



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 2 East Pallant House Chichester on Tuesday 7 February 2017 at 09:30

**Members Present**

Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mrs P Hardwick, Mrs G Keegan, Mrs P Plant, Mrs C Purnell and Mrs S Taylor

**Members Absent**

**Officers Present**

Mr M Allgrove (Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr M Catlow (Group Accountant (Technical and Exchequer)), Mr D Cooper (Group Accountant), Cunningham (MPP Project Officer), Mrs J Dodsworth (Head of Business Improvement Services), Mrs L Grange (Housing Delivery Manager), Mr S Hansford (Head of Community Services), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Head of Commercial Services), Mr A Howard, Mr J Kenny (Archaeology Officer), Mr J Mildred (Corporate Policy Advice Manager), Mrs A Miller (Planning Policy Officer), Mrs T Murphy (Parking Services Manager), Mr S Oates (Economic Development Manager), Mrs S Peyman (Sport and Leisure Development Manager), Mr B Riley (Contracts Manager), Mrs L Rudziak (Head of Housing and Environment Services), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mrs A Stevens (Environment Manager), Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer) and Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services)

317 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mr Dignum welcomed the members of the public, the two press representatives and Chichester District Council (CDC) members and officers who were present for this meeting.

Mr Dignum greeted Colin Hicks, Peter Wilding and Will Murphy. Mr C Hicks, who was the chairman elect of Chichester BID, was present for agenda item 14 (Developing a New Strategy for the Visitor Economy); Dr P Wilding was the chairman of Lurgashall Parish Council; Mr W Murphy was a Year 10 work experience student from Bishop Luffa School in Chichester.

There were no late items for consideration under agenda item 17 a) or b).

Save for Mr Over, no apologies for absence had been received. All members of the Cabinet were present.

[**Note** Hereinafter in these minutes CDC denotes Chichester District Council]

### 318 **Approval of Minutes**

The Cabinet received the minutes of its meeting on Tuesday 10 January 2017, which had been circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

There were no proposed changes to the minutes.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on Tuesday 10 January 2017 be signed and dated as a correct record without amendment.

Mr Dignum then duly signed and dated the final (twenty-fourth) page of the official version of the aforesaid minutes as a correct record.

Mr Dignum referred briefly to minute 310 (Approval of Draft Chichester Vision for Consultation) (Vision) and pointed out that, contrary to what had been indicated in the agenda report for that item at the previous meeting, after the end of the consultation period the Vision document would be brought first to the Cabinet and then finally to the Council meeting for consideration and adoption.

### 319 **Declarations of Interests**

The following two declarations of interests were made, insofar as they were relevant, in respect of agenda item 12 (Selsey Haven):

- Mr P R Barrow declared a personal interest as the owner of a small marine business in Selsey albeit it was not one which would benefit from the proposed Selsey Haven.
- Mrs L C Purnell declared a personal interest as the chairman of the Manhood Peninsula Partnership.

### 320 **Public Question Time**

There had been no public questions submitted for this meeting.

[**Note** Minute paras 321 to 336 below summarise the consideration of and conclusion to agenda items 5 to 19 inclusive but for full details (excluding exempt agenda item 19 and the exempt sixth appendix for agenda item 7) please refer to the audio recording facility via this [link](#)]

## 321 **Budget Spending Plans 2017-2018**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report, its three appendices (appendix 1 consisted of appendices 1a to 1d) in the main agenda supplement, and the second agenda supplement (copies attached to the official minutes).

In addition to the public copies of the main and the second agenda supplements, hard copies of appendix 1b (pages 8 to 13) in the main agenda supplement were available to those observing the meeting.

The report was presented by Mrs Hardwick.

Mr Ward and Mr Cooper were available to answer members' questions on points of detail.

Mrs Hardwick explained that this report was a sequel to the approval by the Council in January 2017 of CDC's Financial Strategy and, ahead of setting the budget and council tax in March 2017, it focussed on the budget spending plans of each Cabinet portfolio and how these aggregated and with various funding streams underpinned the balanced budget now before the Cabinet.

She acknowledged at the outset that the budget process involved an impressive co-operation between individual budget managers and CDC's finance team, overseen by the Corporate Management Team, to ensure that service delivery priorities were met within the inevitably tough constraints of limited public sector financial resources.

The report identified CDC's current funding sources and set out the best estimate for funding going forward. The final details would not be received from central government until after 20 February 2017 as part of the local government annual financial settlement. However, given that CDC had accepted the government's offer of a four-year settlement prior to Christmas 2016, no significant change was anticipated in the final settlement.

CDC undertook balancing the revenue budget (an important statutory requirement) in the context of a five-year financial strategy. The key variables and issues that influenced the strategy included income from fees charges and rents and the use of reserves and council tax. As to council tax, it was considered correct to take up central government's offer of allowing, without a referendum, a rise in council tax by £5 (band D equivalent) to offset the continued withdrawal of central government funding. This would generate an extra £260,000 per annum and assist closing the budget deficit which would otherwise emerge in the medium term. That measure was taken alongside the continuing work on the deficit reduction plan with aims to generate further income and savings amounting to £3.9m over the next five years so as to minimise future council tax increases.

The budget process assessed whether and how CDC's actual performance differed from the year's budget. Para 9.1 of the agenda report (as amended by the second agenda supplement) highlighted that overall in 2016-2017 CDC was likely by the year end to underspend the budget by some £400,000. This was due largely to staff

vacancies (£505,000) and additional revenue generated from the Local Authority Property Fund (LAPF) investment (£360,000), which set off against car parks shortfalls (£360,000) and less housing benefit subsidy (£120,000).

Overall the 2017-2018 budget summarised in the income and expenditure statement on page 7 of the main agenda supplement showed a net revenue requirement of £12.363m (or £9.288m excluding the New Homes Bonus). If the final settlement differed from the provisional settlement, any increase or decrease would be dealt with by adjusting the transfer into the Investment Opportunities Reserve.

The budget process generated detailed variances by department and service area, the major ones of which were summarised on pages 8 to 13 of the main agenda supplement. She drew attention also to the budget summaries by portfolio, the capital and projects programme, the asset replacement programmes and the resources statement.

The statement of reserves, which was consistent with the strategy, remained robust and healthy. It highlighted the purpose of specific reserves and the respective authorisations for their use and demonstrated that the capital programme and asset replacement programmes were fully funded. Mr Ward had duly certified, as required by statute, that CDC's financial estimates were sound, the estimates robust and the reserves adequate.

At Mrs Hardwick's invitation Mr Ward commented on his assessment and the budget spending plans more generally. He said that all spending requests contained within other agenda items at this meeting were assumed to have been approved, and therefore were provided for in the draft budget. An increase of £5 in the council tax had been assumed in the financial strategy and the deficit reduction programme reports. A lower or no council tax increase would require an increase to the £3.9m of savings required in the deficit reduction programme. alternative source for funding the £12,363 budget requirement for 2017-2018. It was not known if there would be the latitude to increase council tax without a referendum in future years.

During the discussion members commended how the budget had been prepared and in so doing reflecting CDC principles of maintaining services and making efficiencies.

Mr Dignum highlighted several of the budget variations: (a) increases - tourism support, recycling project officers, Chichester Festival Theatre and Pallant House Gallery; (b) decreases – return on investments; (c) service efficiencies (achieved not by cutting at the frontline but in the most efficient manner eg the Westgate Leisure Centre outsourcing (which would achieve eventually a £1.5m per annum saving)). The element of uncertainty relating to, for example, scope for the current fiscal opportunity to raise modestly council tax in future years and Brexit should not be underestimated.

In concurring other members pointed out the importance of previous decisions to achieve a balanced budget; widening the range of investments defined as acceptable to include for example the LAPF; CDC's budgetary achievements against successive years of government funding cuts; the fact that only one of the

two new posts of recycling project officers was appointed externally with the other post being an internal appointment and so there was scope for further saving here (section 8 on page 10 of the main agenda supplement); the recent allocation to CDC from the government's Community Housing Fund was a government grant which would be held on the balance sheet and matched to expenditure when incurred. It had no impact on the draft revenue budget.

Mrs Hardwick and Mr Ward answered members' questions on points of detail with regard to NNDR appeals provision (para 6.3 of the agenda report) and the contribution to the Investment Opportunities Reserve (net movement) (section 22 on page 8 of the main agenda supplement).

### *Decision*

At the end of the discussion members voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of the budget spending plans as set out below.

Mr Dignum thanked Mr Ward and Mr Cooper for the work they and their colleagues had undertaken to prepare the draft budget.

### **RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL**

- (1) That a net budget requirement of £12,362,700 for 2017-2018 be approved.
- (2) That council tax is increased by £5 from £145.81 to £150.81 for a band D equivalent in 2017-2018.
- (3) That the Investment Opportunities Reserve is increased by £470,600.
- (4) That, should the final settlement differ from the provisional settlement, any increase or decrease be dealt with by adjusting the transfer to the Investment Opportunities Reserve above.

### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the capital programme including the asset renewal programme (appendix 1c and 1d to the agenda report) be noted.
- (2) That the current resources position (appendix 2) be noted.
- (3) That the budget variances included in the Draft Budget Spending Plan as set out in appendix 1b to the agenda report including growth items be noted.

## **322 Draft Treasury Management Strategy for 2017-2018**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its four appendices in the main agenda supplement (copies attached to the official minutes).

In addition to the public copies of the main agenda supplement, hard copies of appendix 1 (pages 49 to 51) in the main agenda supplement were available to those observing the meeting.

The report was presented by Mrs Hardwick.

Mr Catlow was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Hardwick explained that CDC was required to approve a strategy and the relevant prudential indicators included in the report by 31 March 2017. The report had been considered by CDC's Corporate Governance and Audit Committee on 26 January 2017, as a result of which it had been amended to clarify how Community Infrastructure Levy monies were considered as part of treasury management (page 56 of the main agenda supplement) as well as other minor changes. The risk appetite statement (page 53) was unchanged.

The key updates to the strategy (which had been drafted to support the vision outlined to members in the previous month's treasury management session) were outlined in appendix 1 and were to identify (a) core cash requirements and invest those for security and liquidity and (b) long-term surplus funds and invest those for security and return. The core cash required for liquidity purposes was expected to be invested in a mix of local authority and money market funds in accordance with the limits and terms set out in tables 5 (page 59) and 7 (page 63). To facilitate the management of longer term pooled funds, the limit on investments in money market funds had been increased from £15m to £20m (still below the maximum amounts recommended by CDC's treasury management advisor Arlingclose Ltd ie 50% of total investments) and the funds were considered to represent a good balance of security (AAA rated) and liquidity, being available on demand. In consequence the previous target to maintain at least £10m cash available within three months had been removed (para 7.2 in the main agenda supplement), reflecting the improved systems and processes to forecast daily cash needs.

If required, funds could be borrowed for short term operational needs up to the limits in table 3 (page 57). Currently some £15m of funds were invested for periods greater than one year (table 1 on page 54), £10m of which was with the Local Authority Property Fund and earning a consistent return to support revenue balances of around 4.5%. Officers had focused on long-term cash flow forecasting over the last six months and had identified that CDC could invest between £7.5m and £10m in similar long-term pooled funds; this was consistent with the vision to invest surplus funds for security and revenue return. In order to facilitate such investment changes had been made to the Approved Investment Counterparties (table 5 on page 59), the Non-Specified Investment Limits (table 6 on page 62) and the Limits on Investments Periods (table 11 on page 66). A pooled fund selection day had been arranged in London with Arlingclose at which up to four fund managers would be invited to assist in selecting the most appropriate investment fund for CDC's surplus funds.

Mr Catlow commented on the very challenging nature of treasury management and CDC's focus on seeking to diversify in the most prudent way.

Mr Dignum, Mrs Lintill and Mrs Keegan commended the report and the immense value of the treasury management update briefing session for members held the previous month.

### *Decision*

At the end of the discussion members voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the recommendations to the Council meeting as set out below.

### **RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL**

- (1) That the Treasury Management Policy and Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2017-2018 as contained in appendix 2 to the agenda report be approved.
- (2) That the Investment Strategy 2017-2018 as detailed in the Treasury Management Strategy Statement be approved.
- (3) That the Prudential Indicators and Limits for 2017-2018 included in appendices 2 and 4 to the agenda report be approved.
- (4) The Minimum Revenue Provision Statement for 2017-2018 in appendix 4 to the agenda report be approved.

### **323 Initial Project Proposals 2017-2018 and Corporate Plan**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its six appendices in the main agenda supplement, the last of which was a Part II exempt item and which was considered after agenda item 19 (see minute 336 below) (copies of the report and appendices 1 to 5 only attached to the official minutes).

Mr Dignum began by emphasising the initial nature of these project proposals. He pointed out that the cost of each proposal had been included within the budget spending plans (agenda item 5) but that this was subject to the recommendations made by the Cabinet at the end of this item and the decision to be made subsequently by the Council meeting.

Mr Mildred, Mrs Hotchkiss, Mrs Dodsworth, Mrs Rudziak and Mr Kenny were in attendance for the Part I aspects of this item.

The Cabinet considered each of the initial project proposals (IPP) in turn. There was a brief officer summary and members' questions on points of detail were answered by the aforesaid officers.

The main points to arise were as follows:

#### *Priory Park – Phase One Option Appraisal*

There was a clear consensus that Priory Park was a very valuable asset and that the best possible use should be made of it without, however, permitting any fundamental change to its character.

The Cabinet agreed with Mr Dignum's proposal that the following text should be added to this IPP document (pages 81 to 82 of the main agenda supplement): 'The study should not affect the essential character of the park which is largely laid to grass and enclosed with the gates locked after dark (except when, as in the past, there is an approved evening use).'

Mr R E Plowman, the chairman of the Friends of Priory Park (FPP), addressed the Cabinet at the invitation of Mr Dignum. He said that there had been a very useful meeting between the FPP and two CDC officers: Mr A Howard (Green Spaces and Street Scene Manager) and Mr D Hyland (Communities and Partnerships Manager). The FPP were supportive of the need to upgrade Priory Park and the recent/prospective archaeological work. There was concern about the IPP being expressed in very broad terms including timescales and who would be consulted. The FPP were reassured by the clarification provided by the aforesaid extra text as to ensuring that the fundamental character of Priory Park should be preserved. There was a perceived loss of trust in the consultation process. He asked questions about the first and third bullet points in section 4 (page 82): the feasibility of deriving significant income from the wedding venue market and how to measure improved satisfaction from Priory Park users. With reference to section 8 (identify risks) he queried the prudence of spending up to £30,000 on engaging a consultant to undertake an options appraisal/design work.

Mrs Taylor asked about the project's timescale.

Mr Dignum and Mrs Hotchkiss each said that there would be appropriate consultation including with the FPP. As to the level of detail in the IPP, they both emphasised that the IPP was only an initial preliminary document. Mrs Hotchkiss explained the need to investigate carefully via a feasibility study the state of each of the buildings in Priory Park. She said that the first bullet point in section 4 related to all the clubs and activities in Priory Park; it did not have in view solely weddings in the Guildhall (which was used for functions and events other than weddings) but certainly that aspect had been and would be carefully considered. The centenary of Priory Park was in 2018 and CDC would work with the FPP on how to mark that important anniversary. The timescale would be identified in due course. The consultation would be held later in 2017 after initial work in summer 2017.

Mr Barrow said that it was important for the consultant to be given a wide brief and for wider users of Priory Park as well as, of course, the FPP to be consulted.

#### *East Pallant House – Phase One Option Appraisal*

No specific points arose.

#### *Implementing Chichester Vision*

No specific points arose.



### *Freeland Close*

Mr Dignum emphasised the imperative of addressing the homelessness issue and hence this was precisely why a project such as this was important.

### *Investigation of Roman Buildings in Priory Park*

This was a very exciting project in its own right and had the potential to attract many visitors; it was to be commended.

### *Review of the Careline Service 2017-2018*

The IPP document (appendix 6 to the report) was a Part II exempt item and (as stated in minute 335 below) was considered by the Cabinet at the end of agenda item 19 (The Novium Museum Options Appraisal) (see minute 236 below).

### *Decision*

At the end of the discussion members voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the resolutions as set out below with regard to the IPPs in appendices 1 to 5 inclusive and also the recommendation to the Council as set out below.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Initial Projects Proposals for 2017-2018 in appendices 1 to 5 inclusive to the agenda report be approved.
- (2) That £50,000 funding from Council reserves to undertake appraisals/feasibility work as indicated in para 5.2 of the agenda report be approved.

#### **RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL**

That it be agreed that the Corporate Plan which was approved in December 2015 shall remain unchanged for the year 2017-2018.

#### **324 Revised Local Development Scheme 2017-2020**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix in the main agenda supplement (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Taylor.

Mrs Miller and Mr Allgrove were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Taylor summarised with reference to sections 3 and 4 of the report the nature and purpose of the Local Development Scheme (LDS). She gave an overview of the three principal areas where it was proposed to revise the LDS: Chichester Local Plan (CLP) Review (paras 5.2 to 5.6), Southern Gateway Masterplan paras 5.7 to

5.9) and Statement of Community Involvement (para 5.10). She also referred to neighbourhood development plans (para 5.11).

Mrs Miller did not wish to add to Mrs Taylor's presentation.

Mrs Taylor and Mr Allgrove answered a question by Mrs Hardwick about the likely impact of the Housing and Planning Bill, if enacted, on CDC's CLP Review and the LDS timetable. The Neighbourhood Planning Bill was proposing the requirement for a regular review of the Statement of Community Involvement and the current uncertainty about strategic planning arrangements might be clarified by the publication of a housing white paper which was due to be published on the day of this meeting.

### *Decision*

At the end of the discussion members voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the recommendations to the Council meeting as set out below.

### **RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL**

That the revised Local Development Scheme 2017-2020 be approved.

## **325 Community Led Housing Fund**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix and the fourth agenda supplement which reported a revised version of the second recommendation in para 2.2 of the report (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Purnell.

Mrs Rudziak and Mrs Grange were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Purnell summarised the objective of the government's community-led housing development scheme and how CDC, which would be allocated £1,386,067 in two tranches, would be required to use the funds in the prescribed manner. The funds provided by this scheme would enable CDC to implement (as set out in para 3.3 of the report) the key priorities of its own Housing Strategy. The proposals for how the funds could be used were outlined in section 5 of the report.

Mrs Rudziak emphasised the opportunity afforded by the funding allocation to take forward CDC's Housing Strategy. Officers needed to advise the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) as soon as possible of CDC's proposals for utilising the funds to support community groups with housing initiatives.

Mrs Grange commented that despite the fairly slow take-up of interest in Community Land Trusts (CLTs) during 2016, parish councils were beginning to be enamoured with the concept and so the advent of this scheme with its funding was very timely. CDC was in fact making good progress pleasing advances with CLTs compared with many local authorities and this scheme would enable it to augment the very important preparatory work undertaken by housing officers.

Mrs Grange replied to members' questions on points of details as to the period within which the funds had to be spent (it was not believed to be before the end of March 2017 but DCLG's advice was being sought); the need to indicate to DCLG at this stage only ideas rather than preferences as to how the funds might be spent (CDC would, for example, looking at what Cornwall Council (which was experienced in CLTs) was planning to do); para 8.2 of the report stated that the funding initiative was not restricted to areas with the highest second-home ownership and, in fact, currently the parishes expressing an interest in the scheme were not necessarily those with more second homes.

The Cabinet concurred that this was a very exciting grassroots opportunity but it was important to ensure that local communities were given as much assistance as possible to understand and implement the opportunities this scheme presented.

### *Decision*

At the end of the discussion members voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the recommendations (as amended by the fourth agenda supplement) to the Council meeting as set out below.

### **RESOLVED**

That the allocation of funding of £1,386,067 for the 2016-2017 financial year from the government's Community Housing Fund to support community-led housing developments be noted.

### **RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL**

- (1) That the allocation of funding of £1,386,067 for the 2016-2017 financial year from the government's Community Housing Fund to support community-led housing developments be noted.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Head of Housing and Environment Services, following consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Members for Finance and Governance and for Housing and Environment Services, to approve the spend of the funds in para (1) above in line with government guidance issued with the notification of the award (appendix 1 to the agenda report) and Chichester District Council's Housing Strategy.

## **326 Overview and Scrutiny Committee Call-in of Evening Car Parking Charges**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Keegan.

Mr Hansford and Mrs Murphy were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Keegan remarked that any decision to increase car park charges invariably caused controversy. Such a decision was always carefully considered; in this case,

for example, the issue had been discussed by CDC's Chichester District Parking Forum (CDPF), residents and others in a consultation, the Cabinet, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) at a special meeting as a result of the call-in procedure having been invoked with respect to the Cabinet's decision at its previous meeting and now again by the Cabinet at this meeting. The OSC's comments for the Cabinet's consideration were set out in para 2.1 of the report. The Cabinet's discussion and decision at its previous meeting were recorded in minute 311 on pages 16 to 19 of the agenda for this meeting.

In the light of the call-in she had re-examined all aspects of this issue. In the case of the New Park Centre car park (NPC), she considered that the free 20-minute drop off facility, the NPC's own parking spaces and the blue badge parking spaces were sufficient to offset the impact of the introduction of limited evening charges. In view of CDC's very clear decision to freeze car parking charges until 2018, it was not, in her opinion, open to CDC to raise daytime charges in order to avoid evening charges. The continued debate about car parking charges risked creating and perpetuating an unjustified perception that CDC was a high-charging authority in this respect: the reality was that it was one of the lowest charging authorities in the area. Currently it could be difficult to park in the NPC in the evening; the introduction of car parking charges would, it was hoped, ameliorate that by an effective management of the use of spaces. If a decision was now made to change the proposed charges, this would have to be subjected to a further consultation with a consequent delay and an impact on both expected revenue and capacity planning. The introduction of evening charges was consistent with CDC's policy that the user should pay, whereas to expect daytime users of all car parks to subsidise evening users of the NPC and Northgate car parks ran contrary to that important principle.

As to Northgate car park and the Chichester Festival Theatre (CFT), it was to be noted that in the past CFT had supported the principle of car park charges albeit on the basis that it would benefit from the income thereby generated. The CFT had written to CDC since the OSC's recent special meeting expressing two concerns: (a) the potential management problem of late arrivals for performances by patrons arriving by car after 19:00 in order to pay only for the second hour of the two-hour charging period and (b) its front of house staff would have to pay the charges out of their earnings. However, the charges could be avoided by parking in one of the 15 free evening car parks. More or less every theatre in the country charged for car parking and without losing custom, and although the point was noted about staff, any person working in the city was required to pay daytime parking charges in any car park. The proposal would raise revenue, which should be borne in mind in the light of the budget spending plans item discussed earlier in this meeting and CDC's deficit reduction plan. The proposal also had the merit of continuing the daytime tariff structure rather than introducing a new rate for the evenings which could cause confusion. The charges would be for a trial period after which the CDPF and the Cabinet would consider the outcome including consumer experience.

Mrs Murphy pointed out that the evening charges were for a trial period and would be carefully monitored by CDC staff, CCTV and customer feedback; CDC would work closely with the NPC and CFT to ensure adequate, effective publicity to alert and inform patrons and the trial would be reviewed by the CDPF. CDC had commenced on 23 January 2017 a pay-by-phone facility and the take-up rate so far

was much greater than anticipated with over 500 accounts already having been created and a very positive response to this innovation. This should reassure CFT as to its concern about patrons arriving late to beat the first hour of evening charging and there being queues then to pay near to curtain-up time. There were over ten machines in Northgate car park. On 6 March 2017 CDC would be introducing parking machines in Northgate and NPC car parks which would accept card, contactless and coin payments.

Mr Dignum said that Mrs Murphy's comments were very encouraging. He urged car park officers to take initially a lenient approach to users. Mrs Murphy confirmed that there would be sustained communication with the public to ensure that they were properly informed; there would be lots of new signs in place to alert and explain the new evening charges; the NPC and CFT would be encouraged to inform their customers by notices including, for example, printing information on tickets.

Mrs Hardwick alluded to the OSC's comments in para 2.1 of the report, with which she was unable to agree. As to 1), it was incorrect to say that the charges were unfair and targeted to the city – the two car parks were the busiest at that time of day and the evening charges would help to manage demand and uphold the user pays principle. The trial would be reviewed. As to 2), the point made there was in conflict with the user pays principle and the charges being proposed were not large increases and so it could not be said justifiably that the charges were not fair or equitable. In her opinion the Cabinet should adhere to its original decision.

Mrs Purnell mentioned the positive satisfaction levels among members of the public with CDC's car park charges. She had attended the OSC's special meeting and felt that the debate was very finely balanced. The trial should take place and the outcome then reviewed.

Mr Barrow said that due regard should be given to the OSC's comments. It was incorrect for critics of the Cabinet's decision to call it a cynical income-raising exercise and that the electors should be heard. This proposal would generate an income potential; if the decision were to be reversed, service savings would have to be found. The OSC's point in comment 2) could be considered during the review of all parking charges in 2018. He supported the Cabinet's original decision.

Mrs Plant concurred with Mr Barrow. She too had attended the OSC's special meeting. She did not agree that the charges were unfair and targeted at the city. These two car parks had been chosen because they were well-used. She applauded the introduction of new payment by phone technology. She remained of the view that a flat rate £1 charge for the evening was preferable regardless of arrival time but she would not allow that to affect her support for the proposal. There were free car park alternatives within easy reach of the NPC and Northgate car parks. The user should pay principle was very important to uphold. This was a trial and the outcome required careful scrutiny. She no longer had the concerns she had expressed at the Cabinet's previous meeting.

Mrs Keegan emphasised the trial nature of the proposal; how the blanket daytime increases suggested by the OSC would undermine the user pays principle; the use of new or improved technology to assist car park users; and the revenue benefit.

At the close of the debate Mr Dignum referred to the OSC's two comments. As to 1), he pointed out that the NPC and CFT car parks chosen were the two most heavily used in the evenings and so the proposal was neither unfair nor targeted at the city. As to 2), CDC had promised to review daytime charges before 2018. This was only a trial and the outcome would be carefully reviewed. The case for a flat rate evening charge could be considered as part of that overall review. If charges were not to be introduced then savings in other services would need to be identified. CDC had a policy to raise income from a wide-range of sources, which included its car parks. Chichester District car parks had modest charges and it was intended to maintain this distinctive position. He detected from the debate a clear consensus in favour of adhering to the decision reached at the previous meeting.

### *Decision*

At the end of the debate members voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the resolution set out below.

### **RESOLVED**

That having considered the comments made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its special meeting on 24 January 2017, the decision made by the Cabinet at its meeting on 10 January 2017 with respect to Off-Street Parking Charges (as set out in minute 311) be upheld and come into immediate effect.

[**Note** At the end of this item there was a short adjournment between 11:28 and 11:37]

## **327 Historic Environment Strategy and Action Plan**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its two appendices in the main agenda supplement (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Taylor.

Mr Allgrove was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Taylor referred to Chichester District's distinctive history and the quality of life it afforded to residents and visitors alike; the recent announcement of the exciting discovery of Roman remains in Priory Park was only the latest example of this area's rich historic legacy. The Historic Environment Strategy (HES) and Action Plan (AP) sought to manage change actively. Although it would not apply to the South Downs National Park (SDNP), the SDNP Authority would work in partnership with CDC to ensure a consistency of approach where appropriate. The wide-ranging ambit of the HES was set out in para 5.2 of the report. Following the Cabinet's approval on 4 October 2016 of the HES and AP for public consultation, that process took place between 28 October and 9 December 2016. The representations received and officers' responses thereto were set out in appendix 2. Once approved, the HES and AP would achieve the outcomes in section 4 of the report.

Mr Allgrove acknowledged the work on the HES and AP which had been undertaken by Lone Le Vay; Miss Le Vay had very recently retired from CDC. With reference to

section 2 (Completion of the Selsey Conservation Area Appraisal) in the AP summary in appendix 1 (page 164) he advised that it had not been easy to arrange a meeting with Selsey Town Council and so the target date of March 2017 should be amended to read May 2017.

During a brief discussion it was noted that both Mr Barrow and Mrs Keegan had suggested that it would be very helpful if CDC was able to provide general advice to potential purchasers of listed buildings.

### *Decision*

Members voted unanimously on a show of hands to make the resolutions set out below.

### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the principles and approach to achieving protection and conservation of the historic environment within Chichester District as set out in the Historic Strategy and Action Plan in appendix 1 to the agenda report be agreed.
- (2) That the Historic Environment Strategy and Action Plan be approved and endorsed as part of the evidence base for the review of the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029* and be published on Chichester District Council's web-site.
- (3) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Services to enable minor typographical amendments to be made to the Historic Environment Strategy and Action Plan prior to publication.

## **328 Selsey Haven**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its two appendices in the main agenda supplement (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Purnell.

Mrs Cunningham and Mrs Stevens were in attendance for this item.

Mrs Purnell said that this partnership project had as its aim the construction of a small harbour with associated business units near East Beach Selsey so as to provide fisheries protection, economic opportunities, flood protection and a visitor focus on the Manhood Peninsula. An initial feasibility study had been undertaken; its findings were summarised in paras 4.2 and 4.3 of the report. A technical and economic feasibility study was now recommended and the Cabinet was requested to approve release of monies on a match-funding basis with Selsey Town Council and the Selsey Fisherman's Association. She pointed out that in para 9.1.3 of the report the names of two other CDC members had been omitted: Mr J W Elliott and Mr D Wakeham, who represented respectively the Selsey South and Selsey North wards.

Mrs Cunningham and Mrs Stevens did not wish to add to Mrs Purnell's introduction.

Mr Barrow said that this was potentially a very important project for Selsey and its fishery and tourism/leisure industry. The viability of the project, which could not be guaranteed, needed to be examined properly and this required funding for that purpose. He commended the project and supported the recommendations.

Mrs Taylor supported the proposal, recognising the importance of tourism to Selsey. She remained unsure whether a haven would have a long-term viability but this was a question for the further study to address and answer.

Mr Dignum and Mrs Lintill welcomed the match-funding pledged by the project's two partners. They and Mrs Plant acknowledged that this was a huge project but it was right to assess its viability. Mr Dignum highlighted the list of direct and indirect benefits which a haven was likely to bring (pages 208 and 209 of the main appendix bundle).

Mrs Purnell commented that a haven would greatly improve beach safety. Selsey was the biggest conurbation within the District outside Chichester city and needed to be made into a destination. This study would assess the viability of realising that aspiration in this particular way.

With Mr Dignum's permission, Mr J C P Connor, one of the three CDC members for the Selsey North ward, addressed the Cabinet in enthusiastic support of the project *per se* and the recommendations in the report. He also answered a question by Mrs Hardwick about the number of actual working fisherman in Selsey.

### *Decision*

Members voted unanimously on a show of hands to make the resolutions set out below.

### **RESOLVED**

(1) That given that partnership funding is in place the allocation of funding of £25,000 from reserves be approved for use towards:

- a) a technical and financial report that includes possible operational models and a five-year business case;
- b) a wider socio-economic assessment to assess the benefits of a haven to Selsey;
- c) legal advice and other ancillary project costs.

(2) That the Head of Housing and Environment Services be authorised to approve expenditure of the funds in para (1).

## **329 Closed Churchyards and Burial Grounds - Essential Repairs and Maintenance**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix (copies attached to the official minutes).



The report was presented by Mr Barrow.

Mr Howard and Mr Riley were in attendance for this item.

Mr Barrow summarised the report with reference to sections 3, 5 and 7 with regard how CDC could and in nine cases had already become liable to maintain closed churchyards in its area (there was in fact the prospect of its having to assume responsibility for a tenth churchyard); the legal duty of care imposed on it as occupier; and the resource implications which needed to be put in place to maintain churchyards to the required standard.

Mr Howard did not wish to add to Mr Barrow's introduction.

Mr Howard answered members' questions on points of detail. He advised that parish councils were not obliged to hand over churchyards and graveyards in a particular state of repair although CDC encouraged them to endeavour to put them into at least a fair state. His department would work closely with Legal Services when a parish wished to divest itself of responsibility. He indicated the locations in Chichester District of the current nine churchyards for which it had responsibility.

#### *Decision*

At the end of the discussion members voted on a show of hands unanimously in favour of the recommendations in paras 2.1 and 2.2 of the report.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That £65,000 be allocated from reserves to carry out essential repairs to structures in Chichester District's closed churchyards and burial grounds.
- (2) That an annual maintenance budget of £10,000 be allocated to maintain structures to an acceptable standard.

### **330 Developing a New Strategy for the Visitor Economy**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix in the main agenda supplement and the fourth agenda supplement which circulated a written response by Visit Chichester to the proposals the subject of the report (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Keegan.

Mr Oates was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Keegan explained that with so many outstanding tourist attractions in Chichester District there was a recognised need not only to attract more visitors to the area all year round but to identify ways of exploiting the substantial opportunities to encourage them to stay overnight or for short breaks. The report and its appendix summarised the research studies and surveys already undertaken, the anticipated outcomes of the visitor economy project via partnership working and how best to develop CDC's strategic direction for tourism. Central to realising this objective was

to establish a new Destination Management Organisation (DMO), preferably using Visit Chichester but if not the second of the two options set out in para 6.6 of the report. The next stage was to begin discussions on a service level agreement between the existing DMO, Visit Chichester, and CDC and Chichester BID. She drew attention to the fourth agenda supplement which contained Visit Chichester's written response to the proposals.

Mr Oates said that Chichester District had the potential to become one of the leading tourist locations in the UK. The nature of tourism had changed and the research undertaken in the past year (section 4 of the report) revealed *inter alia* that areas in which tourism flourished had very strong DMOs. It was critical for CDC with its partner Chichester BID to work closely with Visit Chichester, the current DMO, to see how it could be reconfigured to meet the challenge to develop Chichester's tourism potential. He alluded to the outcomes in section 5 of the report and how a revitalised visitor economy strategy was central to the growth of Chichester District's economy as a whole.

Having conferred together, Mr Dignum and Mrs Shepherd announced a revised set of recommendations for this item, the text of which appears in the resolutions set out at the end of this minute.

At Mr Dignum's invitation Mr C Hicks addressed the Cabinet in his capacity as the chairman elect of Chichester BID. Mr Hicks confirmed that BID would match the £50,000 pa as proposed to be allocated by CDC for five years.

During the discussion Mrs Purnell said that it was important that the project was a district-wide and not a city-wide one. Mr Dignum assured her that this was the case, as para 5.1 (a), (f) and (h) of the report made clear. Mrs Keegan added that the vast majority of the tourist attractions were spread throughout the Chichester District area.

In reply to Mr Barrow, Mr Oates provided reassurance that a first rate digital platform was essential to the success of tourism marketing.

Mr Dignum concluded the debate by thanking Mr Hicks for his comments and saying that the sum of £50,000 in the resolution (5) below might be only the start of a process in which CDC was looking very much to a collaborative partnership between the public and private sectors.

### *Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of the revised recommendations read out earlier by Mr Dignum and Mrs Shepherd

**[Note** Mrs Lintill was not present for the vote as she had to leave the meeting at 12:23 for the remainder of its duration]

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the fact that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was supportive of the proposal and the recommendations as set out in the agenda report for this meeting be noted.
- (2) That the establishment of a DMO in line with the criteria set out in sections 6.1 and 6.2 of the agenda report be agreed.
- (3) That the opening by Chichester District Council and Chichester BID of negotiations with the board of Visit Chichester with a view to redevelop Visit Chichester to fulfil the functions and structure set out in sections 6.1 and 6.2 of the agenda report be agreed.
- (4) That if the negotiations in (3) above are unsuccessful then a report be brought back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet setting out how the arrangements will work and the timetable for implementation.
- (5) That the £50,000 annual partnership funding from Chichester BID be noted and £50,000 annual partnership funding for five years from April 2017 to assist the development of Chichester District's visitor economy be agreed.
- (6) That the sponsoring of a strategic review as to how Chichester District Council can facilitate or encourage additional overnight accommodation to be developed in Chichester District be agreed.

### **331 Public Spaces Protection Order - Control of Dogs Consultation Exercise**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its three appendices in the main agenda supplement (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Purnell.

Mrs Stevens was in attendance for this item.

Mrs Purnell referred in particular to sections 4, 5 and 6 of the report to explain the timing for the proposal to replace by 30 September 2017 CDC's existing dog control orders (DCOs) with a public spaces protection order (PSPO) subject first to a public consultation. A further report would be presented to the Cabinet after the consultation and prior to the making of the proposed PSPO.

Mrs Stevens explained that the PSPO would contain the same controls as the extant DCOs. The PSPO would require a review once every three years. The terms of the draft PSPO could be revised as a result of the consultation responses received.

Mrs Stevens answered members' question on points of detail with regard to (a) in the case of the city's enclosed public parks, striking the balance between making them accessible to people walking their dogs and protection from public health aspects of dog faeces for families and children picnicking and playing in the city

parks, that there was a lot of available open green space in and around the City for people to take their dogs; (b) the crucial importance of educating dog owners and the general public about the responsible care and control of dogs which was a wider issue than only fouling; (c) the maps appended to the report; (d) the practicalities of enforcement: (i) CDC had only two dog wardens for the whole of Chichester District, hence the importance of public education and the effective use of social media and (ii) managing an area such as the beach area at West Wittering and East Head; and (e) the provision and emptying of red bins.

### *Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of the resolutions set out below.

### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Head of Housing and Environment Services be authorised to carry out a consultation exercise relating to the matters included in the draft Public Spaces Protection Order – Control of Dogs.
- (2) That the draft Public Spaces Protection Order – Control of Dogs and the schedules and maps in appendices 1 to 3 to the agenda report be approved for the purposes of that consultation.

### **332 Chichester Contract Services Efficiency Review**

The Cabinet received and considered the agenda report and its appendix in the main agenda supplement (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mr Barrow.

Mr Riley was in attendance for this item. He was joined by Mr L Attrill, who was one of the authors of the consultant report (pages 279 to 301) produced by WYG UK in Southampton.

Mr Barrow highlighted the very pleasing and positive findings in WYG's assessment of the very high standard of excellence in performance delivery achieved by Chichester Contract Services (CCS), CDC's frontline service for waste and recycling and street cleansing and grounds maintenance.

Mr Attrill explained WYG's methodology and identified the headline results which showed how and why CDC was, in terms of cost effectiveness, among the top five of its clients which delivered an in-house service; CDC's commercial waste collection service was among the one of top authorities outside London. CDC excelled in overall standards of street cleanliness and had the cleanest subway (Oaklands Way) in the country. The challenges of litter clearance of the A27 were fully recognised. Its horticultural services were run to a very good standard. The dry recycle rate improvement was very much against the national trend. The key point to arise from the findings was how CDC could safeguard this highly successful standard for the future. WYG did not recommend that CDC (a) alter the CCS recycling programme, (b) introduce a food waste collection service at this point in

time or (c) reduce the frequency of residual waste collections. It had been an absolute pleasure to undertake this assessment of CCS and so to demonstrate to other councils the way forward in municipal excellence.

Mr Barrow highlighted three of the headline points in para 3.3 of the report, namely the first (recycling), second (dry recycling) and fourth (contamination rates) bullet points. He thanked Mr Attrill, Mr Riley and all the CCS staff, not forgetting the recently retired head of CCS, Rod Darton.

Members commended CCS and its staff for the very high standard of excellence for which it was already renowned and which was incontrovertibly demonstrated by WYG's report.

Mr Dignum stated that two additional recommendations would be put to the Cabinet, one congratulating CCS and the other requesting CDC's Waste and Recycling Panel to consider the findings of the WYG's report (see (1) and (4) respectively below).

#### *Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands to make the resolutions set out below.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That Chichester Contract Services managers and officers be congratulated on the excellent results of the study.
- (2) That the good overall report for Chichester Contract Services be acknowledged and the independent advice that the service should remain in-house be accepted for the foreseeable future.
- (3) That the actions set out in para 5.2 of the agenda report be approved.
- (4) That the Waste and Recycling Panel be asked to consider the findings of the report as part of its ongoing work.

**[Note** At the end of this item Mrs Taylor left the meeting for the rest of its duration]

#### **333 Late Items**

As stated by Mr Dignum in his announcements at the start of this meeting, there were no late items for urgent consideration by the Cabinet.

#### **334 Exclusion of the Press and Public**

#### **RESOLVED**

That the public and press be excluded from the consideration of the sixth appendix (Careline Business Plan) to the report for agenda item 7 (Initial Project Proposals 2017-2018 and Corporate Plan) and the report and its appendices for agenda item

19 (The Novium Museum Options Appraisal) on the grounds that it is likely that there would be in the case of each of those items 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 that information.

### 335 **The Novium Museum Options Appraisal**

The Cabinet received and considered the confidential report and its two appendices circulated with the agenda to CDC members and relevant officers only.

The report was introduced by Mrs Keegan.

Mrs Peyman was in attendance.

Mrs Peyman and Mr Ward responded to members' questions on points of detail.

Mr Dignum advised with the Cabinet's concurrence that there should be added to the first recommendation in the agenda report (para 2.1) the words 'save for the filling-in of the Roman remains'.

#### *Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the following resolutions.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted and that at this stage none of the options identified in section 5 of the agenda report be discounted save for the filling-in of the Roman remains.
- (2) That the recommendation in para 2.2 of the agenda report be approved.
- (3) That the recommendation in para 2.3 of the agenda report be approved.
- (4) That the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services establish a member task and finish group with representation from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the reasons stated in para 2.4 of the agenda report and to report back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet.

**[Note** At the end of this item Mrs Keegan left the meeting for the rest of its duration]

### 336 **Initial Project Proposals 2017-2018 and Corporate Plan**

The Cabinet received and considered the confidential Part II appendix 6 in the main agenda supplement to the report for agenda item 7 which was circulated to CDC members and relevant officers only.

Mr Hansford was in attendance and he explained the appendix.

Mr Hansford and Mrs Shepherd responded to members' questions on points of detail.

*Decision*

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the resolutions in respect of agenda item 7 (minute 323 above) in respect of the confidential appendix 6.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Initial Projects Proposal for 2017-2018 in the confidential appendix 6 to the agenda report be approved.
- (2) That £50,000 funding from Council reserves to undertake appraisals/ feasibility work as indicated in para 5.2 of the agenda report be approved.

**[Note** The meeting ended at 13:35]

---

CHAIRMAN

---

DATE