

**MINUTES
OF A
MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
HELD IN THE ARUN CIVIC CENTRE
ON 12 SEPTEMBER 2018 AT 6.00 P.M.**

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

[Note: The following Members were absent from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business: - Councillor Tyler and Mrs Neno – Minute 161 [Part]; Councillor Oppler [Minute 161 [Part]; Councillors Dendle and Mrs Pendleton – Minute 164 [Part] to Minute 168; Councillor Northeast - Minute 165 to Minute 168]; and Councillor Purchase – Minute 166 [Part] to Minute 168].

2

148. WELCOME

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

149. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Ballard, Bicknell, Blampied, Clayden, Mrs Daniells, English, Hughes and Mrs Stainton and from the Council's Honorary Aldermen, Mrs Goad, MBE, Mrs Morrish, Mrs Olliver and Mrs Stinchcombe.

150. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Wells declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 5 [Petition from Bognor Regis Civic Society – Provision of a Permanent Ice Rink] in his position as Chairman of the Bognor Regis Bid and his involvement in the provision of the temporary Ice Rink in Bognor Regis over the Christmas period.

151. QUESTION TIME

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.

The Chairman announced that two questions had been received. The first question, to the Cabinet Member for Residential Services, Councillor Bence, commended the Council's Officers and the Cabinet Member for their work to source housing provision for families in need, however, it stated that in recent weeks there had been examples of the Council using accommodation in some areas of Littlehampton that had not received planning consent to be used as houses in multiple occupation (HMOs). The questioner asked if he could be reassured that the Council was making efforts to regularise the situation?

The Cabinet Member for Residential Services, Councillor Bence, responded stating that in relation to the planning and building control aspects of the question, work was underway to ensure that the correct permissions were in place.

In terms of temporary accommodation, the Council had an inspection programme in place and checks were being undertaken to ensure that accommodation being used was compliant with the relevant regulatory regimes. Councillor Bence explained that this was an on-going programme and given that homelessness in the District was increasing, then so was the use of temporary accommodation and so an Officer had been recruited for the sole purpose of expediting a programme of inspections.

The second question, to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, referred to the temporary Ice Rink at Christmas and its enormous success in regeneration terms. The questioner made reference to the next agenda item [the Ice Rink Petition] and one of the proposed options. He asked if the Leader of the Council had had any input or involvement in the creation or approval of the fourth option and if this had been discussed or agreed at a Conservative Group meeting.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, responded confirming that the actual process of a report coming before Members for a decision was nothing of the hallmarks suggested in the question as Members provided the strategic direction for the Council. Officers then looked into the subject matter and advised Members, usually in the form of a report. Although reports had recommendations, it was always the case that Members decided whether to accept the recommendations, or to amend or reject them.

In terms of her involvement or that of the Conservative Group in writing or influencing the recommendations, Councillor Mrs Brown confirmed the answer as “none”.

The Chairman then invited supplementary questions.

The first questioner thanked the Cabinet Member for Residential Services, Councillor Bence, for his answer and stated that he took it that the Council had been or was using some properties that did not have consent to house people on the register. He further asked if such properties had insurances or was the Council’s insurance invalidated or applicable. He also stated that given recent concerns over certification issues with fire and water safety checks, it was his view that this entire issue should be examined by a Special meeting of the Council’s Overview Select Committee and he specifically asked the Cabinet Member if this issue could be addressed in this way.

The Cabinet Member for Residential Services, Councillor Bence, responded stating that he was not in a position to provide an answer in relation to insurance. He could not comment on this or on any compliance issues but could confirm that there was a strong programme of enforcement with checks in place. He reconfirmed that an Officer had been employed to look at compliance; fire safety and health and safety in general and that although he could not elaborate further, he would be happy for any of the processes to go before the Council’s Scrutiny Committee.

The second questioner then asked a supplementary question and requested if the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown could answer his question. He asked again if the Petition on the Ice Rink had been an item discussed at a recent Conservative Group Meeting and if Members had been influenced in terms of how they would consider the Petition?

Full Council – 12.09.18

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, reconfirmed that she had answered the question clearly. She repeated the fact that Conservative Group had not taken a Group decision on the matter; however, she could not confirm this to be the case in respect of other Political Groups.

[To view the full detail of the questions submitted and the answers provided in writing – please refer to the Council’s Public Question Time page on its web site - <https://www.arun.gov.uk/public-question-time>]

152. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS WITH PREJUDICIAL/PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no Questions from Members with prejudicial/pecuniary interests.

153. PETITIONS

The Chairman confirmed that a petition containing 2,557 signatures had been received from the Bognor Regis Civic Society asking the Council to provide a permanent ice rink for Bognor Regis. This had been presented to the meeting of Full Council held on 2 May 2018.

The Petition had been deferred to this meeting of Full Council, rather than the previous meeting held on 18 July 2018, to enable Officers to compile a report and to inform Members for this debate.

The Chairman invited the Petition Organiser, Mr Coster, on behalf of the Bognor Regis Civic Society, to present the petition.

The Council was reminded that the Petition was asking the Council to:

“In view of the tremendous success of the Christmas temporary Ice Rink, we, the undersigned, petition Arun District Council to incorporate a permanent, quality Ice Rink, possibly multi-use, into the Bognor Regis Regenerations plans currently under consideration”.

Mr Coster outlined that the temporary ice rink had contributed, day and night, to the economy of Bognor Regis providing clear proof that a permanent ice rink would work. He stated that a figure of around 8-10 thousand people had flocked into the Town benefiting local businesses and this was why a figure of 2,479 people had signed in support of the petition.

Mr Coster stated that he had been asked why only 2,479 people had signed the petition and he explained that this was because his Society knew that only 1,500 signatures were needed to trigger a Full Council debate and so the opportunity for people to sign the petition had only run for a period of one month. Mr Coster stated that if this period had been extended more people would have signed resulting in the petition achieving more response than, and in excess of, any consultation ever undertaken by the Council on Bognor Regis Regeneration and so he urged Councillors to please listen to the people of Bognor Regis.

Mr Coster then referred to the size of rink that could be used. To attract activities such as speed-skating and ice hockey, an ice rink did not have to be the size of a stadium; a smaller rink would be relevant. The Council's consultants, Urban Delivery, had only considered a larger sized facility and had failed to consider the key elements that a permanent multi-use complex could bring such as retail; food and drink outlets. All of these facilities had been a success as part of the Christmas rink. Mr Coster then referred to target audiences stating that the real catchment area was a number of well over £1m. What he wanted was to bring something that would put Bognor Regis well and truly onto the map. It was Mr Coster's view that the Council's report lacked detail and that a permanent rink would do so much for the Town, especially if this was multi-use. The ice rink could be used over the Christmas period and then used for other events for the remainder of the year. He referred to a rink in Vancouver; the pictures of this rink were displayed at the meeting. This multi-use rink worked in all weathers and had removable sides with the ability for numerous different events to take place on the same venue. Mr Coster outlined that past consultation results proved that 69% of people were in support of a permanent rink. By providing a multi-use facility events such as festivals; laser quest; and numerous fun events could be put on every month to draw people with money in their pockets into the Town – this was what Mr Coster wanted and so he asked the Council to recognise the proven potential for this and not to decide that any ice rink facility should be located out of Town. He asked Members to consider all options carefully and to not focus on the size of any future facility which was wrong as the successful Christmas rink had measured 531 sq. metres. He therefore urged Councillors to consider options 1 or 3 in the report and to not banish the chance of any future facility by voting for option 4.

The Chairman then invited the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, to respond to the Petition as the appropriate Cabinet Member.

Councillor Mrs Brown stated that it was pleasing to note the positive support that the temporary Ice Rink had received. This had been arranged at very short notice and so she felt that all those involved, particularly the Officers here at the Council, should be congratulated for their efforts.

Given the success of last year's event it was her wish to support a similar event for this year. However, it was important to recognise that this was a commercial venture and so the risks involved would need to rest with the operator. Any event this year would be run on the same basis.

Councillor Mrs Brown explained that the Council had the aspiration to close the esplanade for seasonal events and this could potentially be a location for a temporary Ice Rink in the future. Even the events space in the proposed Linear Park could be a possible venue. Clearly in neither location would you want to make such a facility permanent as it would preclude other uses.

Looking at the provision of a permanent Ice Rink, Councillor Mrs Brown referred Members to the report that had been produced in response to the Petition. This stated that the requested location between larger population centres and adjacent to the sea meant that the necessary catchment area required for large scale leisure uses was compromised. This made it challenging but not impossible to make such uses work financially. That said, if any private operator wished to establish a permanent Ice Rink in Arun, then the Council would constructively work with them to make that happen, especially as regeneration was an Arun wide ambition, not one limited to small discreet sites in the main Towns. This willingness to work with private operators was the essence of Option (4) set out within the report, which Councillor Mrs Brown urged Members to support.

The Chairman then invited debate on the Petition from Members.

Members referred to previous debates that had taken place on the provision of a permanent ice rink which had outlined that despite its benefits, the initial feasibility study provided predicted a net loss of £38k a year and a £6.75 m outlay to build an ice rink within a complex. Although the temporary rink over the Christmas period had been well used, it had to be accepted that ice skating was a winter pastime and that for the remainder of the year, especially when the weather was good, visitors to the Town wanted to take part in other activities. Therefore, some Councillors questioned whether such a facility would be used and as a successful Summer attraction. On this basis, some Councillors spoke in support of Option 4 in the report.

Other Councillors speaking in support of Option 4 stated that although they welcomed any opportunity to welcome visitors to Bognor Regis, the reality and issue to discuss was the size of any permanent ice rink. What was being proposed had no vision. Other rinks located at Gosport; Basingstoke; and Guildford all had professional ice hockey teams that assisted financially in paying for the huge amount of maintenance involved. The overriding concern to some Councillors was the huge financial burden that the Council would need to take on and for a facility that would only be used in certain months of the year. Considering the Country had just experienced its best summer in years, the question was asked as to whether people would go ice skating in an exceptionally hot summer? It was hoped that the right commercial operator could be found who might be interested in looking at prospects on the outskirts of Bognor Regis.

Other Councillors supporting Option 4 congratulated the 2,500 residents who had supported the Petition but then stated that they had been mis-led by the Bognor Regis Civic Society in terms of the wording of 'multi-use' which meant that what was proposed would not provide a permanent ice rink. As there was currently no financial provision for the Council to provide an ice rink, it would continue to work with commercial operators to ensure that a similar seasonal event would be provided for this year's festive period.

Other Councillors then spoke in support of the Petition stating that what had to be considered was the amount of visitors that the Christmas ice rink had brought into Bognor Regis over a relatively short period of time. Reference was made to the regeneration plans that the Council had for the Winter Gardens and that at present, Members had not been provided with any solid detail in terms of size and what would be provided. Councillors were asked to be mindful of this and that they should receive the detail of what might be provided on this site so that the decision could be made in terms of what the site could accommodate attraction wise. It was felt that something positive needed to be given back to Bognor Regis and that a sizeable multi-purpose hall was needed to allow Bognor Regis to move forward with regeneration. On this basis, Councillors were urged to disregard Option 4.

Councillor Dr Walsh in speaking in support of the petition asked if a recorded vote could be taken on any proposal put forward. He then confirmed that he wished to make the following amendment to the options outlined within the Officer report. The detail of the amendment is set out below using **bold** for any additions and ~~strikethrough~~ for any deletions:

1. take the action the petition requests; or
2. not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate;
or
3. commission further investigation into the request; including a **multi-use hall**
4. support the following statement:-

“The Council welcomes the support given to the seasonal temporary Ice Rink and will continue to work positively with commercial operators to the successful delivery of similar events in the future. ~~Regarding a permanent facility the Council will provide non-financial support to any commercial operator who has a sound business case to deliver such a facility on the outskirts of the town.~~”

In formally proposing his amendment, Councillor Dr Walsh stated that this Petition outlined very clearly the views of the people of Bognor Regis. His amendment offered a sensible way to take what people wanted forward as it would allow the Council to commission further investigation into including a multi-hall option which could be used for many other events and activities throughout the whole year; this did not commit to any particular design but the point needed to be made that there was no other multi-use building anywhere in Bognor Regis. Councillor Dr Walsh therefore urged Members to support his amendment and he stated that Councillors should not be ruling anything in or out at this stage. Work needed to be undertaken to look at all of the options possible before a particular outcome could be confirmed.

Councillor Oppler then seconded this amendment.

The Chairman then invited Member debate on the amendment.

Councillors spoke against this amendment stating that it was simply not required as the wording to the statement at the start of Option 4 confirmed that the Council would not include or exclude any proposal put forward by a commercial operator. This was supported by other Councillors confirming that the Council had been open to discussion constantly, what needed to be confirmed was that the Council could not take on the financial burden of providing a permanent ice rink that had the potential of jeopardising the Council's regeneration plans.

Members supporting the amendment outlined that they struggled with the sentiment of the start of the statement for Option 4 which sent out a mixed message. The proposal to delete the final sentence in Option 4 provided fairness to all of the residents who had signed the Petition, it was felt that the Council needed to remain open-minded.

Others speaking in support of the amendment, stated that it was time to conduct further investigation looking into what was being asked for by the people of Bognor Regis. The amendment would allow the Council to look at all options and what could be provided on some of the larger regeneration sites. The suggestion was made that this would be an ideal topic for the Council's Scrutiny Committee and relevant Sub-Committees to look at in further detail.

A recorded vote was then requested on the amendment.

Those voting for it were Councillor Brooks, Buckland, Northeast, Oppler, Purchase, Mrs Rapnik Smith, Stanley, Dr Walsh and Wells, (10). Those voting against it were Councillor Ambler, Mrs Ayres, Mrs Bence, T Bence, Mrs Bower, R Bower. Mrs Brown, L Brown. Gates, Chapman, Charles, Cooper, Dillon, Dingemans, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs Hall, Mrs Harrison-Horn, Haymes, Hitchins, Mrs Madeley, Mrs Neno, Mrs Oakley, Oliver-Redgate, Mrs Porter, Miss Rhodes, Warren, Wheal, Wensley and Wotherspoon (30). Councillors Dendle, Gammon, Patel, Mrs Pendleton, Reynolds and Tyler abstained from voting (6).

The amendment was therefore declared LOST.

The Chairman then returned Members to the four options as set out within the report and invited further debate.

Mixed points of view were expressed for and against the Petition. In support of it, it was pointed out that the public had waited for over ten years for an Ice Rink and for regeneration. The Council needed to act now and look at providing a multi-use complex. It was essential for the Council to provide attractions in the Town Centre and not on its outskirts. The Council's own consultation had shown overwhelming support for an Ice Rink. The provision of a multi-purpose leisure facility would overcome the catchment figures mentioned in the report and would provide the significant proposals highlighted by residents as needed in previous consultation undertaken. This was an opportunity to respond to what the public wanted.

In concluding the debate, a request was made to allow Councillors the opportunity to vote on each of the Options set out within the report separately, with a recorded vote being undertaken for each of the Options.

The voting for Option 1 [to take the action the Petition requested] was:

Those voting for were Councillors Brooks, Buckland, Northeast, Oppler, Purchase, Mrs Rapnik, Smith, Stanley, Dr Walsh and Wells (10). Those voting against were Councillors Mrs Ayres, Mrs Bence, T Bence, Mrs Bower, R Bower, Mrs Brown, L Brown, Cates, Chapman, Charles, Cooper, Dillon, Dingemans, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs Hall, Mrs Harrison-Horn, Haymes, Hitchins, Mrs Madeley, Mrs Neno, Mrs Pendleton, Mrs Porter, Miss Rhodes, Warren, Wheal, Wensley and Wotherspoon (28). Councillors Ambler, Dendle, Gammon, Mrs Oakley, Oliver-Redgate, Patel, Reynolds and Tyler abstained from voting (8).

This confirmed that Option 1 was not supported.

The voting for Option 2 [not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate] was:

Those voting for were Councillors Mrs Bence, T Bence, Mrs Bower, R Bower, Mrs Brown, L Brown, Chapman, Charles, Cooper, Dingemans, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs Hall, Mrs Harrison-Horn, Haymes, Hitchins, Mrs Madeley, Mrs Neno, Mrs Oakley, Mrs Pendleton, Mrs Porter, Miss Rhodes, Tyler, Warren, Wheal, Wensley and Wotherspoon (27). Those voting against were Mrs Ayres, Brooks, Buckland, Dillon, Northeast, Oppler, Purchase, Mrs Rapnik, Smith, Stanley, Dr Walsh and Wells. Councillors Ambler, Cates, Dendle, Gammon, Oliver-Redgate, Patel and Reynolds abstained from voting (7).

This confirmed that Option 2 was supported.

The voting for Option 3 [commission further investigation into the request] was:

Those voting for were Councillors Brooks, Buckland, Northeast, Oppler, Purchase, Mrs Rapnik, Smith, Stanley, Dr Walsh and Wells (10). Those voting against were Councillors Mrs Ayres, Mrs Bence, T Bence, Mrs Bower, R Bower, Mrs Brown, L Brown, Chapman, Charles, Cooper, Dillon, Dingemans, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs Hall, Mrs Harrison-Horn, Haymes, Hitchins, Mrs Madeley, Mrs Neno, Mrs Oakley, Mrs Porter, Miss Rhodes, Warren, Wheal, Wensley and Wotherspoon (27). Councillors Ambler, Cates, Dendle, Gammon, Oliver-Redgate, Patel, Mrs Pendleton, Reynolds and Tyler abstained from voting (9).

This confirmed that Option 3 was not supported.

The voting for Option 4 [support the following statement – The Council welcomes the support given to the seasonal temporary ice rink and will continue to work positively with commercial operators to the successful delivery of similar events in the future. Regarding a permanent facility, the Council will provide non-financial support to any commercial operator who has a sound business case to deliver such a facility on the outskirts of the Town"] was:

Those voting for it were Councillors Ambler, Mrs Ayres, Mrs Bence, T Bence, Mrs Bower, R Bower, Mrs Brown, L Brown, Gates, Chapman, Charles, Cooper, Dendle, Dillon, Dingemans, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs Hall, Mrs Harrison-Horn, Haymes, Hitchins, Mrs Madeley, Mrs Neno, Mrs Oakley, Oliver-Redgate, Patel, Mrs Pendleton, Mrs Porter, Miss Rhodes, Tyler, Warren, Wheal, Wensley and Wotherspoon (34). Those voting against were Councillors Brooks, Buckland, Northeast, Oppler, Purchase, Mrs Rapnik, Smith, Stanley and Dr Walsh (9). Councillors Gammon, Reynolds and Wells abstained from voting (3).

This confirmed that Option 4 was supported.

The Council therefore

RESOLVED – That

- (1) to not take the action requested in the Petition for the reasons put forward in the debate; and
- (2) the following statement be supported:

The Council welcomes the support given to the seasonal temporary ice rink and will continue to work positively with commercial operators to the successful delivery of similar events in the future. Regarding a permanent facility, the Council will provide non-financial support to any commercial operator who has a sound business case to deliver such a facility on the outskirts of the Town.

154. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 18 July 2018 were approved by the Council as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment at:

Minute 51 – Declarations of Interest

That Councillor Smith's Declaration of Personal Interest in Agenda Item 30 [Disposal/Acquisition of Interest in Land at the Regis Centre, Bognor Regis] as a Bognor Regis Town Council had been omitted and needed to be added to the Minutes.

155. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman alerted Members to the list of engagements and events that had been attended since the last Meeting of the Council held on 18 July 2018 – these had been emailed to Councillors recently.

156. URGENT MATTERS

There were no items for this meeting.

157. OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE – 10 JULY 2018

The Chairman, Councillor Dingemans, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Overview Select Committee held on 10 July 2018.

Councillor Dingemans alerted Members to two recommendations at Minute 68 [Overview Select Committee – Review of Scrutiny Procedure Rules] which sought approval to change the Council's Constitution at Section 6 (Scrutiny Procedure Rules), following a review of this Section of the Constitution. Councillor Dingemans formally proposed the recommendations which were then seconded by Councillor Mrs Bence.

The Council

RESOLVED - That

(1) The proposed changes to the Constitution at Part 6 – Procedure Rules, Section 2 (Scrutiny) as set out in the replacement text (as amended) as set out at Appendices A and B be approved and;

(2) The Group Head of Council Advice and Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any further consequential changes to the Constitution.

158. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 11 JULY 2018

The Chairman, Councillor Bower, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 11 July 2018.

159. HOUSING & CUSTOMER SERVICES WORKING GROUP – 19 JULY 2018

The Vice-Chairman, Councillor Mrs Porter, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Housing & Customer Services Working Group held on 19 July 2018.

160. CABINET – 23 JULY 2018

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Brown, presented the Minutes from the Cabinet Meeting held on 23 July 2018.

Councillor Oppler then made a statement on Minute 112 [Proposed Offer to Market for Redevelopment the Car/Lorry Park at London Road, Bognor Regis] in line with Council Procedure Rule 13.1, stating that he could not support the disposal of this land for the purpose of redevelopment for student accommodation. This was because there had been inadequate consultation. Councillor Oppler stated that he could not accept the semi derelict state that the Council had left this site in claiming that it had become a wasted facility. He asked why the Council had taken no firm action to stop the constant use of this land by travellers and why preventative measures had not been actioned. Councillor Oppler outlined that the loss of very well used public conveniences situated next door to a primary school was a poor move by the Council as these toilets had always been extensively used. Users now had a long journey into Hotham Park to use alternative facilities. He urged the Council to reinstate these facilities.

In line with Council Procedure Rule 13.1, Councillor Brooks spoke on the same item and in agreement with the points raised by Councillor Oppler. Although he welcomed the expansion of the University, he expressed concern that rents in the Town would increase as a result of the additional accommodation, affecting families in most need.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, responded stating that the disposal of the land for best consideration would be excellent news for the economy of Bognor Regis. This was a derelict site that would be used to meet the demands of increasing student accommodation. The proposed redevelopment would include not just student accommodation, but a public car park and a retained and enhanced gateway access to Hotham Park. At the moment, soft market testing on the site was being undertaken.

Councillor Dr Walsh then made a Statement in relation to Minute 114 (Activities for Older Adults (Exempt – Paragraph 3 – Information Relating to Internal Business Affairs] confirming that he supported the joint statement that had been issued by neighbouring District and Borough Councils in West Sussex confirming that West Sussex Leaders were fighting to protect frontline services threatened by the budget situation faced by West Sussex County Council. The statement confirmed how the Leaders would work together to try and mitigate the potential impacts of the cuts on vulnerable groups by writing to Central Government.

Councillor Dr Walsh outlined that West Sussex County Council had already saved £145 m but now needed to face a funding gap of £146m over the next four years. His concern was that the likely cuts would hit hard activities for older people and he asked what action was being taken by the Council to continue to provide these services.

(During the course of the discussion on Minute 114 [Activities for Older Adults (Exempt – Paragraph 3 – Information Relating to Internal Business Affairs] Councillor Dr Walsh declared a Personal Interest as a Member of West Sussex County Council).

161. AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – 26 JULY 2018

The Chairman, Councillor Chapman, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Audit & Governance Committee held on 26 July 2018.

Councillor Chapman alerted Members to several recommendations at Minute 127 (Treasury Management Annual Report – 2017/18) which summarised the capital activity of the Council during the year; the impact of this on the Council's underlying indebtedness (the Capital Financing Requirement); provided a report on the required prudential and treasury indicators; a summary of interest rate movements in the year; and details on debt activity and detailed investment activity. Councillor Chapman then formally proposed the recommendations which were seconded by Councillor Mrs Oakley.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2017/18 contained in the report, be approved;
- (2) the treasury management report for 2017/18, be noted;
and
- (3) the treasury activity during 2017/18 which has generated interest receipts of £695,980 (1.05%). (Budget £530,000 – 1.02%), be noted.

Councillor Chapman then drew Members' attention to the final recommendation at Minute 129 (Chairman's Annual Report to Council – 2017/18) which he duly proposed. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Mrs Oakley.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the Chairman's Annual Report for 2017/18 be approved.

162. ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE WORKING GROUP – 31 JULY 2018

The Chairman, Councillor Hitchins, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Environment & Leisure Working Group held on 31 July 2018.

163. ELECTORAL REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE – 1 AUGUST 2018

The Chairman, Councillor Dendle, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Electoral Review Sub-Committee held on 1 August 2018.

In drawing Members' attention to the recommendations at Minute 4 [Community Governance Review – Barnham and Eastergate], Councillor Dendle confirmed that he proposed to make an amendment to Recommendation (1) to change the effective date of the Reorganisation Order from 1 December 2018 to 1 April 2019.

He explained that the date for the Reorganisation Order had been set at 1 December 2018 to tie in with the publication of the new Electoral Register. However, as there would be changes to the Parish Precept for residents of both Parishes when they merged, and as Council Tax bills were sent out once a year, if the effective date for the Order was not 1 April 2019, the Council would have to re-bill the residents covering the four month period between 1 December 2018 and 1 April 2019 which would be confusing for residents and a substantial piece of unnecessary work for the Council.

Councillor Wotherspoon proposed the amendment.

On putting the amendment to the vote it was declared CARRIED.

The Chairman then returned to the substantive recommendation, as amended, and

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) Barnham Parish Council and Eastergate Parish Council merge to become Barnham and Eastergate Parish Council with 13 Parish Councillors, with effect from 1 April 2019.
- (2) the Group Head of Policy be given delegated authority to publish the Reorganisation Order.

164. CONSTITUTION WORKING PARTY – 14 AUGUST 2018

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Bower, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Constitution Working Party held on 14 August 2018.

Councillor Mrs Brown then presented each of the recommendations at Minute 9 [Constitutional Amendments to Part 6, Individual Cabinet Member Decision Notice Procedure Rules]; Minute 10 [Constitutional Amendments to Part 6 – Access to Information Procedure Rules]; and Minute 11 [Constitutional Amendments to Part 6 – Corporate Complaints Procedure Rules] on block and formally proposed all of the recommendations. These recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Wensley.

On the request of the Committee Services Manager, the recommendations were then voted upon separately.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) the proposed changes to the Constitution at Section 1 (Decision Notices) Part 6, Procedure Rules (Other) as set out in the replacement text at Appendix 1 to the report be approved; and

(2) the Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any further consequential changes to the Constitution.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) the proposed changes to the Constitution at Section 4 (Access to Information), Part 6 (Procedure Rules – Other, as set out in the replacement text at Appendix 1 of the report be approved; and

(2) the Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any further consequential changes to the Constitution.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) the proposed changes to the Constitution at Section 8 (Corporate Complaints), Part 6 (Procedure Rules – Other) as set out in the replacement text at Appendix 1 of the report be approved; and

(2) the Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any further consequential changes to the Constitution.

165. MOTIONS

No Motions had been submitted to this meeting.

166. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13

Three questions had been received as set out below:

- (1) from Councillor Stanley to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services, Councillor Wotherspoon, regarding the Hothamton Children's Play Park;
- (2) From Councillor Stanley to the Leader of the Council, regarding the Linear Park consultation; and
- (3) From Councillor Stanley to the Leader of the Council, regarding West Sussex County Council's proposed budget cuts

The full detail of the question asked and the response provided can be found at the back of these Minutes.

167. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

Although no changes to Committee Memberships were reported, Councillor Wells stated, in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, that he could no longer remain as a Member of the Development Control Committee.

Councillor Wells was advised to confirm this with his Group Leader, Councillor Purchase, so that the change in Membership could be confirmed with Committee Services in line with the Council's Constitution.

168. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, proposed a change in representation to the following Outside Body:

The Conservation Advisory Area Committee (CACC) in that the Council's representative be Councillor Mrs Bower and not Councillor R Bower.

Councillor Wensley seconded this change.

Subject to approval at the next meeting

125

Full Council – 12.09.18

The Council

RESOLVED

That Councillor Mrs Bower replaces Councillor R Bower as the Council's representative on the Conservation Advisory Area Committee (CAAC).

(The meeting concluded at 20.07 pm)

COUNCIL MEETING – 12 SEPTEMBER 2018

**QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO
COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13**

Q1: Councillor Stanley to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services, Councillor Wotherspoon

Q1 There has been much discussion at Bognor Regis Town Council regarding the soundness of the fencing that surrounds the Hothamton Children's Play Park.

In light of the recent dog attacks in multiple Bognor Regis Parks I would like to ask the Leader of the Council if she will support us in ensuring a swift replacement of this fencing.

A1 The Council formally inspects all of its play areas weekly and has reviewed the independent risk assessments for this site. There have been no historical or current issues with dogs gaining access or dog fouling in this play area. The level of risk identified for this play area including all play equipment and fencing has been certified by the independent risk assessment as low. This independent risk assessment has been disclosed as part of a previous Freedom of Information request.

The risk assessment makes no reference to 'insufficient' height of fencing/gates. There is also no legal requirement for fencing to be a particular height or design, instead decisions on these matters are made in consideration of identified risks. The fencing and gates as they stand have been of this design since the play area was developed in the late 1980s without incident. Therefore the Council does not believe there is sufficient justification to replace all of the fencing at this time.

The Council will continue to inspect and monitor the play area and will carry out further works as and when required'.

Supp

Q Thank you for the response. Is it possible for you to provide me with a schedule of the weekly risk assessments undertaken for the Hothamton Play Area as I would like to see them?

Supp

A I will be happy to arrange for these to be provided to you.

Q2 **Councillor Stanley to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown**

Q2 In the 2015 Regeneration Consultation it is clearly evident that the area referred to as the Hothamton Car Park did not include the Hothamton Sunken Gardens.

Only during the 2017 Linear Park Consultation were the community made aware that it was the plan of the majority party to remove these gardens and replace it with the Linear Park.

Even at the 2017 Consultation the community was not asked their opinion, you said yourself in May's Full Council meeting "This was not intended to be a choice on the park happening or not – that decision had already been made."

Can we then agree this Council has never consulted the community on their views regarding the loss of the Hothamton Sunken Gardens and their views on its potential replacement, the Linear Park?

A2 Councillor Stanley, thank you for your question.

May I take you back to the 2003 Masterplan for Bognor Regis. The proposals for the Hothamton area included the statement "The new and existing community will have a stronger identity and will benefit from the creation of a new urban park that connects to the seafront." As you will be aware these proposals were subject to public consultation at the time. The Council has subsequently re-endorsed the masterplan concepts with some tweaks.

The current proposals are an extension of that concept.

In the 2015 consultation the public were invited to indicate their support or otherwise for a broad range of uses and activities and the comments received have informed the ideas that have subsequently come forward including the Linear Park.

Subject to approval at the next meeting

This Council has clearly resolved that a planning application should be prepared and submitted for this scheme. Therefore, my challenge to you is to invite you to move on and engage positively with this project as the necessary details for the planning application are developed.

Supp

Q With respect, you have not answered my question. Further to that, in the 2015 neighbourhood plan, the Town Council spent over 3.5 years on this project which was supported by the community. This is a key historic landscaped area valued by the community and so development is not permitted – can you please provide a comment on this for me please?

Supp

A I do feel that I have provided the answer. All of these facts will be taken into consideration when we have received the planning application - comment can be made then.

Q3 **From Councillor Stanley to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown**

Q3 I would like to ask the Leader of the Council what impact she believes West Sussex County Council's decision to cut "Housing Funding Support" will have on the homeless situation in Bognor Regis.

Following this announcement what new plans will Arun District Council introduced to mitigate the impact on some of our communities' most vulnerable people?

A3 All of the Conservative Council Leaders from across West Sussex met earlier this week to discuss the budget situation faced by West Sussex County Council.

The Leaders discussed in detail the twin problems of increasing demand for services, particularly for children and vulnerable adults and reductions in funding from Government.

The County Council has already saved £145m out over the last eight years but it must save a further £146 m over the next four years.

The Leaders discuss how they could work together to try to mitigate the potential impacts of the cuts on vulnerable groups and to ensure that the impact on residents across the County is kept to a minimum.

Subject to approval at the next meeting

However, we also agreed that working together would not be enough. So we will write to Government to collectively request that key services for children and vulnerable adults are properly funded.

The Leaders also expressed regret that Crawley Borough Council would not participate in this joint work for local communities.

However, Councillor Stanley, you have based your question on incorrect information. West Sussex County Council has not made a 'decision' to cut its housing support funding. It is still just a proposal. Following the meeting, officers from across West Sussex will consider the proposal, its impact and whether any alternative approaches to save money could be utilised.

The review will identify all current resources and try to align resources to the recent Homelessness Reduction Act (2017) and the Government's Rough Sleeping Strategy.

The timeline for this review, including consultation with existing WSCC commissioned services is now through to December 2018.

This piece of work will be led by our own Chief Executive, Nigel Lynn.

Supp

Q Do you have any initial thoughts personally on it that you can share with us?

Supp

A There is not much else that I can add at this stage. Only to re-emphasise that the West Sussex Leaders will be working together to mitigate the potential impacts of these proposed cuts.