



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 2 - East Pallant House on Tuesday 12 April 2016 at 9.30 am

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

Members not present: Mr B Finch and Mrs G Keegan

In attendance by invitation:

Officers present all items: Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr P E Over (Executive Director) and Mr P Coleman (Member Services Manager)

180 **Minutes**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the special meeting of the Cabinet held on Thursday, 31 March 2016, be signed as a correct record.

181 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

182 **Declarations of Interests**

No interests were declared at this meeting.

183 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted.

184 **Recycling Action Plan**

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

Mr Barrow introduced the report, reminding the Cabinet of the requirement to achieve a recycling target of 50% by 2020 and to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. Failure to do so could result in fines, although the details of the penalty regime were not yet clear.

This represented a major challenge, as the Council's current recycling rate was around 40%. The Waste and Recycling Panel was now ready to present its initial action plan, although this would grow and develop as time went on.

One opportunity would be to increase the take-up of garden waste collection. Around 20% of residents currently used this service, which contributed about 10% of the Council's recycling. However, one neighbouring council had around 40% of residents using the service. It was, therefore, proposed to make an introductory offer of three months free subscription to residents who signed-up on-line with a direct debit mandate. There was no direct cost to the Council for this.

The key issue in the action plan was public education. Surveys had shown that up to 20% of material in the residual waste bins could have been re-cycled, and around 7% of material in the re-cycling bin should have been residual waste, and contaminated loads could be rejected. There were particular problems in the use of communal bins.

There seemed to be no cheap route to public education. The organisation WRAP (Waste and Recycling Action Programme) estimated that expenditure of £1 per household per year on communications was required to maintain continued engagement with existing services, and £2 per household per year when major new initiatives were being introduced.

The Waste and Recycling Panel had prepared a Communications Strategy (Appendix 2). The first step was a four-page spread in the Council's Initiatives magazine, which had been distributed to the meeting. The strategy included engagement with large businesses, and Tesco had already been very helpful, and he hoped that the Observer series newspapers would help spread the message. The list of communications initiatives would be developed over time.

However, there was a need for increased resources and the report sought approval for the recruitment of two Recycling Project Officers whose duties were set out in paragraph 5.6 of the report, at a cost of about £30,000 each including on-costs. The report also sought funding of £37,000 from reserves for communications initiatives and recycling guidance, including the production of bin stickers.

Mr Riley (Contracts Manager) explained that re-cycling performance was complicated. The Council's performance had remained level for the last few years because, although in 2014/15 more recyclables of higher quality had been collected, there had been an increase in residual waste, and the amount of garden waste collected had declined on the previous year which had been a good growing year.

There was a good participation rate from residents in the district and most recycled well but, of course, could always do better. To date communications had concentrated on recycling but messages also needed to be directed at reducing residual waste.

Cabinet members welcomed the proposals, but pointed to the need for communications such as bin stickers to be simple and to be backed by more detailed communications. They proposed that the requested communications budget should be increased from £37,000 to £50,000.

Mrs Hardwick referred to the need to reduce packaging and suggested that the Council should engage local businesses on this. Mr Riley confirmed that there was a lot of engagement with business on packaging at national level.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Recycling Action Plan (Appendix 1) be endorsed.
- (2) That the introductory offer for new Garden Waste customers, as set out in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.5, be authorised.
- (3) That the appointment of two Recycling Project Officers be approved at an annual cost of £30,000 each to be funded from reserves for 2016/17 and subsequently added to the base budget for the duration of the project to March 2020.
- (4) That one-off funding of £50,000 from reserves be approved for communication initiatives and recycling guidance, including the production of bin stickers for residents, and that the Head of Contract Services be authorised to approve expenditure on communication initiatives.
- (5) That the Communication Strategy (Appendix 2) be approved.

185 District Council Car Parks - Review of Payment Options

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

In the absence of Mrs Keegan, Mr Dignum introduced the report. He explained that the Council owned and managed 29 car parks, with over 90 payment machines and in 2014-15 sold one million car park tickets and around 2,000 season tickets.

The purpose of the proposals in the report were to ensure that:

- The parking payment options offered were what customers wanted;
- These payment options could be offered at reasonable cost to the Council;
- The car parks were customer-friendly and met their needs, for example helping customers find their cars on return;
- The maximum potential of the car parks was attained by increasing the number of spaces available where possible.

It was therefore planned that

- All City car parks would be able to take debit/credit cards, including contactless, by 2018.

- All machines that could take credit and debit cards would also take contactless payments.
- Payment by phone would be offered by the year-end. This would allow people to top up remotely if they stayed longer than they intended. They would be able to receive a text message saying their time was up, to avoid paying the penalty charge.
- The larger car parks would be zoned to help customers find their car on their return.
- Additional spaces would be added in Little London and Northgate Car parks.

Table 1 in Appendix 1 (page 34) set out an assessment of each car park and the payment methods proposed and other improvements planned for each.

The additional pay and display machines which accept credit / debit card payment would yield a saving to the Council by reducing the coin collections required.

19 new machines were being introduced currently and all would accept credit and debit cards. A tender exercise was to be undertaken in the next few months for the purchasing of further pay and display machines. Then further machines could be replaced during this financial year using the capital funding in the Parking Services budget. Sufficient funds would be brought forward from later years to ensure every paying car park in the District had at least one machine able to take credit and debit cards and every machine in the City would have that facility by 2018.

Whilst the Pay on Foot method of parking at the Avenue de Chartres car park had allowed customers more flexibility in terms of when they returned to their vehicle, there had been no net increase in the income received. This experience had suggested that there was unlikely to be a financial payback or return on investment.

He, therefore, recommended that extending the Pay on Foot system should be deferred and recommendation 2.2 amended accordingly.

He and the Cabinet Member had agreed that the priority this year was to widen the range of payment methods and extend the number of machines able to take credit and debit cards. The proposed payment by phone method of parking would assist with providing flexibility to customers without the capital investment needed for pay on exit. The new £1 coin would be introduced in January 2017, and this would impact on the timing of installation of new payment machines.

Mrs Murphy (Parking Services Manager) added that all recommendations were based on customer feedback from a consultation exercise.

Cabinet members welcomed the proposals. In answer to members' questions, Mrs Murphy confirmed that:

- the new payment machines would also accept coins, as well as cards;

- machines in coastal car parks had a seasonal pack to help protect them from salt water damage;
- she was aware of skateboarders using the Avenue de Chartres car park. Such activities were not permitted, and assistance from civil enforcement officers, community wardens or the police was called upon where necessary. However, there had been no reported incidents of damage or injury;
- she understood that if payment by a contactless card was defaulted upon this would result in a loss to the Council, but she would investigate this further and let members know;
- the service had an annual maintenance budget, so that bringing forward funds in the Asset Replacement Programme would not result in funding being unavailable in the event of subsequent failure of payment machines.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the options for Parking Payment as set out in Appendix 1 (Table 1) be approved for implementation, with debit, credit and contactless payment machines for all car parks in the City and at least one machine in each rural car park being available by 2018.
- (2) Having reviewed the Pay on Foot scheme at the Avenue de Chartres car park (Appendix 1, Section 2), that further work on the Pay on Foot system should be deferred.
- (3) That the Head of Commercial Services be authorised to give appropriate notice of any revised changes to parking payment methods pursuant to the Off-street Parking Places (Consolidation) Order 2016 and the Road Traffic Act 1984.
- (4) That up to £100,000 be brought forward from the Asset Replacement Fund to 2016/17 in order to give effect to resolution (1) above.

186 Public Spaces Protection Order Consultation Exercise: Chichester City

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

Mr Barrow introduced the report. He explained that Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPO's) were intended to deal with a particular nuisance or problem in a defined public area that was detrimental to the local community's quality of life. PSPO's were a fairly new tool which had been available to councils since 2014. A PSPO could only be made by councils and only when satisfied (on reasonable grounds) that the activities carried out, or likely to be carried out, in a public space -

- had, or were likely to have, a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality;
- was, or was likely to be, persistent or continuing in nature;
- was, or was likely to be, unreasonable; and
- justified the restrictions imposed.

A number of PSPO's had been introduced around the country and they had had a mixed reaction, in some cases because they tried to cover too many activities.

Two activities in particular were being investigated for potential inclusion in a PSPO for Chichester City Centre. These were anti-social street drinking (based on the existing model of the Council's current Designated Public Place Order associated with consuming alcohol in public) and the on-going issue of illegal street trading.

Officers had conducted an initial scoping exercise to identify whether there was support for a PSPO amongst key partners. The responses to that initial exercise were set out in Appendix C. Responses had been received from a range of partners including the local Police Commander, Town Clerk, fellow Councillors and officers of the Council.

It was now proposed to carry out a six-week public consultation as to the appropriateness of a PSPO for the city centre, what activities should be covered, and what area the PSPO should apply to. Further consideration as to the detail would take place after the consultation period.

If a PSPO was introduced enforcing officers, i.e. police officer, PCSO, council officer or other person designated by the council, could issue a fixed penalty notice. This was easier than the existing Designated Public Place Order which required court action.

With the Chairman's permission, Mrs Apel reported on the activities of City Angels. Whilst they had been active on Friday and Saturday nights in the City:

- Antisocial behaviour had reduced by 58% on a Friday and 39% on a Saturday
- Acts of violence had reduced by 67% on a Friday and 82% on a Saturday.
- Violent acts on a person which leads to injury had reduced by 79% on a Friday and 82% on a Saturday.
- The volunteers had had 130 meaningful conversations resulting from individuals who had been in a fight and thrown out of a pub or lost their friends – these were mostly aged between 21 and 30
- and had:
 - Picked up 583 bottles
 - Served 700 coffees
 - Served 500 teas
 - Served 1200 Hot chocolates
 - Given out 450 waters
 - Given out 73 pairs of flip flops.

Mr Foord (Licensing Manager) stated that City Angels would be consulted about the proposed PSPO. He knew that they made a valuable contribution to the night-time economy, and provided valuable assistance to the police.

Mrs Taylor asked whether licences were issued to buskers and street traders.

Mr Foord replied that no licences were issued by the Council. Buskers should obtain permission from West Sussex County Council, as highway authority, for a pre-planned activity. Street traders should have a pedlar's licence issued by the police force of their place of origin.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Head of Housing and Environment Services be authorised to carry out a consultation exercise relating to the potential behaviours to be included in, and geographical area of, a potential Public Spaces Protection Order.
- (2) That the attached draft Public Spaces Protection Order and map (Appendices A & D) be approved for the purposes of that consultation.

187 Asset Management Plan 2016-2021

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

In the absence of Mr Finch and Mrs Keegan, Mr Over introduced the report. He drew attention to the revised Appendix 1 to the Asset Management Plan circulated to the meeting, and to some minor amendments to Figure 1 (page 68).

He explained that the Council owned property worth £115m, received rental income from it of £2.5m (which excluded operational income such as car parking fees), spent £400,000 a year on maintaining it, and would spend £3m over the next five years on capital works. The Council's property holdings included operational property for delivery of services and non-operational property, which was held for income generation purposes, such income being used to protect service delivery in an environment of reducing government funding.

It had been a compulsory requirement for councils to have an Asset Management Plan (AMP), but this was no longer the case. However, in view of the scale of the Council's property holdings and the growing reliance that the Council placed on the income generated from it, the Cabinet Members and the Commercial Programme Board had agreed that it would be right to replace the Council's previous AMP, which had now expired.

Mr Over drew particular attention to the performance indicators in Appendix 3 and the action plan in Appendix 6.

Mr Barrow pointed out, in relation to paragraph 1.5.1 of the AMP, that the Climate Change Strategy (2008-2013) had been superseded by the Climate Change Action Plan (2016-2020).

Mrs Hardwick asked about the reference to a centrally managed public sector estate in paragraph 1.4.1 on devolution and service sharing.

Mr Over explained that the concept of one public estate was already established in a number of large urban areas, where public authorities had found they could deliver services more efficiently if they combined their estates. Pilot areas for expansion of the programme were being sought. This could become relevant locally as shared services and devolution deals progressed. The Chief Executive added that many aspects of this were being discussed. For example, the Housing and Communities Agency (HCA) already had responsibility for the surplus land holdings of the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Justice. However, it did not depend on devolution for such initiatives to be taken forward. The Grange at Midhurst was a multi-user building, and the Council was about to share space in East Pallant House with other services. The Southern Gateway in Chichester was also an opportunity for public land holdings to be brought together for better use. However, this did not imply nationalisation of public land holdings. The Council would be able to decide whether or not to take part in devolution or shared services deals.

RESOLVED

That the Asset Management Plan 2016-2021 be approved.

188 Budget Carry Forward Requests

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

Mrs Hardwick introduced the report. She reminded the Cabinet that they considered requests to carry forward budgets annually. This year's requests had come earlier than usual in order to help close the accounts earlier. There were three requests for carry forward, which had been considered and recommended for acceptance by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.

RESOLVED

As recommended by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee at its meeting on 22 March 2016, that the requests totalling £88,600 for budgets to be carried forward in 2016-17 be approved in principle, subject to the funds being available and unspent at the year end.

189 Exclusion of the Press and Public

The press and public were not excluded for any part of the meeting.

The meeting ended at 10.44 am

CHAIRMAN

Date: