syrian Refugees**

At the beginning of the meeting the Leader of the Council made the following statement:

“The Prime Minister has said that the UK will accommodate 20,000 Syrian refugees over the next five years and that the Government will be putting the details of plans together with a view to making a further announcement next week. He announced that the foreign aid budget can provide the financial support in the first year for these refugees and be targeted to help local councils with housing costs. If all local authorities play their fair part, the numbers coming here would be low.

“Chichester District Council will cooperate fully with the Government’s plans when these are set out as promised in more detail next week.

“Our Housing Department is already identifying how many vacant units may be made available in the Council’s own accommodation for the homeless, but these are likely to be strictly limited. Many bed and breakfast establishments within the District are not prepared to accept homeless families and it is likely to be the same with asylum seekers.

“We have already been approached by members of the public offering to provide a room or two in their homes for asylum seekers. We welcome these offers and they will all be followed up when we are advised of those refugees wishing to come to the District. Those offering rooms need to be aware of the challenges they may face and that they may need safeguarding checks. The refugees may have suffered severe trauma and may require intensive emotional and medical support. Council officers will do all they can to help settle the refugees happily in their hosts’ homes.”

38 **Minutes**

**RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 7 July 2015 be signed as a correct record.

39 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

40 **Declarations of Interests**

Mr Finch declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a member of Southbourne Parish Council in agenda item 10 (Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan). He withdrew to the public seating area while that item was discussed and took no part in the discussion or vote.

Mr Barrow explained that, although he had a small marine business in Chichester, his business would derive no benefit from the provision of a haven at Selsey. As owner of a boat, he might on occasion use such a haven for shelter. Accordingly he did not believe that he had a pecuniary or prejudicial interest in agenda item 14 (Coastal Community Team Projects).

Mr Dignum declared a personal interest as a member of Chichester City Council in agenda item 9 (Chichester City... Preparing a Vision for the City).

Mrs Apel and Mr Macey (present in the public seating area) also declared personal interests as members of Chichester City Council in agenda item 9.

41 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted.

42 **Chichester District Council Annual Report 2014-2015**

The Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

The Chairman commended the draft Annual Report 2014-2015 as an excellent summary of a year of real progress for the Council in its provision of services to residents. Cabinet Members had approved their own sections of the report, and had had the opportunity to read the other sections, and would be giving a brief summary to the next Council meeting.

**RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

That the Annual Report 2014-15 be approved.

43 **Approval of the Council's Infrastructure Business Plan for consultation with**

## **the City, Town and Parish Councils and key Infrastructure Delivery Commissioners**

Referring to minute 8 of 2 June 2015, the Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda, together with a replacement foreword for the draft Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP), replacement tables for paragraphs 1.17 and 1.18 of the Executive Summary of the IBP, other amendments to the IBP, and revised terms of reference for the Infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group (copies attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report. She reminded the Cabinet that the IBP was reliant on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) being in place by the end of 2015, and its assumptions had been made on the basis that the rates would remain as submitted for Examination. The CIL Charging Schedule was still at the Examination stage. It was unlikely that the Examiner would issue his report before the end of September 2015, and thus it was unlikely that the CIL would be adopted before October 2015.

This was the first time that the Council had prepared a Draft Infrastructure Business Plan. Its purposes were:-

- to ensure that infrastructure was delivered in time to support the development identified in the Local Plan;
- to ensure the CIL was spent to best effect
- to select the priority for projects to be funded.
- to identify infrastructure that will be funded from S106 and other sources besides the CIL.

The draft IBP concentrated on the projects that needed to be funded during the first five years from 2016 to 2021, particularly those that were to be funded from CIL.

The IBP would be a 'living' document and would be rolled forward and updated each year to reflect funding availability, development delivery rates and revised infrastructure requirements.

If approved by the Council, the draft document would be subject to six weeks consultation with stakeholders from 1 October to 12 November 2015. Their comments and any modifications would be reported back to the Joint Member Liaison Group on 2 December, then to the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel (DPIP) for consideration on 14 January, before going to Cabinet for approval on 2 February 2016, and Council on 8 March 2016 for budget and CIL allocation approval.

Mrs Taylor explained that Page 56 and the table at paragraph 1.18 was the most important part of the IBP. This showed which projects had been shortlisted for CIL funding in each of the five years. The remaining balance was rolled forward into the following year.

The rest of the IBP set out the methodology for identifying the projects to be funded from CIL and the long list of projects put forward by others. There was a relatively

small amount of money to begin with, but parish councils would also have a proportion of CIL that could be spent on smaller projects.

The DPIP had asked for the Foreword to be redrafted, particularly to explain the relationship between CIL and S106, and to explain that the document would be updated each year. The revised Foreword had been circulated and replaced the one in the report.

The DPIP had also expressed concerns about funding the Smarter Choices infrastructure items that related to behaviour change in order to encourage modal switch away from reliance on the private car. Instead, The DPIP would prefer the money to be spent on hard engineering projects such as new cycling infrastructure, or a combination of Smarter Choices to follow on from the harder measures.

The Joint Member Liaison Group had met on 4 September, and recommended that their Terms of Reference be revised to include consideration of the County Council's Place Plan for Chichester.

The Group also recommended to Cabinet further alterations to the IBP:-

- A revised Foreword (tabled at this meeting for approval).
- A revision to paragraph 1.9 to make it clear that the critical infrastructure is the Tangmere WWTW which will be funded from future water bills and the A27 which will be funded from S106/S278. (tabled at this meeting for approval).
- A revision to IBP paragraphs 7.8 and 7.9 to refer to the relevant parts of the CIL Regulations in relation to the Parish share of the CIL (tabled at this meeting for approval).

The Group had also discussed the Cashflow and Spending Plan at IBP paragraph 1.17 and agreed that West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) would look at providing a more balanced approach to encourage modal switch away from the private car to accompany a reduced amount of funding for Smarter Choices. This approach could include bringing forward projects originally identified in the long list for the medium/long term such as filling in gaps in the cycle network.

WSSCC had also indicated that it was refining the work relating to educational requirements, and might need less of the CIL for school places, owing to the availability of Basic Needs Grant from the Government. WSSCC would not be in a position to provide information on the revised projects, nor on the additional transport projects, before the IBP was published for consultation, and would therefore provide this information during the consultation period itself.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Dower and Mr Allgrove for their work on the draft IBP. He also commented that he believed, after its first meeting, that the Joint Member Liaison Group was working well.

As a result of the consideration by the DPIP and Joint Member Liaison Group, the recommendations in the Cabinet report had been revised.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Head of Planning Services be authorised to make typographical and other minor amendments to the draft Infrastructure Business Plan 2016/2021 following consultation with the Cabinet member for Housing and Planning.
- (2) That the terms of reference of the Infrastructure Business Plan Joint Member Liaison Group be amended as shown on the version tabled at this meeting.

## **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

That the Council be recommended to approve the Council's first draft Infrastructure Business Plan 2016/2021 for consultation with West Sussex County Council, neighbouring district councils, City, town and parish councils, and key infrastructure delivery commissioners for a period of six weeks from 1 October to 12 November 2015, as amended by:

- (a) The revised foreword tabled at this meeting
- (b) The other Amendments tabled at this meeting
- (c) Typographical and other minor amendments approved in accordance with (1) above

### **44 Upgrade of Heating and Ventilation Systems, South Wing, East Pallant House, Chichester.**

The Cabinet considered the report and appended Project Initiation Document (PID) circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Finch introduced the report. He explained that the heating and ventilation plant serving the south wing had been installed in 1983 as part of a major extension over three floors at East Pallant House. The installation had been substantially modified in the mid 90's and again in 2007 and it had been hoped that it would continue until the 2020's However, because of problems with the original design this was unsustainable. Staff surveys had emphasised uncomfortable working conditions on the ground floor, and these reduced the flexibility to manage the space to bring in additional people.

The options, described in the PID, were to do nothing, but this would not address the serious problems; option 1 which would be a cheaper alternative but would deal only with part of the problem and not provide additional flexibility; and the preferred option 2, which would address the limitations of the original design and, in particular, would improve working conditions for staff. This option would cost £186,000, give a design life of 15-20 years, and give an ancillary saving of £5,000 per annum on heating costs.

Mrs Hardwick supported the proposal, commenting that working conditions for the staff on the ground floor were intolerable during a hot summer.

Mr Bacon (Buildings and Facilities Services Manager) explained that the fundamental elements of the preferred option included.

- replacing the two original Air Handling Units (AHUs) located in the lower ground floor plant rooms with a single larger externally located AHU.
- re configuring the distribution of air flow on the ground and first floors.
- replacing the control system.
- replacing the current air conditioning units with modern more efficient units.

The proposal would cater for over 162 staff, and would enable zoning of conditions. The estimated £5,000 saving on fuel costs was conservative and could be twice that.

Mrs Lintill asked about the effects of noise from the AHUs. Mr Bacon explained that these would be outside the building, which was double-glazed. They would be audible but not intrusive. Mr Over added that the small number of staff in the room next to the AHU to be installed on the roof could be re-located if the noise level did prove to be troublesome.

Mrs Keegan asked whether the proposal would assist with energy saving targets. Mr Bacon replied that it would help with the target to reduce total carbon emissions and also help improve the energy efficiency rating of the building.

Mr Barrow asked whether the staff had been consulted. Mr Bacon replied that the proposal was a response to staff concerns, and staff now had the means to work flexibly off-site or elsewhere in the building during installation. The most invasive works would be carried out at weekends.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Project Initiation Document (PID) set out in the Appendix to this report be approved.
- (2) That Option 2 be approved as the preferred option.

#### **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

That £186,300 be released from capital reserves, to fund the upgrade of the heating and ventilation plant including associated costs and fees.

## **45 Safeguarding Policy**

Referring to minute 255 of 4 September 2012, the Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Lintill introduced the report. She explained that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had assessed the Council's Safeguarding Policy in 2013, as a result of which a new combined policy covering children and vulnerable adults had been introduced, relevant to the roles and responsibilities of this Council. The introduction of the Care Act 2014, with obligations for local authorities with effect from April 2015,

and national guidance including “Working Together” had now prompted a review of the existing policy. The principal changes were described in paragraph 5.2 of the report. She asked all members and staff to ensure that they understood their responsibilities.

#### **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

- (1) That the revised Safeguarding Policy be approved.
- (2) That the Head of Community Services be authorised to approve minor amendments to the Policy in line with local working arrangements.

#### **46 Chichester City ... Preparing a Vision for the City**

Referring to minute 701 of 6 January 2015, the Cabinet considered the report and appended Project Initiation Document (PID) circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Keegan introduced the report and PID. The project supported the Corporate Plan key priority to improve and support the local economy, and especially the objectives to promote the City as a vibrant place to do business and to promote Chichester as a visitor and cultural destination.

The project would be carried out in partnership with key stakeholders, both local authorities and the private sector, to obtain information and data in order: to develop a picture of retail needs and correctly balance city centre and out-of-town provision; to take account of the growth in housing in and around the city, including in neighbouring districts; and to identify the risks and challenges from competing centres. She recommended that funding of £50,000 be released (rather than the £43,000 in the report) for the research and consultancy costs, including independent drafting of the initial Vision document, which should become available by the end of March 2016.

Mr Oates (Economic Development Manager) emphasised that this was a partnership project. A number of ideas, projects and schemes already existed. The intention was to pull these together to produce a clear, credible and locally supported articulation of ‘what we want Chichester City to be’. One aim would be to create investment opportunities, jobs (especially higher value ones) and economic growth.

Mr Finch enthusiastically supported the project. Many people and organisations had a vision, but there was a paucity of objective data.

Mrs Hardwick referred to the project to develop a new strategy for the visitor economy approved at the last meeting and asked how consistency between the two projects would be achieved. Mrs Keegan replied that the two projects would be managed by the same officer (Mr Oates) and the City Vision would feed into the tourism project.

The Chairman asked that specific additional outcomes should be added to the list in paragraph 5.1 of the report, namely 'measures to mitigate the impact on the City Centre of the new housing planned in and around the City' and 'well-maintained' to be added to the description of the City in outcome (e). He also emphasised that the Council had already worked with partners to produce visions for Midhurst, Petworth and Selsey and that publicity would be given to reporting that progress.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Project Initiation Document (PID) 'Chichester City ... Preparing a Vision for the City' (Appendix to the report) and the draft Terms of Reference (Appendix 1 to the PID) be approved subject, in paragraph 4.2 of the PID, to the anticipated future outcomes being amended by the addition of the words "well maintained" to outcome 7 and to the addition of another outcome "11. Measures to mitigate the impact on the City Centre of the new housing planned in and around the City", and to minor amendments agreed by the Project Steering Group.
- (2) That the Senior Responsible Officer be authorised to seek and agree partnership contributions towards the cost of the project.
- (3) That funding of up to £50,000 less any partnership contributions secured be released from Council reserves to cover the project delivery costs,

47 **Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan**

(Mr Finch withdrew to the public seating area)

The Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report. She reminded the Cabinet that neighbourhood plans were statutory documents that formed part of the Development Plan. They enabled parish councils to influence the development of their localities. The Examiner of the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan had concluded that, subject to a number of modifications, the Plan met the requirements of the basic conditions. These modifications, and the justification for them, had been agreed by the Southbourne Parish Council and were set out in the Decision Statement in the appendix.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Decision Statement as set out in the Appendix be published.
- (2) That the Examiner's recommendation that, subject to modifications as set out in the decision statement, the Neighbourhood Plan proceed to referendum be approved.

(Mr Finch returned to the Cabinet table)



48 **Land at Church Road, Portfield, Chichester**

Referring to minute 6 of 2 June 2015, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes, except for exempt appendix).

Mrs Keegan introduced the report and reminded the Cabinet of their previous discussions, including the selection of a preferred bidder, a minimum price and a minimum of 40% affordable housing. The Cabinet had also decided to delegate powers to officers, following consultation with herself, to conclude a sale to another bidder, in the event that the sale to the preferred bidder did not proceed. However, this latter decision had been called in for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which had recommended that the Cabinet re-consider it. The recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were appended to the report.

The preferred bidder's offer had turned out to be too good to be true. In negotiations, the bidder had changed its position on paying for the roundabout, had changed its housing association partner and its business model and had substantially revised its bid. Officers had sought revised offers from the other bidders. The report now recommended the freehold disposal of the land and the selection of Bidder B in Appendix 2 as the preferred bidder.

Mrs Keegan also pointed out that the offer would optimise both the provision of affordable housing on the site and a capital receipt to the Council. It would be open to the Council to use some of these receipts to fund the provision of affordable housing elsewhere.

Officers confirmed that Bidder B appeared committed to the purchase and had allowed for all costs in their offer; the bid appeared straightforward, except that the bidder needed to obtain planning permission.

The Chairman reminded the Cabinet that it had always intended to obtain a higher than minimum proportion of affordable housing on this site, and the proposed minimum of 40% was 10% above the Local Plan requirement. The Council was concerned about the availability of affordable housing in the district. He suggested that the Council could have a role in using its capital to provide loans to community land trusts to purchase land, and initial discussions were taking place with the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), South Downs National Park Authority and a housing association about a partnership scheme for rural affordable housing. He proposed a further recommendation ((5) below) to facilitate this.

Mrs Grange (Housing Delivery Manager) explained that registered providers found it difficult to develop small rural schemes, unless there was a cross-subsidy from market housing, which was not always desirable. She was, therefore, exploring how the Council could encourage community land trusts, through the use of capital receipts and new homes bonus. She had visited one project elsewhere and was due to visit others to see what could be learned about them.

Mrs Taylor welcomed support for community land trusts as an example of the use of capital receipts for the benefit of communities.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) That it be noted that the delegated powers in minute 6(3) of 2 June 2015 have not been exercised and that that decision be accordingly rescinded.
- (2) To proceed with the freehold disposal of the site as recommended in paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5. and that the decision in minute 6(1) of the Cabinet meeting on the 2 June in relation to the selection of a preferred bidder be rescinded.
- (3) To conclude a sale with the party shown "B" in the exempt Appendix 2.
- (4) In the event that the sale does not proceed, that the Head of Commercial Services be authorised, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and the Leader of the Council, to conclude a freehold sale at not less than the figure indicated in the exempt Appendix 2 as the minimum acceptable sale price and an affordable housing level of 40%.
- (5) That, once the sale is completed, the Council consider use of part of the receipt to supplement existing capital funding to further support the Council's affordable housing programme in accordance with the approved Housing and Financial Strategies.

### **49 Scout Premises, Sherborne Road, Chichester**

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes, except for exempt appendix).

Mrs Keegan introduced the report. She explained that the Chichester Scout Group had been in discussions with officers to seek greater security of tenure for their premises in Sherborne Road, which they wished to improve. These had developed into a request to purchase the premises.

The Council would wish to ensure that it obtained the true value of the site, and that it continued to be used for scouting purposes and was not sold on for development. Negotiations to this end had been successful and she was delighted to recommend facilitation of what the scouts wanted which would also result in a community benefit and a capital receipt to the Council.

## **RESOLVED**

That the freehold sale of the site of the Scout premises to the Scout Association be approved on the principal terms set out in paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of this report.

### **50 Disposal of Land for New RNLI Station, Selsey**

Referring to minute 25 of 7 July 2015, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes, except for exempt appendix).

Mrs Keegan introduced the report, reminding the Cabinet of their previous discussion, when they had agreed to dispose of this site to the RNLI for provision of

a new lifeboat station, subject to the RNLI providing public conveniences. The Council's priority was to ensure the RNLI remained in Selsey with the latest technology, but the Council had hoped for synergy with its proposal to close the public conveniences. However, subsequent negotiations had revealed that the RNLI would not be able to provide a facility to the general public to cover the opening hours of the present facilities and were willing only to provide facilities for visitors to the lifeboat station.

Mr Barrow reported that, in the peak month of August 2015, the public conveniences had been used by a daily average of 48 men and 42 women, except during the lifeboat weekend, when over 1,000 had used them. The public conveniences cost £17,800 pa to maintain; assuming that the August average was sustained through the year (which would not be the case as usage would be much lower in the winter), each visit cost 90p. However, the facilities were known to be valued by divers and fishermen. He, therefore, proposed that usage should be monitored for some time after the new lifeboat station opened, and compared with the usage at the East Beach public conveniences, and that the future of the public conveniences and the requirements of the divers and fishermen should then be reviewed.

Mr Carvell explained that, although the closure of these public conveniences had been included in the Council's review of public conveniences as part of the deficit reduction programme, the target savings had already been achieved.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the disposal of the land at Kingsway, Selsey, (shown edged red on Drawing no. 4970) be approved on the terms as set out in the paragraphs 6.1 to 6.3 and the exempt Appendix 2.
- (2) In the event that any detailed terms require further negotiation, that authority is delegated to the Head of Commercial Services to agree the final terms of sale.
- (3) That the use of the existing public conveniences be monitored and a decision on whether to close them or keep them open be made in the light of such monitoring about 12 months after the new lifeboat station is opened to visitors.

#### **51 Coastal Community Team Projects**

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Barrow introduced the report, explaining that it related to both the Environment and Commercial Services portfolios. The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) community teams awards had awarded £10,000 to the Peninsula Coastal Economy Team, affiliated to the Manhood Peninsula Partnership, for two projects: a feasibility study for a Selsey Haven; and a demographic and employment development study for Selsey, East Wittering and Bracklesham. The two projects were estimated to cost £23,000 and the Cabinet was asked to approve the £13,000 balance of the funding. This would count as match funding if the projects developed to a request for EU funding.

Mr Barrow, Mr Oates and Mrs Cunningham described the projects in more detail. The Selsey Haven was an ambitious major project, which would give added protection to the fishing industry and strengthen sea defences. It had long been discussed and was referenced in the Selsey Neighbourhood Plan, and the study aimed to find out whether it was technically feasible and to provide some understanding of costs as a basis for engaging partners and applying for funds from the EU and the Marine Fisheries Agency. The demographic and employment development study would examine the local economy along both sides of the peninsula.

Mr Oates added that an Initial Project Proposal Document (IPPD) would be produced in due course.

**RESOLVED**

That funding of £13,000 be approved from general fund reserves to provide the balance of funding following the £10,000 Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Coastal Community Team award, to enable delivery of the Coastal Community Team projects:

- (a) Selsey Haven Feasibility Study.
- (b) Demographic and Employment Development Study for Selsey and East Wittering & Bracklesham.

**52 Redress Schemes for Lettings Agents and Property Managers**

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report. She welcomed the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013 and the subsidiary Order, which required lettings agents and property managers to belong to a government backed Ombudsman scheme. This would enable all tenants to pursue complaints to an independent Ombudsman. The report recommended that the administration and enforcement of the Order be delegated to the Head of Housing and Environment Services. The Housing Department had already sent a newsletter and checked that all known agents were members of a scheme. Officers would check local newspapers for advertisements by agents who were not previously known.

**RESOLVED**

That the Head of Housing and Environment Services be authorised to exercise the enforcement powers reserved by the Redress Schemes for Lettings Agency Work and Property Management Work (Requirement to Belong to a Scheme etc) (England) Order 2014, and as may be amended.

## **Recording and broadcasting of Committee Meetings**

Referring to minute 748 of 7 April 2015, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Finch introduced the report. He reminded the Cabinet of previous discussions of this topic, including the recommendation by a Task and Finish Group of a one year trial of audio recording of certain committee meetings, and the request by the Cabinet for officers to report on options for both audio recording and web-casting. The options were set out in the report. Although audio recording was simpler and cheaper, it would require a contrived arrangement for speakers to be identified. He felt that web-casting would provide a better service to the public and he supported this option.

Mr Bacon reported that the costs in the report had been based on 100 hours of recording in the trial period. Based on the recording of Council, Cabinet, Planning, Overview and Scrutiny, and Corporate Governance and Audit Committee meetings, 140 hours of recording would be required, which would increase the cost of web-casting to £22,238.

Mr Barrow spoke strongly in support of the web-casting option. He felt that audio recording only would be dull. He stated that it was important that the Council engaged with a younger generation, who would find web-casting preferable, especially if promoted by social media. He drew attention to many other councils that already web-cast their meetings.

Mrs Lintill stated that she had changed her view and supported web-casting, having experienced its use on the Police and Crime Panel.

Mrs Hardwick suggested that the longer term costs and implications needed to be understood. Mr Bacon explained that the equipment would be leased, so that it could keep up with technological change. There would, therefore, be an annual cost for the equipment and for the services of a contractor in producing the webcasts. A discount would be obtained if the Council entered into a longer term contract after the trial period. For a five year lease, estimated costs were £70,000 if paid fully in advance or £80,000 if paid annually in advance. A full evaluation, including costs, would be carried out at the end of the trial.

The Chairman concluded that a majority of the Cabinet clearly favoured the web-casting option, but it would be right to consult the full Council before making a decision.

### **RESOLVED**

That Cabinet expresses a preference for web-casting, but asks the Council which of the options for audio recording or web-casting of key committee meetings should be implemented for a one year pilot, and that Cabinet subsequently considers the matter again after Council has expressed its view.

54 **Appointments to Pallant House Gallery Board of Directors 1 October 2015 - 30 September 2019**

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Lintill introduced the report. She explained that the Pallant House Gallery was a registered charity and company limited by guarantee, which had been set up by the Council in 1984. It operated independently of the Council. Under the Articles of Association, the Council had the right to appoint up to seven directors/trustees. However, since 2004 it had appointed five. The Gallery was conducting a governance review, which recommended a change in the composition of its Board to help it work more effectively. The Gallery had asked the Council to consider reducing the number of directors it appoints in anticipation of the outcome of the review.

The report recommended that, in view of this request, the Cabinet should appoint one Director/Trustee to the Board for a full term, by re-appointing Cllr Ransley, and should also re-appoint Mr James for a short term, pending the outcome of the review which should result in the Gallery finding an alternative means of appointing its Company Secretary. The recommendation also to appoint a deputy was withdrawn. The appointment of Mr Ransley would be on the same basis as previously, recognising that, as a charity trustee, his prime responsibility would be to the interests of the Trust.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) That Councillor Josef Ransley and Mr Trevor James be appointed to the Board of Directors of the Pallant House Gallery with effect from 1 October 2015; the term of office of Councillor Ransley being four years to 30 September 2019 and the term of office of Mr James being until 30 September 2016, pending the outcome of the Gallery's Governance Review.
- (2) That the Gallery be informed that, depending on the outcome of the Governance Review, the Council is likely to agree to its representation on the Board being reduced to one member of the Council.
- (3) That a further report be made to the Cabinet in respect of approval of revised Articles of Association and the outcome of the Gallery's Governance Review.

55 **Review of Members Allowances Scheme**

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Hardwick introduced the report, explaining that the scheme of members' allowances was reviewed in the year after each election. Because of the difficulties of councillors deciding on their own allowances, Government regulations required the Council to take account of advice from an independent remuneration panel. One of the three members of the Council's existing panel had resigned. The timetable to review the scheme in time to be taken into account in the budget for 2016/17

required that the panel should start its work in September, which did not leave enough time to recruit a replacement by advertisement. An approach had been made to an experienced member of Arun District Council's panel, who was willing to serve and could see benefits in sharing experience and ideas across the neighbouring authorities.

In accordance with the Constitution, the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had assented to the Cabinet making the decision to appoint the members of the panel as a matter of urgency, provided that a full report was made to the next meeting of the Council.

**RESOLVED**

That as a matter of urgency, the following persons are appointed to form the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel and Parish Remuneration Panel:

Mr Michael Bevis  
Mr John Pressdee  
Mr John Thompson

**56 Exclusion of the Press and Public**

**RESOLVED**

That the public, including the press, be excluded from the meeting for the following item on the grounds that it is likely that there would be a disclosure to the public of 'exempt information' of the description specified in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 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.

**57 Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan - legal costs in relation to judicial review proceedings**

Referring to minute 759 of 24 April 2015, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda.

Mrs Taylor introduced the report. She reminded the Cabinet that the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan had been made by the Council on 14 July 2015. However, it was the subject of judicial review proceedings lodged in the High Court by Crownhall Estates, and a hearing was set for 18/19 November 2015 at the Royal Courts of Justice. The Cabinet had resolved to defend these proceedings and had authorised expenditure for this, but had asked for a further report detailing likely costs when it was known whether the judicial review would proceed. The report described the available budget, expenditure to date, and estimated further costs.

**RESOLVED**

That further expenditure up to £10,000 funded from reserves be authorised for legal costs in relation to the ongoing judicial review proceedings concerning the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan.

The meeting ended at 11.58 am

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date: