



# Public Document Pack

Arun District Council  
Civic Centre  
Maltravers Road  
Littlehampton  
West Sussex  
BN17 5LF

Tel: (01903 737500)  
Fax: (01903) 730442  
DX: 57406 Littlehampton  
Minicom: 01903 732765

e-mail: [committees@arun.gov.uk](mailto:committees@arun.gov.uk)

17 March 2021

## **COUNCIL MEETING**

To all Members of the Council

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL to be held on **Wednesday 17 March 2021** at **6.00 pm** virtually via zoom to transact the business set out below:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. V. Lynn", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nigel Lynn  
Chief Executive

## **AGENDA**

3. **Public Question Time** (Pages 1 - 10)  
To receive questions from the public (for a period of up to 15 minutes)
  
8. **Urgent Matters** (Pages 11 - 14)  
To deal with business not otherwise specified in the Council summons which, in the opinion of the Chairman of the Council (in consultation with the Chief Executive), is business of such urgency as to require immediate attention by the Council.
  
10. **Questions from Members** (Pages 15 - 18)  
To consider general questions from Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.3.

30. **Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee - 4 March 2021** (Pages 19 - 22)

The Chairman, Councillor Stanley, will present the Minutes from the Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee held on 4 March 2021. There is a recommendation at:

- Minute 18 [Bognor Regis Place Branding] – to view the report and Appendix, please click on this link – [Report](#) and [Appendix 1](#) and [Appendix 2](#)

- Members are reminded that if they have detailed questions, would they please inform the relevant Cabinet Member/Chairman and/or Director in advance of the meeting in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules
- Copies of the reports on the recommendations from the Cabinet Meetings have been previously circulated to Members and Members are asked to bring their copies with them to the meeting. Further copies are available from the Committee Manager.
- Copies of the reports on the recommendations from the other Committees are provided via an e-link, where appropriate

Filming, Photography and Recording at Council Meetings - The District Council supports the principles of openness and transparency in its decision making and permits filming, recording and the taking of photographs at its meetings that are open to the public. This meeting may therefore be recorded, filmed or broadcast by video or audio, by third parties. Arrangements for these activities should operate in accordance with guidelines agreed by the Council and as available via the following link – [Filming Policy](#)

## FULL COUNCIL MEETING – 17 MARCH 2021

### AGENDA ITEM 3 – PUBLIC QUESTION TIME – ORDER IN WHICH THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL WILL INVITE QUESTIONS BELOW RECEIVED IN WRITING IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING

1. From Mr Collins to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh and/or the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury
2. From Mr Cosgrove to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh
3. From Mrs Lownsbrough to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh
4. From Mrs Collins to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh and/or the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury
5. From Mr Meadmore to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh
6. From Ms Jarvis to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury
7. From Mr Collins to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh and/or the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury
8. From Mr Cosgrove to the Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development, Councillor Coster
9. From Mrs Collins to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh and/or the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury
10. From Mr Meadmore to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh
11. From Mr Collins to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury
12. From Mr Cosgrove to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh
13. From Mrs Collins to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh and/or the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury
14. From Mr Meadmore to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh
15. From Mr Collins to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh and/or the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury

### THE FULL DETAIL OF THE QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED IS DETAILED BELOW

**NOTE:** The Chairman will:

- invite questions from members of the public who have submitted in writing their questions in line with the Council's Constitution;
- explain that the questions received will be answered by the appropriate Members of the Cabinet or the Chairman of the Overview Select Committee
- confirm that Public Question Time allows Members of the public to ask one question at a time and that a maximum of one minute is allowed for each question.

- state that questions will be invited in the order in which they have been received and that if there is time remaining from the 15 minutes allowed for Public Question Time, questioners will be allowed to ask a supplementary question.

### **QUESTION ONE**

#### **From Mr Collins to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury**

Land North of Summer Lane Pagham

I act for a number of residents who have objected to the manner in which OPP 58/15 OUT is being implemented, the unauthorised development arising on site and the proposals under P/97/20 PL and have also made a corporate complaint in respect of such matters which remains unanswered.

The same residents also had their application under ADC ref: P/1/21 PL refused by the DCC on 3 March 2021 and that application relates in part to the subject land. That decision has been appealed and the application has been resubmitted so that ADC may review their decision and consider whether or not they wish to defend the appeal.

As part of that process it has come to our attention that Arun District Council has a financial interest and a charge relating to the property and land held to which these applications and the appeal relate by virtue of Land Registry Title WSX408542.

Please can the Leader of the Council/Cabinet Member for Planning confirm and provide full details of the financial interest held by Arun District Council and the Charge relating to the property in their favour and the part of the subject site to which these relate and whether or not that interest was or will be fully disclosed to the public when any planning decisions were or will be made in respect of the site.

## **QUESTION TWO**

### **From Mr Cosgrove to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

Can he confirm that C2C in awarding Arun Council £1.2m for Place St Maur improvements stipulated that ADC should contribute 50%-60% match funding, £600-£750,000 and that their grant would be paid in arrears?

Will he also confirm that Arun has made provision for £370,000 supplementary estimate for this purpose? How much of that will pay for consultancy as agreed so far?

Why is the Council seeking to deal with the issue piecemeal when the Place is part of the Regis Centre Regeneration area?

## **QUESTION THREE**

### **From Ms Lownsborough to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Lury as the Cabinet Member for Planning will respond**

Planning approval was granted on appeal to the Sir Richard Hotham Project by the Secretary State on July 5th 2018. Contained within the appeal document are 57 *pre-development conditions* required to be completed before the main development can commence. Many of which would appear to additionally require Local Authority Approval.

- How many of the 57 pre-development conditions have been advised to the Council as completed.
- Whether a schedule of works in relation to the above has ever been submitted to the Council.
- How many of the pre-development conditions requiring Local Authority Approval have been discharged.
- When is the cut-off date for all the pre-development conditions to be met.
- If the pre- development conditions are not discharged by the cut-off date, does that mean that the planning appeal permission expires.
- Have any discussions/agreements taken place between the Council, Whitbreads/Arun Arts, and in respect of leases between 2020 and in 2021 to date.

#### **QUESTION FOUR**

##### **From Mrs Collins to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury**

Can the Leader of the Council or Cabinet Member for planning confirm that ADC has financial interest with regard to the Summer Lane development site P/58/15/OUT and that this was disclosed when any planning decisions were made.

The Summer Lane development continues to cause problems with surface water run off which is impacting on the surrounding ditches alongside the Spinnaker View development and the Mill Farm Estate. ADC Drainage Engineers knew all along this was going to be a problem but chose to proceed and approve the Drainage Strategy conditions and is promising to find a suitable solution in the future (sandbags are not a long term solution). As Drew Smith will not accept conditions that would require work on third party land who will now take responsibility?

Ref. HSP2. I. positively responds to sustainable water management taking particular account of the coastal plain topography which may require strategic surface water solutions.

The Land Drainage Act 1994 requires that a watercourse be maintained by its owner in such a condition that the free flow of water is not impeded and the riparian owner **or anyone else** must not cause a watercourse to become blocked or obstructed. If ADC has a financial interest then surely it is ADC's responsibility to investigate, source ownership of the ditches and enforce conditions and take preventative measures to protect adjacent properties from flooding in the future.

### **QUESTION FIVE**

**From Mr Meadmore to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

What is the Council's expectations of its Working Group meeting scheduled to take place on 25th March 2021 with Southern Water Services Ltd?

Does it expect the meeting to establish firm dates (or trigger points) whereupon Southern Water Services will have completed all required works to facilitate the connection (of each) Arun Strategic Development Site development to the main public wastewater system within 24 months of final planning approval matters, and, will have also completed all works necessary to eliminate Spills of influent (or only partially processed effluent) into rivers, watercourses, SPAs, SSSIs and from all causes in the Arun District area? If not, then would the Council please issue a statement that it understands and accepts full responsibility for environmental and ecological consequences in permitting new dwellings to be occupied without such critical works having been carried out?

### **QUESTION SIX**

**From Ms Jarvis to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury**

Can it be confirmed that the financial interest made by Arun District Council into the above development prior to consent was declared to the committee before or during the meeting to determine the application?

Can the Leader of the Council or the Cabinet Member for Planning answer the question of what determines "predetermination" with regard to an application, and in doing so show that predetermination was not made in the case of the above application?

### **QUESTION SEVEN**

**From Mr Collins to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh and/or the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury – Councillor Lury to respond as the Cabinet Member for Planning**

The Arun Local Plan 2018 was prepared and adopted by the previous ADC Conservative Administration on 18 July 2018 and it allocated 9 Strategic Allocations in the western part of Arun District for development with 9,700 dwellings and just 2 strategic Allocations in the eastern part of Arun District at Angmering for 1050 dwellings.

The allocations in the western part of the district were intended to supply some 48.5 % of the total district wide number of 20,000 dwellings that the plan said would be provided 2011 – 2031 but none of these allocations have provided any housing to date.

In May 2019 the Local Elections resulted in all the previously conservative held wards in the western part of the district being changed to Liberal Democrat, independent and/or Green Party control largely due to those elected promising to review the Local Plan and strategic allocations in the western part of the district approved by the previous Conservative administration and redistribute the housing allocation more evenly and more sensibly across the district as a whole. In this context please can those identified address the following questions:

1. Does the Liberal Democrat Leader of the Council support the Arun Local Plan 2018 and the 9 strategic allocations in the western part of Arun District?
2. Does the Liberal Democrat Cabinet Member for Planning support the Arun Local Plan 2018 and the 9 strategic allocations in the western part of Arun District?
3. Notwithstanding the answers to 1 and 2 please can both say what they and their administration have done so as to initiate a review of the Local Plan and these 9 strategic allocations since May 2019?
4. Notwithstanding 1 – 3 does the Leader and the Ward Member for the Beach Ward in Littlehampton support the ALP Strategic Allocation at West Bank Littlehampton for development with 1000 houses (SD 4)?
5. Notwithstanding 1 – 3 does the Cabinet Member for Planning and the ward member for Bersted support the ALP Strategic Allocation at West of Bersted for development with 2500 houses (SD3)?

#### **QUESTION EIGHT**

**From Mr Cosgrove to the Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development, Councillor Coster**

Can he tell me what progress has been made on contacting Sussex Police following the rejection of the London Road Lorry Park deal, also what is happening re The Arcade in Bognor High Street? Is there are update on dealings with Whitbread on the Regis Centre site?

## **QUESTION NINE**

**From Mrs Collins to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh and/or the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury – Councillor Lury to respond**

Can the Council confirm that no decisions will be made in respect of any applications within the Strategic Site Allocations until a masterplan has been endorsed by the council as stated in ALP Policy HSP 2 and policy HSP2a

*“Development proposals within the strategic site allocations must be comprehensively planned and should have regard to a masterplan endorsed by the Council for the respective areas ..... “*

The strategic site allocations of SD1 Pagham South and SD2 Pagham North must be sustainable and be aligned with neighbouring parcels of land. The close proximity to Pagham Harbour with its drainage and water implications should not be detrimentally affected and Pagham Treatment Works is nearing capacity hence the transport of sludge across the area.

Is the coastal plain being overwhelmed with housing allocations because they will yield the highest return for developers and Councils alike, regardless of the impact on good growing land to future proof our self-sufficiency, regardless of already inadequate infrastructure and regardless of the potential threat to the Pagham Harbour and Nature Reserve, which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated by a monetary contribution?

## **QUESTION TEN**

**From Mr Meadmore to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh – Councillor Lury as the Cabinet Member for Planning to respond**

What is the Council’s expectations of County Highways and Highways England in relation to the highways infrastructure improvement imperatives that have been identified by its transport studies and previously presented as proposals by representatives of the said organisations?

The indication from them recently is that they would only begin planning once all of the stipulated s106 contributions have been paid under all of the developments pertaining to each highway infrastructure improvement proposal, and that there might likely still be a lead time of at least a further 24 months. Each development of course will likely follow a differing timeline path, some will remain uncertain for years to come, and many are inter-dependent. In this situation what is the Council’s contingency plan and ‘trigger’ points whereupon these works will nonetheless be required to be completed by County Highways and Highways England irrespective? If none, then may we ask the Council to issue a statement

that in consenting to the developments without conditions prerequisite upon these infrastructure providers it thereby understands and accepts full responsibility for the consequences if these critical 'severe impact' highways improvements are not implemented.

### **QUESTION ELEVEN**

#### **From Mr Collins to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury**

ALP Strategic Allocations SD1 Pagham South and SD2 Pagham North are identified in the ALP 2018 for development with 400 and 800 houses respectively subject to any actual proposals for the site demonstrating compliance with the detailed design and infrastructure requirements set out in ALP Policies HSP 2 and HSP 2a.

Please can the Cabinet Member for Planning confirm whether or not he would oppose any proposals put forward for the strategic allocations SD1 and/or SD2 that do not demonstrate compliance with the detailed design and infrastructure requirements for those sites set out in ALP Policies HSP 2 and HSP 2a.

### **QUESTION TWELVE**

#### **From Mr Cosgrove to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

May I point him to the Submission made by Seaward Homes to the 2015 Regeneration Consultation [[link](#)] in particular where it says "The two sites in question need to be viewed and considered differently. Instead of being branded as 'regeneration', the project needs to be redefined as one of 'redevelopment.' The issue of regeneration has, in Seaward's opinion, clouded the debate and the resultant progression of realistic and deliverable proposals. Potentially, the positioning of the project and the higher level view adopted has affected its delivery. To date, the requirement is to see a multitude of uses included on what are in development terms, very limited parcels of land .... With the understanding that all involved are looking at a redevelopment project, then a new approach based around a 'less is more' ethos could be the answer to delivering an achievable outcome". "... Seaward considers it fair to state that another developer-led masterplan is not an approach that will deliver a positive outcome" "... That a fresh approach is endorsed by ADC following recognition of the fact that adherence to the 'core requirements' is only likely to lead to further local difficulties - The project and its scope is sharply redefined – the focus becomes redevelopment and not regeneration " Would he not agree that this appears to be what Arun Officers have been promoting since, and that it is acknowledged by Seaward that this is NOT Regeneration?

**QUESTION THIRTEEN**

**From Mrs Collins to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

Do Arun District council still intend to remove the "leader and cabinet" style of governance and replace it with a "Committee System" as decided at the Full Council Meeting on 15th January 2020. If not when was the decision to overturn this made?

**QUESTION FOURTEEN**

**From Mr Meadmore to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh – Councillor Lury to respond as the Cabinet Member for Planning**

Q3: What is the Council's expectations of the Health Authority in relation to the identified infrastructure improvements necessary to support the Strategic Development Sites' incremental population? What is the Council's intended 'trigger' points whereupon these works must be done and completed?

If none, then may we ask the Council to issue a statement that in approving the developments to proceed without conditions prerequisite upon this infrastructure provider it thereby understands and accepts full responsibility for the consequences if these infrastructure improvements are not implemented.

**QUESTION FIFTEEN**

**From Mr Collins to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh and/or the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury – Councillor Lury to respond as the Cabinet Member for Planning**

Strategic Allocations SD1/SD2 - Pagham North and Pagham South and related matters

In view of the attached letter to the Council's Chief Executive and the e mail response on his behalf from Mr Roberts please can the Leader and/or the Cabinet Member for planning respond to the following question:

Please can you confirm when the required master plan will be prepared for public consultation and endorsement by the Council in accordance with the development plan and that no decisions will be made in respect of any applications made for these sites until such time as the required master plan is prepared consulted upon and endorsed by the Council?

(Mr Collins has attached email correspondence between himself and Officers of the Council which should not be shared)

This page is intentionally left blank

## ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

### REPORT TO AND DECISION OF FULL COUNCIL ON 17 MARCH 2021

**SUBJECT: HM Treasury Levelling Up Fund**

**REPORT AUTHOR:** Nigel Lynn, Chief Executive

**DATE:** 17 March 2021 **EXTN:** x37600

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

This report is presented to Full Council as an urgent item, as permitted in the Council's Constitution (Part 5, Section 1, 3.1, viii). The new Levelling Up Fund has been introduced by the Government to address the needs of individual places and the strategic case for investment. The Fund is especially for deprived towns and coastal communities of which the Arun District contains both deprived towns and such coastal communities. Arun District Council fits within Category 2 of the bidding level and bids could be successful "if they are of the exceptional quality". Bids are required by 18 June 2021. The Council, therefore, needs to urgently convene a Member Working Party to consider the Council's options with regards to a bid to enable the possible success of achieving the maximum amount of money from The Fund for the community.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended to Full Council to:

- i) Agree to set up a Levelling Up Fund Working Party with the necessary political balance; and
- ii) That the Working Party's remit will be to advise Officers on their project preferences for bidding, including the priority order.

#### **1. BACKGROUND:**

- Very recently, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Rishi Sunak, has launched the Levelling Up Fund Prospectus, worth £4.8bn, to be spent by 2024. The Prospectus is attached in the Background papers.

##### **Introduction**

- The Fund is for "things that strengthen the local economy and build civic identity, the infrastructure of everyday life". In the introduction, the Chancellor refers to "the needs of individual places and the strategic case for investment". The Fund is "especially for deprived towns and coastal communities". Local stakeholder support, plus the local MP ("expect to consult your MP") is "at the heart of its mission". The Chancellor

wants people to be able “to look around their towns and villages and recognise that their communities are better off than they were five years ago”.

**Main points of The Fund are:**

- The projects will be smaller in scale, regenerating a town centre, providing local investment in cultural facilities and upgrading the local transport infrastructure
- Projects must be visible and have a tangible impact on people and places in need
- There will also be the Community Renewal Fund (£220m) which will take over from the EU Structural Fund, and the Community Ownership Fund to empower local communities to protect vital local assets
- £800m will be used for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, leaving £4bn
- “Capacity funding” will be made available to those “most in need” to develop bids and later bidding rounds, although these funds are unlikely to be available for this stage and the Council will need to fund this work from existing budgets
- Local MP’s are expecting to back one bid as a priority
- Projects can be up to £20m, although higher bids can be accepted for “exceptional bids”
- All bids need relevant approvals
- Projects need to have consulted with stakeholders
- Councils can put in multiple bids (up to the £20m) but must spread their projects “fairly and equitably” within the Council boundary
- Projects must target pockets of deprivation

**There is a focus on three main themes:**

1. Transport – e.g. cycling, bus, transport, disabled, roads
2. Regeneration and town centre investment – e.g. eyesores, dated facilities, safe community spaces
3. Cultural investment – e.g. museums, galleries, visitor attractions, support for the arts, theatres, arts venues.

**Other factors to consider in the bid:**

- Projects must make a visible impact in their local areas
- Net zero Carbon must be considered – impact on nature and flooding
- Impact of COVID 19 on local High Streets
- Whilst improving the public realm, projects should design out crime and ASB
- Projects could attract tourists to bolster local business
- Support for culture and heritage bids that strengthen communities
- Investments should complement, rather than compete, with current funding
- Community assets, spaces and green spaces can be considered
- The Fund can be used for key cultural sites
- The Fund identifies three levels of Category, 1, 2 or 3, with 1 being the highest priority and the most likely to be funded. This will be the basis of the funding. ADC is a Category 2 (along with Adur), whilst the rest of West Sussex is a level 3. Levels 2 and 3 bids could be successful “if they are of exceptional quality” the Prospectus states. Category bids from 2 & 3 will only be considered on the “merits of deliverability, value for money and strategic fit”.

- Packaged bids must represent the highest value for local priorities and have a coherent set of interventions. However, there is a maximum of three bids in the package.
- There should be a local financial contribution of “at least 10%”.

**Timing:**

- It is a high priority for the Government that projects must be “on the ground” in 2021/22. Bids are required by 18 June 2021 and a decision will be made by the Autumn 2021 (therefore, we will only have between the Autumn 2021 and Spring 2022 to mobilise our project if successful). To enable this timing to be met, Officers will need to reply on preparatory work they have already completed as a starting point.

**2. PROPOSAL(S):**

To agree to set up a Levelling Up Fund Working Party (held in private) with the necessary political balance, to advise Officers on project preferences for bidding, including the priority order. Cabinet in May 2021 (date still to be determined) will decide on the final bid to The Fund, because this is a Cabinet function (Article 7 Paragraph 1)

**3. OPTIONS:**

To set up a Levelling Up Fund Working Party, which will meet in private, or; to recommend an alternative course of action

**4. CONSULTATION:**

The Chief Executive has consulted with the five Political Group Leaders. Political balance will need to be agreed by Group Leaders. If there is no consensus, the Leader will determine, as this is a Cabinet function within the Constitution.

Has consultation been undertaken with:	YES	NO
Relevant Town/Parish Council		No
Relevant District Ward Councillors		No
Other groups/persons (please specify) – The five political Group Leaders	Yes	
<b>5. ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS IN RELATION TO THE FOLLOWING COUNCIL POLICIES: (Explain in more detail at 6 below)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Financial	Yes	
Legal		No
Human Rights/Equality Impact Assessment		No
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime & Disorder Act		No
Sustainability		No
Asset Management/Property/Land	Yes	

Technology		No
Safeguarding		No
Other (please explain)		

**6. IMPLICATIONS:**

The Levelling Up Fund provides an opportunity for the Council to receive Government funding for some of its regeneration projects for its town centres. It is important that such opportunities are taken as the next phase of funding, probably aimed at category 2 and 3 areas, may not be for a few years (2024?).

**7. REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

To enable officers and Members to urgently consider the use of the Levelling Up Fund.

**8. BACKGROUND PAPERS:**

To view the Levelling Up Prospectus [referred to as Appendix A in the report] – please click on this link - [The Prospectus](#)

## COUNCIL MEETING – 17 MARCH 2021

### QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.3

**Q1** Councillor Edwards to the Cabinet Member for Residential Services,  
Councillor Mrs Gregory

**Q1** Members, I and others have spoken about the issue of shared bathing facilities for some of the residents at Flaxmean in Felpham at a number of previous meetings of this Council. Many Councillors, across all Parties, remain concerned about the perceived lack of progress on this issue and I ask the following question on behalf of my colleagues, who like me, want to see something done to improve the current situation. I acknowledge that whatever is proposed will require formal consultation with the residents concerned as we are talking about their homes. I also acknowledge that the Coronavirus pandemic may have slowed progress on this issue, but these inadequate facilities are, I know, of great importance to some residents, who have personally contacted me, my Ward colleague and other Councillors.

My question is, what progress has been made since the issue was raised in 2020, and what is going to happen to progress this issue to the satisfaction of all the residents concerned?

**A1** Thank you for your question Councillor Edwards regarding the perceived lack of progress on this issue and understand you are representing the frustrations of both local residents in Flaxmean House and your fellow ward councillors.

Firstly, let me explain the Housing Services' situation :

On 23 March 2020, in response to the Covid 19 pandemic the Council provided residents at Flaxmean House, that share bathroom facilities, with external individual shower facilities.

I must stress at that point, with many unknowns in relation to the pandemic, the Council's primary concern was the safety of residents. Having considered the options at the time this was considered to be the most viable and expedient. This was only ever intended to be a short term arrangement in response to the virus. Some 12 months later we are much better informed about steps that can be taken to limit transmission in shared spaces.

There is no easy or quick fix solution to this especially during a pandemic due to the need to prioritise the safety of residents. In order to mitigate against risk we have enhanced the cleaning regime to the shared facilities and this along with the rollout of the vaccine presents a different picture to a year ago.

That said, I understand that shared bathing facilities are not acceptable. In response I have asked officers to contact all residents that share bathing facilities and offer the option of a supported move to alternative sheltered accommodation, if they so wish. We have been exploring the option of converting the three existing void properties at Flaxmean House into shower

## COUNCIL MEETING – 17 MARCH 2021

### QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.3

facilities. To this end, an initial high level estimate of feasibility and cost was commissioned in the autumn of last year, which I shared with ward Members.

Further, Officers are to consult with all Flaxmean residents within the next 6 weeks and depending on the outcome, if appropriate a report will be tabled at the July Residential and Wellbeing Committee, outlining the next steps.

I should make Members aware that in the event that tenants wish for showers to be installed a full procurement exercise will be required to deliver this. The Housing Service is already stretched to capacity with existing workload, plus additional tasks that have arisen over the last year as a result of the pandemic. Alongside this there are key vacancies within the service that are impacting capacity.

As a Ward Councillor, I do fully understand your concerns for our residents and the need to offer basic standards of accommodation and will fully support the outcome of the consultation.

#### **Q2 Councillor Roberts to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

**Q2** You previously told Full Council that the £14,000 spent on the 3D Street Art in Littlehampton came direct from a Government Fund. Do you now accept that it was funded by Arun District Council and Littlehampton Town Council, with Littlehampton Residents effectively paying twice? And if so, how did you get it so wrong?

**A2** A verbal response will be provided at the meeting.

#### **Q3 Councillor Roberts to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

**Q3** You previously told Members and the Public that there was never any discussions or instruction to not hire foreshore officers this year. You said that it was always the intention to continue with the service, but that you would delay the recruitment process until after the current lockdown. Do you stand by that as being accurate and true?

**A3** A verbal response will be provided at the meeting

COUNCIL MEETING – 17 MARCH 2021

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO  
COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.3

**Q4 Councillor Roberts to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

**Q4** You told Members and the Public at Special Full Council that your administration was on track to deliver 90 new council homes this year. Do you stand by that as being accurate and true?

**A4** A verbal response will be provided at the meeting.

**Q5 Councillor Roberts to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

**Q5** Full Council Minutes show that in relation to Littlehampton Public Realm works that you told members and the Public all was on track to have “Spades in the Ground” in March 2021. At Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> March, you said that Officers told you it was due to start in March 2021, and you wrongly interpreted that as meaning “Spades in the Ground”. On Social Media just hours before the meeting you said **“I was told by Officers in December and January that they expected to get spades in the ground in March”**. Which is the truthful and accurate version please?

**A5** A verbal response will be provided at the meeting.

**Q6 Councillor Roberts to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

**Q6** At Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> March, I mentioned the video you had put on social media and said you had accused Cllr Seex of speaking untruths. You said you did no such thing. At 1 minute to 1 minute 15 seconds on that video you say **“She further makes a suggestion that I have not listened or spoken to her about various economic matters and regeneration matters that she has wanted to speak to me about. THAT’S COMPLETELY UNTRUE”**. Do you now accept that you did state and accuse her of speaking untruths?

**A6** A verbal response will be provided at the meeting.

**Q7 Councillor Roberts to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

**Q7** On Social Media in discussions about the further delay in the Littlehampton Public Realm works you said **“The High Street makeover is not 2 year late! It was due to start before Christmas, and then put back to March, but contractor delays means it is now September, which is about 9 months. Fact”**. Do you stand by your so-called “fact” as being truthful and accurate?

**A7** A verbal response will be provided at the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

## BOGNOR REGIS REGENERATION SUB-COMMITTEE

4 March 2021 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Stanley (Chairman) Brooks (Vice Chairman), Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards (Substitute for Mrs Madeley) English, Oppler, Roberts (Substitute for Mrs Stainton) and Mrs Warr.

Councillor Goodheart was also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

Apologies: Councillors Mrs Madeley and Mrs Stainton

### Chairman Announcement

The Chairman expressed his thanks for the work that the Senior Regeneration Officer had put in over her many years of service– *get wording from Matt to input here would*

### 14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made.

### 15. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2020 were approved and it was agreed that the Chairman would sign these as soon as practicably possible.

### 16. BOGNOR REGIS BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) - UPDATE

The Chairman of Bognor Regis BID extended his thanks the Senior Regeneration Officer for her hard work over the years and wished her well on her retirement.

He then provided members with an update on the work that had been undertaken by the team since the last meeting of the Sub-Committee. The key highlights were;

- Reduction in Crime rates
- The Annual General Meeting (AGM) of the BID was confirmed and invitations had been sent on 11 March 2021
- Partnership working over the Christmas period with the 'light up' light installations across the Bognor Town Centre had been well received
- General Market confirmed as returning shortly, restrictions dependant
- Work with Bognor place branding team, with clear objectives to make Bognor a welcoming Town
- New oversized planters had injected colour into the town centre and had been received well by business owners and the public

Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee - 4.03.21

- A bright colourful artwork installation in Norfolk Road had been completed by a local artist which incorporates subliminal messaging to direct people up through the Highstreet
- A living wall had been established near the Bedford Toilets, it was confirmed that this was doing well and would look beautiful in full bloom.
- Wooden Planters had been placed in the far east end of the Highstreet

He also confirmed that the team are working to a re-opening date of 8 April 2021, however this date was subject to review dependant on restrictions and national Government guidelines.

Members then took part in a question and answer session and the Chairman of the Bognor Regis BID and the Bognor Regis BID Co-Ordinator provided answers to all questions raised.

The Chairman thanked the Chairman of the Bognor Regis BID and his team for their hard work and the support they provide to the town.

#### 17. PRESENTATION FROM THE BOGNOR REGIS REGENERATION BOARD

The Chairman of Bognor Regeneration Board thanked the Senior Regeneration Officer for her hard work over the years and wished her well on her retirement. He then invited the Advisor to the Bognor Regeneration Board to deliver the presentation from the board to Members.

After the presentation members then took part in a question and answer session where the Advisor to, the Chairman of the Bognor Regeneration Board and the Bognor Regis BID Co-Ordinator provided answers to all questions asked.

The Sub-Committee noted the presentation that had been received and the Chairman thanked the Advisor and the Chairman of the Bognor Regis Regeneration for their work and attendance at the meeting.

#### 18. BOGNOR REGIS PLACE BRANDING

*(Councillor Steve Goodheart joined the meeting at the start of this item)*

The Senior Regeneration Officer provided members with an overview of her report and then invited the Bognor Regis BID Co-Ordinator to provide a more detailed summary of the work that had been completed, she highlighted that;

- It could not be a more appropriate time to grab hold of this and embrace it fully to help Bognor Regis recover from the Pandemic
- Changing the narrative on perception of Bognor Regis was within the control of all stakeholders and members

- The new shared narrative detailed in the Core Values of the place brand provided a common framework and consistent message for all stakeholders to reference when delivering initiatives for Bognor Regis

The Chairman then invited the Advisor to the Bognor Regis Regeneration Board to make any further comment.

Members then took part in a question and answer session and answers to all questions raised were provided by the Senior Regeneration Officer. It was clear from the comments made and questions asked that members were not all in agreement with the detail of the core values as some found them to be too simplistic. Members were reminded during the discussion that all of the detail before them had been driven from consultation with the community of Bognor Regis and not an external company. A further concern was raised that it was felt that all stakeholders involved may not have an equal say in the final actions delivered and it was unclear as to how some of the stakeholders involved had been agreed upon.

Discussion then turned to specific events and celebration of Bognor Regis heritage being something that members wanted more involvement in. the following events were mentioned as they had been particularly successful in the past;

- The Clown Convention
- The South Downs Folk Festival
- The Rox
- The Birdman
- Bognor Pride

The comments in reference to Butlins were felt to be unfair and it was stated by one member that, they had worked really hard for Bognor Regis and that they should be promoted in a good light. As discussion drew to an end it was highlighted that the survey that had been used to collate all of the feedback for this report may not be accurate as the survey was still showing as 'live' and this caused concern for one member.

On turning to the vote, it was requested and agreed that the recommendation be split, on conclusion of the vote the second part of the recommendation to adopt the place branding core values and brand filter for all Council activity in Bognor Regis was voted against and therefore;

The Sub-Committee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL that;

- 1) the findings of the place branding perception study be noted as a reflection on community perceptions following the public consultation exercise.

- 2) the place branding Core Values and “Brand Filter” approach are not adopted for all Council activity in Bognor Regis

19. BOGNOR REGIS REGENERATION POSITION STATEMENT

The Senior Regeneration Officer advised members that they had received the updated position statement in the agenda and that if there were any questions that members had she would answer where she could, but in the absence of the Group Head of Economy and the Director of Place some answer may require a written answer where she or the Chief Executive could not provide the detail needed.

The following points were raised;

- When would the planning application for the A29 be being brought before the Development Control Committee, the current date has been advised as ‘Spring 2021’? It was confirmed that not specific date could be provided, only that the Planning Team are currently processing the application and that the Senior Regeneration Officer had seen is as part of the consultation process.
- Questions regarding Place St Maur and Sunken Gardens were asked, and answers were provided by the Chairman, the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Independent Group.
- Would the public toilets on Bognor Regis seafront be open for the Summer as confirmed by the notice that had been placed on them? It was confirmed they would be open for the Summer season.
- Had the Council matched the £50k funding that had been received for the Bandstand and how was this decision made? It was confirmed that the Council had matched the £50k grant that had been received, but that an answer to how and who made that decision would need to be provided outside of the meeting.
- It was asked was the application for Butlins to move their check in desk, likely to be presented to the Development Control Committee. It was confirmed that the application was in process at the current time.

It was confirmed by a member that the organiser of the Birdman event had been in touch as they had been watching the meeting via the website and they wanted to confirm that it was the intention to run the Birdman event and Bognor Pride, but that this was dependant on sponsorship.

The Chairman thanked all attendees for their participation in the meeting and then drew the meeting to a close.

(The meeting concluded at 20:04)