

**MINUTES  
OF A  
MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL  
HELD IN THE ARUN CIVIC CENTRE  
ON 12 JULY 2017 AT 6.00 P.M.**

Present:- Councillors Mrs Pendleton (Chairman), Gammon (Vice-Chairman), Ambler, Mrs Ayres, Ballard, T Bence, Mrs Bence, Bicknell, Blampied, Mrs Bower, R Bower, Brooks, Mrs Brown, L Brown, Buckland, Cates, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Cooper, Mrs Daniells, Dendle, Dillon, Dingemans, Edwards, Elkins, English, Gammon, Mrs Hall, Mrs Harrison-Horn, Haymes, Hitchins, Hughes, D Maconachie, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Mrs Oakley, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Patel, Mrs Porter, Purchase, Mrs Rapnik, Reynolds, Miss Rhodes, Mrs Stainton, Tyler, Dr Walsh, Warren, Wheal, Wells, Wensley and Wotherspoon.

[Note: The following Councillors were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters detailed in the Minutes indicated – Councillors Oliver-Redgate – Minute 72 to 73 [Part]; Councillors Bicknell and Oppler – Minute 72 to Minute 76 [Part] and Councillor Northeast – Minute 78 to Minute 98; and Councillor Mrs Harrison-Horn – Minute 89 [Part] to Minute 09].

72. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Councillors and representatives of the public, press and officers to the Council Meeting.

73. FORMER COUNCILLOR KEN SCUTT

The Chairman announced that it was with great sadness that she had to announce the death of former Councillor Ken Scutt who passed away on 28 June 2017.

The Chairman offered her and the Council's sincere condolences, thoughts and prayers to his family friends and this sad time.

The Council then stood in silence to his memory.

Full Council - 12.07.17

74. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mrs Maconachie and Mrs Neno and all of the Council's Honorary Aldermen, Mrs Goad, MBE, Mrs Morrish, Mrs Olliver, Mrs Stinchcombe and Squires.

75. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Monitoring Officer has advised Members of interim arrangements to follow when making declarations of interest. They have been advised that for the reasons explained below, they should make their declarations on the same basis as the former Code of Conduct using the descriptions of Personal and Prejudicial Interests.

Reasons

- The Council has adopted the Government's example for a new local code of conduct, but new policies and procedures relating to the new local code are yet to be considered and adopted.
- Members have not yet been trained on the provisions on the new local code of conduct.
- The definition of Pecuniary Interests is narrower than the definition of Prejudicial Interests, so by declaring a matter as a Prejudicial Interest, that will cover the requirement to declare a Pecuniary Interest in the same matter.

Where a member declares a "Prejudicial/Pecuniary Interest", this will, in the interests of clarity for the public, be recorded in the minutes as a Prejudicial and Pecuniary Interest.

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

76. QUESTION TIME

- (a) Questions from the public (for a period of up to 15 minutes).

The Chairman invited questions from members of the public who had submitted their questions in advance of the meeting in accordance with the rules of the Council's Constitution. Supplementary questions would only be permitted should time allow once the notified questions had been responded to. Please note that the questions and answers in these Minutes are a summarised version, with the full version to be published on the Council's website within 10 days of the meeting.

(1) The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, was asked a question about the delivery of the Arundel By-Pass and that according to Highways England, work was due to commence in March 2020 with a scheduled completion for 2022. How did the Council plan to capitalise on the Government's proposed £250 million investment in an Arundel Bypass?

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown responded by stating that the Council was working very closely with Arundel Town Council to promote the positive benefits of providing an Arundel By-Pass. Only last week, she and Arun's Chief Executive had met with the Chief Executive of Highways England, alongside a Member of Arundel Town Council and the Leader of West Sussex County Council. However, the proposed consultation document had yet to be published. When it was, the Council would formulate its detailed response.

(2) The Cabinet Member for Residential, Councillor Bence, was asked what action the Council would be taking to protect tenants in Arun owned and leased properties following the Grenfall Tower disaster.

The Cabinet Member for Residential, Councillor Bence, provided a comprehensive response outlining the actions that the Council had taken to date.

(3) The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown was asked a question about the £100 million of recent investments in Bognor Regis and that the Regis Centre site and the Hothampton car park redevelopment would bring a transformational impact for Bognor Regis which would benefit residents, business and visitors. The Bognor Regis Master Options Report on the two sites had been agreed by the Council in March but what progress was being made in bringing forward these proposals and when would further announcements for forthcoming.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, outlined the work that the Council had undertaken since March 2017 to progress these schemes.

(4) The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, was asked a further question regarding regeneration with the questioner stating that there was no regeneration for Littlehampton Town Centre or its seafront. The questioner wanted to be convinced that regeneration would be pushed forward.

Full Council – 12.07.17

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, provided a very detailed response detailing the regeneration achieved for Bognor Regis and Littlehampton. On the question of the regeneration plans for Bognor Regis, the community had been asked what they would like to see and all of this information had been molded into a scheme which had received positive comments and cross-party support back in March 2017. Councillor Mrs Brown reconfirmed the Council's commitment to progressing the various regeneration schemes in place but stated that the public needed to understand that developing and delivering projects took time and the Council did not have the financial or human resources to deliver multiple projects at the same time.

(5) The Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Charles, was asked a question about Tuppens Field in Walberton and why this site was now under threat when the examiner had been clear in his recommendation for it to be included as a Local Green Space (LGS). The questioner stated that she could not understand why the Council had refused his advice – nor could they find an example of a local planning authority overriding an independent examiners report on an LGS in a Neighbourhood Plan – could the Council?

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Charles, reiterated the fact that the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) identified 'potential' development sites within the District. It did not allocate any sites and it did not grant planning permission for any sites. It was merely a list of those sites that might have potential. A planning application for development on the site had recently been submitted and the HELAA as well as the Landscape and Sustainability Appraisal work would be some of the factors in considering the principle of development – there would also be a public consultation.

Councillor Charles emphasised that the Council had communicated its concerns about the quality and validity of the Examiner's report into the Neighbourhood Plan with the Parish Council prior to issuing any decision. The decision notice had been issued after the Council had taken legal advice and it had been made publicly available on the Council's website. At that time, the Neighbourhood Planning Group had two options – to have accepted the Council's decision stated' amended the Plan and gone to a referendum or it could have challenged the decision statement and asked the Secretary of State to intervene. It chose to follow the first option. If the Neighbourhood Plan group were convinced that the Council was wrong in this decision, then the time to challenge it was at the end of last year before their Neighbourhood Plan when to referendum.

(6) The Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Charles, was asked a further and similar question in relation to Tuppens Field, Walberton. This question outlined the reasoning behind why the Walberton Neighbourhood Plan Examiner had recommended the land for designation as a LGS. The questioner then referred to the debate at the meeting of the Overview Select Committee on this item asking why the Council was not listening to the view of the examiner and parishioners that the land should be a LGS.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Charles, responded stating that the District Council had communicated its concerns about the quality and validity of the Examiner's Report into the Neighbourhood Plan with the Parish Council prior to issuing any decision. The decision notice had been issued after the Council had taken legal advice and that decision notice was publicly available on the Council's web site. As with the response provided for the last question, at that time, the Parish Council had two options but it had chosen to follow the first option. Councillor Charles stated that the designation of LGSs was done through Neighbourhood Plans and all LGS designations in the District had been brought forward in this way. They had chosen not to challenge the decision of the Council and therefore did not include any LGS designation at that time. The Overview Select Committee had recommended that any future LGS designation would be brought forward when Walberton reviewed its Neighbourhood plan and the land at Tuppens Field would be considered as a LGS at that time.

(7) The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, was asked if she agreed, in principle, that if any Councillor misrepresented their age to the electorate that they should not be trusted?

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, confirmed that she did not agree with this statement and that all residents voted for someone to be an effective Councillor working on their behalf.

(8) The Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Charles, was asked whether in light of the NHS not taking up the Council's offer of assistance in opening up the Morrison's site for a new Surgery unit for Littlehampton, if the Council could offer assistance to an existing surgery at The Lawns, adjacent to the Zachery Merton Hospital.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Charles, confirmed that the Director of Place had offered to meet Dr Scholosberg to establish if and how the Council might be of assistance in helping to identify a possible solution.

Full Council – 12.07.17

(9) The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, was asked a question about the microphone system in the Council Chamber as it was often difficult for members of the public to hear what Councillors were saying. The Leader of the Council was asked if it would be better if Councillors spoke from a seated position, closer to the microphones, so that the public could hear what they said?

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, explained the benefits of asking Members to stand when speaking.

The Chairman then called Public Question Time to an end.

(b) Questions from Members with prejudicial/pecuniary interest – No questions had been received.

(c) Petitions from the public – the Chairman confirmed that no Petitions had been received.

#### 77. MINUTES

The Minutes from the Annual Council Meeting held on 17 May 2017 were approved by the Council as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the word 'Mrs' being removed from Minute 6 [Election of Vice-Chairman] on page 3 of the minutes.

#### 78. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman outlined that she was delighted to be able to share some good news. Firstly, the Council was celebrating the receipt of an award for Excellence in Planning for the Innovative Delivery of Infrastructure. This had been presented at the Royal Town Planning Institute's Awards for Planning Excellence 2017 for the work that the Council had undertaken with the Environment Agency; LDA Design; and CH2M to rejuvenate the 450 m stretch of promenade at East Bank, Littlehampton.

The official presentation had been held at a recent ceremony in London but as a Council the Chairman stated that she wished to acknowledge this achievement and in doing so she welcomed the Engineering Services Manager [Roger Spencer] and the Principal Landscape Officer [Rachel Alderson] to collect the award.

Secondly, the Chairman announced that the Hotham Park Café in Bognor Regis had been highly commended in the Commercial Category at the Annual Sussex Heritage Awards. This category rewarded only the highest quality conservation; restoration; and good design for newly built projects whilst encouraging the use of traditional crafts or skills. The Chairman congratulated all those involved in this project's success.

Thirdly, the Chairman stated that on behalf of the Council she wished to congratulate Mr Raymond Radmall of Pagham who had been awarded a BEM (Medallist of the Order of the British Empire) for services to the community in Pagham as part of the Queen's Birthday Honours.

Finally, the Chairman alerted Members to the list of engagements and events that had been attended since the Annual Meeting of the Council held on 17 May 2017 – these had been emailed to Councillors recently. A list of her forthcoming fundraising events had also been circulated which she encouraged Members to attend – the first taking place on 19 August 2017.

79. URGENT MATTERS

There were no items for this meeting.

80. STATUTE MATTERS

There were no items for this meeting.

81. MATTERS FROM THE LAST MEETING

There were no matters for this meeting.

82. ANY OTHER MATTERS

There were no matters for this meeting.

83. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 24 MAY 2017

The Chairman, Councillor Bower, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 24 May 2017.

Full Council – 12.07.17

84. OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE – 30 MAY 2017

The Vice-Chairman, Councillor English, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Overview Select Committee held on 30 May 2017 and explained that he would be moving the first set of recommendations at Minute 26 (Walberton Parish Council Petition – Local Green Space, Tupperts Field) as he had chaired the meeting for this item. Councillor English then formally proposed the recommendations which were duly seconded by Councillor Dingemans.

As seconder to the recommendations, Councillor Dingemans spoke thoroughly covering the background to this issue which had commenced back in October 2015. In summary this covered:

- That the Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) had stated that Tupperts Field was not suitable for development
- The Neighbourhood Plan Inspector had stated in his report that Arun had recommended that four sites proposed in the neighbourhood plan for local green space (LGS) did not meet the criteria
- The Independent Examiner had not agreed with this view declaring it should be made a LGS as it had met three tests laid down in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- Walberton Parish Council removed Tupperts Field from its Neighbourhood Plan and had been put under pressure from Arun District Council (ADC) to do so.
- A decision notice had been issued by ADC in September 2016 but in October 2016, new regulations came into force allowing Neighbourhood Plan Groups to ask the Secretary of State to intervene in instances where the recommendations of the examiner were not accepted.
- ADC alerted HELAA to state that the site could be suitable for development in April 2017
- Development company Weights held a public consultation exercise on 8 May 2017 at the Hilton Avisford Park Hotel stating that it had a proposal for 200 houses on the site and that they had been asked to work up a proposal for development by ADC – the Parish Council had not been informed of this.
- It needed to be noted that on 14 January 2016, a radar survey was undertaken by Waters and agreement signed but all before ADC issued the first decision statement in September 2016



In view of these facts, Councillor Dingemans urged Members to support the recommendations as had been amended at the meeting.

The Chairman then invited debate. Councillor Bower, as the Chairman of the Local Plan Sub-Committee, stated that he was not quarrelling over the recommendations as he accepted the discussion that had taken place at the Overview Select Committee and the facts that had been explained in detail by Councillor Dingemans. His difficulty was that the recommendations were planning policy issues and so should be referred to the Local Plan Sub-Committee to assess the implications that might arise. There was another issue that also needed to be raised, this was that in time, Councillor Bower could see that there was possibility that the Council might not be able to deliver the housing numbers allocated to it. With this in mind, it was Councillor Bower's view that Recommendations (1) and (2) were planning policy matters that needed to be dealt with by the Local Plan Sub-Committee so that it could assess the District wide effect of what was being proposed. Councillor Bower stated that he had genuine concern that if the recommendations were adopted, this could potentially open the floodgates for any potential development site in terms of any group who did not wish for housing development to take place there – this had to have an effect in terms of the Council's ability to deliver the numbers that it had to.

Councillor Bower stated that he therefore wished to propose the following amendment. This was that a new Recommendation (3) be included to read "That Recommendations (1) and (2) be referred to the Local Plan Sub-Committee with Recommendation (3) becoming recommendation (4).

Councillor Charles seconded this amendment.

The Group Head of Council Advice and Monitoring Officer provided some advice. For clarification purposes she stated that she understood that what Councillor Bower meant was that Recommendations (1) and (2) stand referred to the Local Plan Sub-Committee for consideration of the District wide implications on planning policy for adopting. Recommendation (3) would then remain unchanged.

Both Councillor Bower, as proposer to the amendment, and Councillor Charles, as seconder, accepted this rewording.

The Chairman then invited debate on the amendment.

There were arguments expressed speaking against this amendment. The point was made that the Council's Constitution for the Local Plan Sub-Committee did not state anything about policy being controlled by that Sub-Committee – this was a matter for Full Council.

Other Councillors speaking against the amendment stated that the Council adopted a fair and open approach when dealing with Petitions. This same approach had been applied to this Petition submitted to the Overview Select Committee where all the evidence had been heard; information presented; and the genuine concern of residents had been listened to. On this basis, Members argued that the Council should endorse the recommendations.

A request was made for the vote on the amendment to be recorded.

Those Councillors voting for the amendment were Councillors Mrs Bence, T Bence, Mrs Bower, R Bower, Mrs Brown, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Cooper, Dillon, Elkins, Mrs Hall, Haymes, Hitchins, Mrs Madeley, Mrs Porter, Mrs Stainton, Wensley and Wotherspoon (19). Those voting against were Councillor Ambler, Mrs Ayres, Ballard, Bicknell, Blampied, L Brown, Buckland, Cates, Dendle, Dingemans, English, Mrs Harrison-Horn, Hughes, Mrs Oakley, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Patel, Purchase, Mrs Rapnik, Reynolds, Miss Rhodes, Dr Walsh, Warren, Wheal, Wells (25). Councillors Brooks, Mrs Daniells, Edwards, Gammon, Maconachie, Mrs Pendleton, Tyler (7) abstained from voting.

The Amendment was therefore declared LOST.

The Chairman then returned to the substantive recommendations and announced that she would be taking the vote on these separately.

The Council

**RESOLVED**

That the Council accepts the principle of the recommendation of the Independent Inspector, Mr Edward Cousins, to designate Tuppens Field, Walberton as a Local Green Space.

As there were no debate on Recommendation (2), the Council

**RESOLVED**

That Tuppens Field, Walberton no longer be considered suitable for development and to be considered for potential as a Local Green Space and when Walberton Neighbourhood's Plan is reviewed.

Councillors then spoke in support of Recommendation (3) and the need for the Council review its Petition Scheme to allow the Petition Organiser to be able to speak and to be questioned when a petition was brought before the Overview Select Committee.

The Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer confirmed that the Constitution Working Party had discussed the Council's intention to undertake this work and had, in reviewing its work programme, concluded that it should adhere to its work programme in place. This being that the Constitution would be tackled in order, starting from the beginning and working through to the end. A review of the Petitions Scheme would be considered at Part 8 – Section 9 – Petitions Scheme. It was pointed out that this would not be undertaken immediately but that the outcome of this work would be reported back to the Overview Select Committee in due course.

The Council, then

**RESOLVED**

That the Council's Petition Scheme be reviewed, in particular the approach to Petitions brought before the Overview Select Committee and the rights of the Petition Organiser to speak and be questioned and that a report be submitted to the Committee in due course.

Councillor Dingemans then alerted Members to the final two recommendations at Minute 30 (Work Programme – 2017/2018) which he duly proposed. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor English.

The Council

**RESOLVED – That**

- (1) The Overview Select Committee's Work Programme for 2017/18 be approved; and
- (2) The Chairman and Vice-Chairman continue to monitor any changes needed to the work programme and report these to the Committee as required.

Councillor Brooks then made a Statement in relation to Minute 28 (Cabinet Member Questions and Updates) regarding the Daisyfield camp site in Littlehampton. The Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Haymes explained that this was a confidential item and so he urged Councillor Brooks to wait for a report that would be submitted to a meeting of Cabinet on 31 July 2017.

85. LITTLEHAMPTON REGENERATION SUB-COMMITTEE – 14 JUNE 2017

The Vice-Chairman, Councillor Dingemans presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee held on 14 June 2017.

Councillor Dingemans alerted Members to a series of recommendations at Minute 4 [Littlehampton Seafront – Public Realm Works] and stated that the Sub-Committee had had a detailed debate on the Littlehampton Seafront design scheme and what the proposed next steps were for this project. In considering the update, consultation responses, and the funding elements, Councillor Dingemans outlined that what the Sub-Committee had been asked to approve were broadly conceptual design principles. They were not being asked to approve conceptual drawings; these had been provided to present an illustration. Councillor Dingemans stated that this was an important fact for Members to be aware of in considering the recommendations and the amendments made by the Sub-Committee.

Councillor Dingemans stated that in looking at the Action Plan that had accompanied the report, the Sub-Committee had encouraged Officers to take the concepts away to look at them in their entirety and so that an order of project prioritisation could be developed. This was because it would be easier to deliver some minor projects recognising that the more major projects should be addressed as one package. The importance of working in partnership with key stakeholders over the use of coaches at Banjo Road were all decisions that still needed to be made and so a further review of parking requirements for coaches and cars had been requested. Councillor Dingemans therefore asked Members to support the recommendations so that key projects could be delivered over the coming years.

Councillor Mrs Ayres then seconded the recommendations.

In discussing the recommendations, these were supported. It was acknowledged that the various projects listed might take several years to be delivered and were just a concept at this stage with the detailed designs coming forward later. A thorough consultation would be undertaken at the appropriate time. The importance of liaising with key stakeholders such as the Windmill and Harbour Park were again confirmed and as they all had different covenants on that site.

The Council then

RESOLVED – That

- (1) the proposed conceptual design principles for Littlehampton seafront (as set out in Appendix 1) are approved but that a further review of parking for coaches, mini buses and cars be undertaken;
- (2) the proposed conceptual design principles are delivered, as phased projects over the longer-term in partnership with Littlehampton Town Council, West Sussex County Council and other key stakeholders subject to the necessary funding becoming available;
- (3) the proposed Action Plan for enhancing Littlehampton seafront and connecting roads from the Town Centre is supported with Actions 2 and 4 being merged;
- (4) authorisation is given to the Director of Place to apply for external funding sources to support any of the seafront project proposals. This includes sponsorship for elements of the scheme to help finance parts of the project;
- (5) the proposed Action Plan for enhancing the Littlehampton seafront be produced to prioritise individual concepts; and
- (6) a progress report be presented to the Sub-Committee annually or at shorter intervals if appropriate.

86. CABINET – 19 JUNE 2017

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Brown, presented the Minutes from the meeting of Cabinet held on 19 June 2017.

Councillor Mrs Brown referred Members to a recommendation at Minute 40 [Tackling Homelessness] and stated that this recommendation addressed proposals to reduce Bed and Breakfast and experiences of homelessness in both Bognor Regis and Littlehampton which were continuing to grow for many reasons. As there continued to be a large demand for temporary accommodation in the District, the Council had solid proposals in place to tackle and reduce this demand. Councillor Mrs Brown then formally proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Bence.

The Council

**RESOLVED**

That a supplementary estimate of up to £1 million be approved (equivalent to a Band D Council Tax of £16.62) for the purchase of a suitable property or properties for use as temporary accommodation, with the purchase delegated to the Cabinet Member for Corporate Support with the Group Head of Corporate Support and Group Head of Residential Services, once they were satisfied that a viable business case had been made.

Councillor Dendle then made a Statement on Minute 33 (Public Question Time) in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.2 and asked a question in relation to the response that had been provided to him in respect of (4) which had been about Officer pay. Councillor Dendle stated that the 1% pay freeze on wages had dragged on for far too long and that this was affecting Officers by injecting a real lack of morale across the Council. Councillor Dendle stated that although he accepted that the Council did negotiate pay nationally with Trade Unions, he could not see why the Council could not go beyond what had been agreed nationally and as a good will gesture by bringing forward the 1% increase that would be awarded in April 2018 to October 2017.

Councillor Dendle then made a Statement on the same minute in relation to the third question that he had asked at Public Question Time. This related to Sundry Debtor Write-Offs. Councillor Dendle stated that the response that had been supplied to him was good in that the Council had outperformed other Councils in terms of the percentage of write-offs which were low. Councillor Dendle stated that the HMRC used the services of professional debt recovery agencies for their work and he believed that there was scope for Arun to do the same. He therefore asked the Cabinet Member for Corporate Support to consider this and put forward ideas and proposals to a suitable Committee of the Council to see if this approach could be used.

Councillor Dendle then made a Statement on the same minute in relation to the second question that he had asked at Public Question Time. This related to Arun's Local Plan and Councillor Dendle's concern that housing numbers within Arun would be forced to increase. He asked whether the Leader of the Council would take responsibility if the Council's annual housing number needed to increase to over 1,200.

87. CONSTITUTION WORKING PARTY – 20 JUNE 2017

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Bower, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Constitution Working Party held on 20 June 2017 and alerted Members to the first of two sets of recommendations at Minute 4 [Proposed Constitutional Amendments – Cabinet Member Responsibilities] which reallocated responsibilities and renamed the Cabinet Member Portfolios to match the new management structure.

Councillor Mrs Bower then duly proposed the recommendations which were then seconded by Councillor Wensley.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) the proposed changes to the Constitution at Part 3 (Responsibility for Functions) as set out in the replacement text at Appendix, be approved; and
- (2) The Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any further consequential changes to the Constitution.

Councillor Mrs Bower then alerted Members to the next recommendation at Minute 5 [Proposed Constitutional Amendments – Updating the Constitution with New Group Head Titles] which she formally proposed. The recommendation was then seconded by Councillor Wensley.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer be authorised to update the Constitution to reflect the new Group Head titles; and make any consequential changes as a result of these or future changes.

Full Council – 12.07.17

88. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 21 JUNE 2017

The Chairman, Councillor Bower, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 21 June 2017.

89. BOGNOR REGIS REGENERATION SUB-COMMITTEE – 26 JUNE 2017

The Chairman, Councillor Hitchins, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Bognor Regis Sub-Committee held on 26 June 2017.

Councillor Wells made a Statement on Minute 5 [Presentation on Progress of Plans for Hotham Park] in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.2 and declared a Personal Interest as he owned a business in the Town]. He stated that in terms of the Minutes that had been produced for this meeting he had been disappointed that a discussion on the proposed removal of the Bognor Regis Bandstand had not been included and he asked the Chairman for an explanation. Councillor Wells then referred to the responses that had been provided to questions asked as part of Public Question Time in relation to regeneration as we was concerned at the tone used and that as it appeared that there was no concern expressed by the Leader of the Council over the fact that some regeneration projects were not moving forward as quickly as hoped. Councillor Wells believed that the regeneration plans for Bognor Regis had been dragging on now for far too long and that there was great uncertainty in the Town over the future of some concessions as leases had been running on a year to year basis affecting the investment of businesses. There had been much talk and planning but on the actual seafront there was a sever lack of delivery. He asked the Leader of the Council to take these comments on board and push forward plans for the Seafront.

Councillor Brooks then made a Statement on the Minutes in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.2 referring to a Consultant's report on Swansea Gardens for one of the previous regeneration schemes. Councillor Brooks also referred to some of the questions that had been asked as part of Public Question Time as this showed the frustration and feeling of the public. Councillor Brooks outlined the value of tourism within the District and his concern that there was just one Tourism Officer in post to manage this and market the entire District. Although he realised that tourism was not a statutory service, it was his view that more support was needed to find ways of supporting this officer so that she could deliver a clearer commitment to tourism in Arun.



The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, responded to the questions asked and statements made. She had no concerns over the speed of regeneration work in Bognor Regis and referred to one of the responses she had provided as part of Public Question Time. This was because this had confirmed that for the Hothampton Linear Park, a report setting out the next steps for development was expected in October 2017. Councillor Mrs Brown reinforced her earlier message which was that big regeneration schemes took time. She stated that she wished to congratulate the Council's Tourism Business Development Officer for her outstanding work.

Councillor Oppler then made a Statement on the Minutes in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.2 in relation to the proposed relocation of the bandstand in Bognor Regis. He was concerned as this had generated a huge amount of concern and upset in the Town. He stated that he would have also liked to have seen some form of formal minute to reflect the discussion had. He referred to past reports that had provided detail over plans to relocate the bandstand to a new and more fitting location in Waterloo Gardens but nothing had progressed.

Councillor Hitchins confirmed that the meeting had not actually discussed the bandstand. An informal discussion on this had taken place before the meeting of the Sub-Committee had commenced and so this was why no minute had been provided. Councillor Hitchins reassured Members that regeneration was moving forward in Bognor Regis and would continue to do so. In relation to the Bognor Regis bandstand, Councillor Oppler was advised to read an article that Councillor Hitchins had written for the magazine Sussex Views – this provided information on the bandstand that Councillor Oppler would find interesting.

90. AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – 29 JUNE 2017

The Chairman, Councillor Chapman, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Audit & Governance Committee held on 29 June 2017.

Councillor Chapman alerted Members to recommendations at Minute 62 (Treasury Management – Annual Report 2016/2017). In formally proposing the recommendations, Councillor Chapman confirmed that he wished to commend the activities of treasury management team who had achieved income at £194k above budget. Councillor Mrs Oakley then seconded the recommendations.

Full Council – 12.07.17

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2016/2017 contained in the report be approved;
- (2) the treasury management report for 2016/2017 be noted;
- (3) the treasury activity during 2016/2017 which has generated interest receipts of £754,340 (1.11%) (Budget £560,000 – 1.10%) be noted.

Councillor Chapman then alerted Members to a recommendation at Minute 64 (Chairman's Annual Report to Full Council – 2016/2017). In proposing this recommendation, Councillor Chapman stated that he would invite the former Chairman of the Committee, Councillor Clayden, to make any comment as the content of the report covered his year as Chairman. Councillor Mrs Oakley then formally proposed the recommendation.

Councillor Clayden in commenting on the report stated that he agreed with its contents and wished to thank the Committee and Officers for their work over 2016/2017.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the Chairman's Annual Report for 2016/2017 be approved.

91. LOCAL PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE – 3 JULY 2017

The Chairman, Councillor Bower, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Local Plan Sub-Committee held on 3 July 2017.

92. STANDARDS COMMITTEE – 5 JULY 2017

The Chairman, Councillor English, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 5 July 2017, which had been circulated at the meeting.

93. ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE WORKING GROUP – 27 JUNE 2017

The Chairman, Councillor Hitchins, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Environment & Leisure Working Group held on 27 June 2017 which had been circulated to the meeting.

94. MATTERS RELATING TO JOINT ARRANGEMENTS

There were no items for this meeting.

95. MOTIONS

There were no Motions to consider.

96. QUESTIONS/STATEMENTS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11.2

Four questions had been received as summarised below:

- (1) From Councillor Buckland to the Leader of the Council – Councillor Mrs Brown Re: Dog Fouling
- (2) From Councillor Oppler to the Cabinet Member for Leisure & Amenities – Councillor Dendle
- (3) From Councillor Oppler to the Cabinet Member for Planning & Infrastructure, Councillor Bower
- (4) From Councillor Oppler to the Cabinet Member for Leisure & Amenities, Councillor Dendle

The full detail of the questions asked and responses received can be found at the back of these Minutes.

97. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

The Council noted the following changes to Committee Memberships as reported by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown. These were that:

- (i) Councillor Mrs Neno was now a Member of the Environment & Leisure Working Group;
- (ii) The Landlords Forum no longer had Member representation; and
- (iii) The Cabinet Member sitting on the Staff Safety Panel be the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Haymes.

*Subject to approval at the next meeting*

78

Full Council – 12.07.17

98. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES

There were no changes in representation to Outside Bodies reported to the meeting.

(The meeting concluded at 8.04 pm)

*Subject to approval at the next meeting*

**COUNCIL MEETING – 12 JULY 2017**

**QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO  
COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11.3**

**Q1: Councillor Buckland to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Charles**

**Q1 As on street car parking is becoming very detrimental to areas with which people live in Arun, will the Cabinet Member reassure me that they will look into the local planning authority's role in assessing planning applications and that there has to be now, and for the future, adequate parking allocations made for all new developments and that all ward councilors; parish and town committees; where relevant, will be consulted prior to the application being determined and if comments are received about parking issues that they will be listened to and acted upon and not ignored?**

**A1** Thank you Councillor Buckland for your question.

Firstly, as you are aware, all Councillors are provided with a weekly list of all planning applications from which you can view the details of any application and comment onto the Officer.

Secondly, all Parishes and Town Councils are sent applications for their areas and are able to consult upon.

Thirdly, for each planning application all details including representations and consultee responses are available to be viewed on the Council web site, for all to see.

Regarding the question of parking standards, your question is timely as only today I met with Councillor Lanzer, the relevant Cabinet Member at West Sussex County Council, to discuss a range of issues including parking standards.

We intend to undertake a number of resident surveys on new developments to establish a number of issues including the level of car ownership.

This information will be used to assist us in the preparation of our own review of residential parking standards. It is quite possible we will see the standards move towards one space per bedroom.

Finally, I must say I am disappointed you believe we ignore comments made. We do not ignore relevant comments from anyone. However, there may often be very good reasons why we cannot accommodate

*Subject to approval at the next meeting*

views expressed, in particular conflict with existing policies and standards adopted by the Council.

As the Cabinet Member of West Sussex County Council pointed out in his correspondence with you – “Arun has, on a number of occasions, refused applications on parking grounds but has lost the argument with the Planning Inspector on appeal. Would I say that comments were ignored – No. What is most important is to be able to say very clearly why a different decision was made.

**Supp**

**Q** I was not making an allegation about being ignored – Members who sit on the Development Control Committees talk about issues to do with planning applications. One main and regular comment made is that there is not enough parking spaces allocated. The general public say the same thing that developments are permitted and then Councillors receive the backlash as a result of these decisions as vehicles do not enough spaces. I would like to bring in a policy that planning has to start listening to comments made on car parking when considering future development – all I am asking is that this plea is not ignored at the early planning stages and that comments are listened to allowing something to be done on this matter.

**Supp**

**A** No further response was provided.

**Q2** **Councillor Oppler to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services, Councillor Wotherspoon**

**Q2** Over the last few years there have been several incursions by travellers onto the London Road Coach Park and car park. Such incursions are serious wherever they occur, however, due to the car park being located next to a school, a public park and a high concentration of residential properties; it has become a very serious issue for the community.

Could the Cabinet Member explain why action has not been taken to create physical barriers to stop the travellers from entering the site, particularly has it become a regular occurrence? Does the Cabinet Member also share my concern and dismay that the recording of these events are incomplete, particularly prior to 2015?

**A2** The London Road Coach and Lorry Park provides for 24 hour parking for these types of vehicles; we receive an income for this parking service. The next nearest Lorry Park is Crossbush near Arundel.

If barriers were put in place then coaches and lorries would be prevented from entering the Coach and Lorry Park. Resources would be required to open and shut the barriers on demand 24/7 which would make this facility unviable.

*Subject to approval at the next meeting*

A record of traveller incursions, which are dealt with in partnership with West Sussex County Council, is maintained.

**Supp**

**Q** I am concerned that there is a disease affecting the Cabinet and that this is their inability to answer questions. The London Road Coach Park is not the only coach park in the country that is under the threat from travellers who wish to enter this site. There is technology available and I would urge the Cabinet Member to investigate what systems are suitable for parks such as London Road. The coach park has a car park adjacent to it which could have barriers fitted with time locks in place. As traveller incursions are becoming a regular occurrence; and as the coach park is next to a school; park; and public area – this brings great distress to the local community. I doubt very much that the Cabinet Member has even spoken with County Officers over the recording of such events. I have checked and records are incomplete. Also prior to 2015, this was not the responsibility of West Sussex County Council and there are no records prior to that date. Why does the Cabinet Member not know this?

**Supp**

**A** I will look into the points that you have made and will get back to you.

**Q3 Councillor Oppler to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown**

**Q3** West Park in Bognor Regis is a great asset for the community; however, the public are deeply angered that the Cafe is not currently open. The park is used extensively by dog walkers and families and a growing number of seasonal events. The Council was fully aware that the previous contract was ending this year, why preparations did not start last year to ensure there was a smooth transfer for this much used facility?

**A3** The café in West Park is a valued asset and was included within the recent procurement for the Council's Greenspace management contract, awarded to ISS. As part of this contract ISS are proposing significant investment in Arun sites across the District starting with the adventure golf course at Hotham Park. Due to the size and nature of these plans it has been necessary for ISS to phase them in order to ensure effective project management and delivery. Property & Estates and Greenspace Managers have met with Directors from ISS and we have impressed upon them the importance of the West Park Café and the Council's clear desire to see this open. I can confirm that ISS are working on their plans for the café at West Park and these are currently under discussion. It is currently the view that this café requires enlarging within the existing building footprint and it is also clear that it requires full refurbishment.

*Subject to approval at the next meeting*

The Council is working closely alongside its partners at ISS in order to establish a temporary café opening as soon as possible at the West Park site. It is the Council's hope that this will be in time for the coming summer holiday season so that customers will see a reliable café service in the park. The plans for the larger refurbishment and café improvement scheme will continue to be worked up so that they can be displayed and communicated to park and café users alike so that all will see and understand the future plans for the café in this great park in Bognor Regis.

**Supp**

**Q** This situation was avoidable and the Council was well aware that this contract was coming to an end in March of this year. There were many problems experienced last year with opening and closing times – Officers were also aware of this. Why did the Council not arrange for temporary provision to bridge the gap? The Council has let down many members of the public and communication to the public prior to Easter was diabolical.

**Supp**

**A** We were aware of the problems with the café and this was why we recently included it as part of the recent contract with ISS. This is an example of another significant investment by the Council. We are looking to build a larger café and in the meantime are trying to get a temporary café open as soon as possible. Hopefully this will be before the main summer season.

**Q4** **Councillor Oppler to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown**

**Q4** In view of these very difficult financial times that we are in and that our staff have only had a 1% pay rise for several years now, would the leader agree with me that Councillors should only be able to claim one special responsibility allowance? I am sure she is aware that this is common practice in many Councils around the country, including West Sussex County Council.

**A4** As Councillor Oppler will know, the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 require Local Authorities to establish and maintain an Independent Panel to review Members' Allowances. The regulations require Local Authorities to have regard to the recommendations of an Independent Panel when paying Allowances.

The current Members' Allowances scheme and the allowances paid have not changed since the last review was agreed by Full Council back in 23 October 2013. One of the recommendations agreed at that time was that the Basic Allowance should continue to be index linked to the annual staff pay settlement, as agreed in the last review in 2009, and this be a subject for further examination in the next review based on a comparison with other Councils. The Basis Allowance paid to



*Subject to approval at the next meeting*

Councillors has therefore only increased in line with the staff 1% pay rise that you have already mentioned.

Staff cost of living pay increases are, and have for some time been, limited to 1%, with the majority of staff being employed on incremental pay-scales. This means that a proportion of them will also receive further annual increases, based on length of service and skills development until they reach the top of their scale. Arun District Council remains committed to the national pay negotiating machinery for Local Government Services staff.

I recommend that your suggestion with Members only being entitled to claim one SRA is put forward to our Independent Remuneration Panel to consider as part of its next review which will commence in early 2018.

**Supp**

**Q** Again, no attempt has been made to actually answer my question. In view of the fact that Chichester and Mid Sussex District Councils and West Sussex County Council have all adopted this policy to allow Councillors to only claim one SRA per Councillor – will the Leader support the call for Arun to have the same policy – Yes or No?

**Supp**

**A** As already stated, I recommend that you make your suggestions known to the Independent Remuneration Panel when it starts its next review in early 2018.