

**MINUTES
OF A
MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
HELD IN THE ARUN CIVIC CENTRE
On 11 MAY 2022 AT 6.00 PM**

Present: Councillors Brooks (Chair), Staniforth (Vice-Chair), Batley, Bicknell, Bower, Buckland, Caffyn, Chapman, Chace, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Daniells, Dendle, Dixon, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs English, English, Goodheart, Gregory, Gunner, Hamilton, Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Madeley, Needs, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Pendleton, Rhodes, Roberts, Stainton, Stanley, Thurston, Walsh, Warr, Worne and Yeates.

The following Members were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters referred to in the Minutes indicated:-
Councillor Needs and Northeast – Minute 843 (Part) to Minute 846;
Councillors Batley, Madeley, Stainton, Rhodes, Thurston, Worne and Warr – Minute 844 (Part) to Minute 846].

834. WELCOME

The Chair welcomed Councillors, representatives of the public, press and officers to the meeting.

835. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for Absence had been received from Councillors Catterson, Charles, Jones, Purchase, Seex and Tilbrook and from Honorary Aldermen, Mrs Stinchcombe and Mr Dingemans.

836. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Declaration of Interest Sheet set out below confirms those Members who had made a declaration of their personal interest as a Member of a Town or Parish Councillor or a West Sussex County Councillor, as confirmed in their Register of Interest as these declarations could apply to any of the issues to be discussed at the meeting.

Name	Town or Parish Council or West Sussex County Council [WSCC]
Councillor Tracy Baker	Littlehampton
Councillor Kenton Batley	Bognor Regis
Councillor Jamie Bennett	Rustington
Councillor Paul Bicknell	Angmering
Councillor Billy Blanchard-Cooper	Littlehampton
Councillor Jim Brooks	Bognor Regis

Full Council - 11.05.22

Councillor Ian Buckland	Littlehampton and WSCC
Councillor David Chace	Littlehampton
Councillor Mike Clayden	Rustington
Councillor Andy Cooper	Rustington
Councillor Alison Cooper	Rustington and WSCC
Councillor Sandra Daniells	Bognor Regis
Councillor Roger Elkins	Ferring and WSCC
Councillor Paul English	Felpham
Councillor Steve Goodheart	Bognor Regis
Councillor Pauline Gregory	Rustington
Councillor June Hamilton	Pagham
Councillor Shirley Haywood	Middleton-on-Sea
Councillor David Huntley	Pagham
Councillor Henry Jones	Bognor Regis
Councillor Martin Lury	Bersted
Councillor Claire Needs	Bognor Regis
Councillor Mike Northeast	Littlehampton
Councillor Francis Oppler	WSCC
Councillor Jacky Pendleton	Middleton-on-Sea and WSCC
Councillor Vicky Rhodes	Littlehampton
Councillor Emily Seex	Littlehampton
Councillor Martin Smith	Aldwick
Councillor Samantha Staniforth	Bognor Regis
Councillor Matt Stanley	Bognor Regis
Councillor Isabel Thurston	Barnham & Eastergate
Councillor Will Tilbrook	Littlehampton
Councillor James Walsh	Littlehampton and WSCC
Councillor Jeanette Warr	Bognor Regis
Councillor Gillian Yeates	Bersted

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

837. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chair confirmed that six public questions had been submitted, all of which were from Mr Cosgrove – these have been very briefly summarised below:

- (1) To the Chair of the Policy & Finance Committee, Councillor Gunner regarding the Levelling-Up Fund project in Bognor Regis;
- (2) To the Chair of the Policy & Finance Committee, Councillor Gunner in relation to the setting up of a Working Party to look at Regeneration presentations;
- (3) To the Chair of Policy & Finance Committee, Councillor Gunner in relation to the Levelling-Up Fund project in Bognor Regis;
- (4) To the Chair of the Policy & Finance Committee, Councillor Gunner, in relation to the Levelling-Up Fund and consultation;

- (5) To the Chair of the Housing & Wellbeing Committee, Councillor Pendleton, in relation to the Bognor Regis Youth and Community Centre at Westloats Lane, Bognor Regis; and
- (6) To the Chair of the Economy Committee, Councillor Andy Cooper, regarding local fisherman in Bognor Regis.

Supplementary questions were asked and responded to at the meeting.

(A schedule of the full questions asked, and the responses provided can be found on the Public Question Web page at: <https://www.arun.gov.uk/public-question-time>)

838. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS WITH PECUNIARY/PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

No questions were asked.

839. PETITIONS

The Chair confirmed that there were no petitions to present to this meeting.

840. MINUTES

The Chair asked Members to approve as a correct record the Minutes from the meetings held below:

- Special Meeting of the Council on 23 February 2022
- Special Meeting of the Council on 3 March 2022
- Full Council on 9 March 2022
- Extraordinary Meeting of the Council on 14 April 2022

Having been proposed by Councillor Gunner and seconded by Councillor Bower the minutes from the meeting of the Special Council held on 23 February 2022 were approved as a correct record with the Chair confirming that he would sign these at the end of the meeting.

The Chair then turned to the Minutes from the Special Meeting of the Council held on 3 March 2022. Councillor Elkins challenged the accuracy of the minutes in relation to Minute 692 [National Highways' Proposals for the A27 Arundel Improvements – Response to Statutory Consultation (Grey Route)] in that the amended recommendations on Page 25, Item E did not match the resolutions on Page 27 Item E and he sought an explanation. Given the detailed nature of the challenge, the Interim Group Head of Law & Governance confirmed that this entry would be reviewed with a view to the minutes being re-tabled at the next meeting of the Full Council on 13 July 2022.

The Chair then turned to the Minutes from the Full Council meeting held on 9 March 2022. Councillor Walsh challenged Minute 719 [Appointment of Vice-Chair of the

Full Council - 11.05.22

Council for the Municipal Year 2022/23] where it had been reported that the Monitoring Officer had confirmed that there had been 7 spoilt ballot papers. Councillor Walsh stated that this was not accurate and that the number of spoilt papers had been challenged following the conclusion of that meeting. Based on this fact, he felt that the minutes should reflect that the ballot papers had been challenged.

Councillor Gunner, as Leader of the Council, responded by outlining that Councillor Walsh was not challenging the accuracy of the minutes he was challenging the outcome of that meeting. Councillor Gunner sought legal advice as to whether Council could proceed with voting to approve these minutes.

The Interim Group Head of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer outlined that the purpose of presenting minutes for approval was to confirm that the minutes recorded proceedings not whether the outcome was acceptable to everyone. The minutes accurately reflected what had been announced at the meeting by the Monitoring Officer.

Following further discussion, Councillor Gunner proposed that the minutes be approved with this being seconded by Councillor Bower. A request was then made that the voting to approve these Minutes be recorded.

Those voting for were Councillors Bicknell, Bower, Caffyn, Chace, Chapman, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Daniells, Dendle, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs English, English, Goodheart, Gunner, Hughes, Kelly, Madeley, Oliver-Redgate, Pendleton, Rhodes, Roberts and Staniforth [24]. Those voting against were Councillors Batley, Coster, Dixon, Gregory, Hamilton, Haywood, Huntley, Lury, Needs, Oppler, Stanley, Thurston, Walsh, Warr, Worne and Yeates [16]. Councillors Brooks, Buckland, Northeast and Stainton abstained from voting [4].

The Council therefore approved the minutes from the meeting of Full Council on 9 March 2022 as an accurate record of the meeting.

Having been proposed by Councillor Gunner and seconded by Councillor Edwards, the Minutes from the Extraordinary Meeting of the Council held on 14 April 2022 were approved by the Council as a correct record.

841. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair outlined that he was delighted to have the opportunity to celebrate Alderman Mrs Stinchcombe's twenty first anniversary on being made an Honorary Alderman for the District.

842. URGENT MATTERS

The Chair confirmed that there were no items for this meeting.

843. REPORT OF CONSTITUTION WORKING PARTY - COMPLETING THE TRANSITION TO A COMMITTEE SYSTEM

The Chair invited Councillor Bower, as Chair of the Constitution Working Party, to present and propose the recommendations from the meeting of the Constitution Working Party held on 11 April 2022 which had been circulated to Members at the meeting, having previously been circulated in advance of the meeting electronically.

The minutes accompanied a report from the Interim Group Head of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer containing a range of recommendations from the Constitution Working Party on continuing amendments to the Constitution designed to smooth the transition from Cabinet to a Committee system form of governance.

Councillor Bower reflected upon the Member seminars that had been delivered by external consultants in January and March 2022 assisting Officers with the review of the new Committee style Constitution. As these had not been attended by every Member of the Council, he had decided to postpone consideration of some of the more controversial items such as proposals for the reduction in the number of Committees and the reduction in the number of Full Council and Committee meetings. The Working Party had agreed to defer their consideration until after the first cycle of meetings in the new Municipal Year.

The Interim Group Head of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer then presented his report confirming that it set out the recommendations for Council to consider from the meeting of the Constitution Working Party held on 11 April 2022. The purpose of the recommendations was to continue the decision made by Members to move from the Cabinet form of governance to the Committee form of governance. It was important that the Constitution mirrored that proposed transition. The report also contained recommendations previously made by the Working Party on 7 February 2022 relating to changes to the procedure for organising Planning Committee site visits. The proposals for change had been agreed by the Planning Committee at its meeting held on 2 February 2022, with the proposed changes then being reported to the Working Party on 7 February and again on 11 April 2022. Other recommendations for change related to organisational and other legislative changes designed to ensure that the Constitution was keeping on track in terms of accuracy.

The Chair confirmed that there were twelve recommendations for consideration which were briefly explained. Members would then be invited to ask questions.

The recommendations before Members were:

- (1) Amendments to the Articles (Part 2 Article 14.2) (Changes to the Constitution) – as set out in Annex 1 and Appendix 1 of the report.
- (2) That Full Council accepts the amendment to the Articles (Part 2 of the Constitution 1.0 to insert the following sentence after the first sentence “no person shall be eligible for nomination as Chair or Vide-Chair for as long as

Full Council - 11.05.22

they hold a position of responsibility as Leader or Deputy Leader within a Political Group (Appendix 1)

On a Point of Order about the procedure to be followed, the Chair confirmed that there would be a general discussion and questions and that following this, each of the recommendations would then be debated to allow for any amendment to be proposed or further request for clarification to be made.

A Point of Order was raised by Councillor Coster. He felt that there were errors and inconsistencies in the report and that it should not be discussed and debated in this form. Councillor Coster was of the view that it would be impossible for Full Council to cover all of the issues in appropriate detail tonight and so he formally proposed that the recommendations be referred back to the Constitution Working Party for it to arrange a seminar or briefing or Special Council Meeting to allow all Councillors to consider all of the matters in more detail and with more time. Councillor Coster confirmed that he had a seconder in Councillor Walsh. The proposal was not seconded at this time.

The Chair responded stating that the Officer presentation would take place first with questions and that each recommendation would then be considered one by one to allow for full debate and amendments.

The Interim Group Head of Law & Governance then continued with his presentation:

- (3) That Full Council accepts the amendment to Part 3 (Responsibility for Functions) to include a power for each Service Committee to appoint an Urgency Sub-Committee composed of the Chair, Vice-Chair and one other member of the Committee. The purpose was to deal with those urgent matters which could not wait until the next cycle of the committee.
- (4) That Full Council accepts amendments to the Committee Procedure Rules (Part 5 – Section 2 Paragraph 8.1) to reduce the default length of meetings to three hours (from four and a half hours)
- (5) With exception of council tax meetings, Full Council accepts amendments to the Council Procedure Rules (Part 5 – Section 1 Paragraph 17.5) and Committee Procedure Rules (Part 5 Section 2 Paragraph 13.3) to reduce the length of speeches for ordinary council and committee meetings from 5 minutes to 3 minutes.
- (6) That Full Council accepts amendments to Part 5 – Section 1 Paragraph 12 to make provision for valid Public Questions which in the opinion of the Monitoring Officer relate to the terms of reference of a Council Committee to be accepted at Full Council and be automatically referred by Full Council without discussion or debate to the relevant committee
- (7) That Full Council accepts the amendment to Part 4 – Section 1 (Chief Executive and Directors) and the deletion of Part 4 – Section 2 (Chief Executive and Directors) and Part 4 – Section 3 (Group Heads). This meant that Part 4 Sections 2 and 3 would be removed from this part of the Constitution and placed

in Part 7 (Management Structure) (Appendix 2). The matters reserved scheme would not be continued in its present form.

- (8) That Full Council accepts the changes to Part 6, Section 4 – Purchasing Procurement Contract Rules (Appendix 4)
- (9) That Full Council accepts the changes to Part 6, Section 3 – Financial Procedure Rules (Appendix3)
- (10) That Full Council accept the changes to Part 8 – Section 3 – Planning Protocol agreed by the Planning Committee on 2 February 2022 and agreed by the Working Party on 7 February 2022 relating to an updated protocol for Planning Committee Site Visits.
- (11) That Full Council accepts amendments to Part 9, Section 5 (Filming and Photographic Protocol) in that this protocol would apply to Councillors in the same way it applied to members of the public, permitting Councillors to record and film during meetings.
- (12) That Full Council notes the consequential amendments due to organisation and legislative changes.
- (13) To note that the Constitution Working Party would report back to Full Council on the postponed consideration of:
 - Part 3 (Responsibility for Functions) including proposals for the reduction in the number of committees and the reduction in the number of Full Council and committee meetings;
 - Referral and Recovery procedures
 - Amendment to the Petitions Scheme to clearly exclude planning and licensing related matters and to clarify that the Petition Scheme only applies to matters within the powers of the district council
 - Quorum and voting at hybrid meetings
 - Making provision for electronic voting (when the electronic voting system has been installed) and to clarify all voting procedures

The Interim Group Head of Law & Governance then returned to Recommendation (2) 2.2 and provided further explanation and clarity. Paragraph 1 of Article 14 had inserted a sentence to ensure that no person could be appointed to the role of Chair or Vice-Chair of the Council if they held a position of responsibility within a local political group.

The Chair confirmed that there would be one debate on all items covering recommendations 2.1 to 2.12 and he invited Members to confirm if they required any further clarification or questions answered. A vote would then be taken on each of the recommendations where amendments could be tabled.

Councillor Coster returned to his proposal made earlier which addressed his belief that all of the recommendations were too onerous for the meeting to consider now and that he wished to make an amendment to refer the recommendations back to to the Constitution Working Party. This was not seconded at this time.

Full Council - 11.05.22

As Chair of the Constitution Working Party, Councillor Bower moved the recommendations stating that these had been fully debated and agreed by the Working Party. As Chair of the Working Party, he had also agreed with the Monitoring Officer that a Members' Seminar would be arranged to deal with the deferred issues outlined in 2.13 of the report.

Councillor Cooper, as Vice-Chair of the Constitution Working Party formally seconded the recommendations from the Constitution Working Party.

The Chair then invited questions from Members. The following questions were raised:

- Recommendation 2.2 – an inconsistency in wording was highlighted on page 49 and clarification was sought. It was felt that the wording should make it clear that the intention was that this referred to any Councillor holding the position of Leader or Deputy Leader within a political group of the Council rather than local political group. The Interim Group Head of Law & Governance confirmed this to be the case and that he was happy to change the wording to meet that intention.

Following detailed discussion it was agreed that the recommendation would refer to a political group of this Council. It was also agreed to change the word nomination to appointment.

- Recommendation 2.7 was explained in more detail outlining that its intention was not to move everything deleted into Part 7 of the Constitution. It was for Chief Executive to determine his own authorisations.
- Recommendation 2.1 – it was felt that Members should have sight of the amendments to be made to the Constitution and this was the reason behind this provision.
- Recommendation 2.11 – A number of clarifications were sought about the scope of this proposal. It was clarified that Councillors had the same right to film/record the proceedings as anyone else. Councillors could not film confidential or exempt business. This related to the recording of meetings not the recording of papers on Members' desks. Members were bound by confidentiality rules to ensure that confidential business of the council was not leaked to the public – this would continue to apply.
- Returning to Recommendation 21. – following further discussion it was clarified that the three days should be reworded to mean 'working' days to allow more time for the amendments to be circulated to all Members prior to Full Council. Members wanted assurance that the requirement would be that at least three days would allow for the amendments to be circulated to all Members and that this needed to be made clear.
- Recommendation 2.3 – Urgency Sub-Committees – a number of clarifications were sought. In response to the request for clarifications, it was explained that each Committee that appointed an Urgency Sub-

Committee would look to what the political composition of the Committee was in terms of Chair and Vice-Chair and would then look to see who the third member should be. It was clarified that any Urgent Sub-Committee should meet physically and that agendas and minutes would be open to the public by default in the normal way. It was clarified that these Sub-Committees would only meet to consider exceptionally urgent business. Other Members of the Committee could attend if they wished, although there was no provision for other members to be invited. It was clarified that the Sub-Committees, once convened, could take a different view as to the urgency of the matter before them and decide to leave the matter to be dealt with by the next full service committee.

- Recommendation 2.4 – the guillotine. Clarification was sought and given that the three hours did not include the time when the meeting was temporarily adjourned and that failing agreement it would still be a requirement for the adjourned meeting to be in consultation with the Chief Executive and Group Leaders.
- Recommendation 2.8 – clarification was sought on the different contracts this referred to and if an explanatory note could be inserted into the Constitution.

The Chair then invited debate on the recommendations.

The first to speak was Councillor Coster in terms of his amendment proposed earlier. Councillor Walsh then seconded this amendment.

Councillor Coster explained that his amendment had been proposed due to the amount of detail in the report and as there were forty four different items which required full debate as well as points requiring clarification. As the Constitution was a vitally important document, he felt that the recommendations before Members were not items that could be skated over quickly and that they warranted further discussion by CWP before being very carefully considered by the council. The CWP should consider if a Members' Seminar or briefing be required; or a special council meeting, whichever route would allow review in detail. Councillor Walsh seconded this amendment.

Many Councillors supported this amendment in their speeches highlighting that this was an important issue that could not be rushed. It was felt that to hold a Members' Seminar would allow many of the questions and concerns to be ironed out ahead of decision making at council.

Following further debate, Councillor Cooper then proposed a Motion Without Notice that the Question Be Now Put and this was seconded by Councillor Chace.

Having sought legal advice from the Interim Group Head of Law & Governance & Monitoring Officer, the Chair confirmed that this Motion without Notice could not be accepted as it was not in keeping with the requirements of the Constitution. Following further debate, Councillor Chace then proposed a Motion Without Notice that the Question Be Now Put and this was seconded by Councillor Oliver Redgate. The Chair

Full Council - 11.05.22

ruled that he felt that as there were still Councillors who had indicated a wish to speak, he would continue with the debate.

Other Councillors outlined that they could not support the proposal to refer this item back to the Working Party. This was because the proposed changes to the Constitution had been debated in full by the Working Party and now needed to be approved by the Council to allow the changes to be implemented.

Councillor Walsh, as seconder of the amendment, explained why he supported the proposal to defer. He felt that the detail of the various amendments for change had been received without allowing adequate time for Members to digest their contents. He also felt that to have only received the minutes from the Working Party in hard copy tonight did also not allow sufficient time to digest the contents properly and to allow Members time to raise inconsistencies. He conceded that the minutes had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting electronically.

Councillor Coster, as propose of the amendment, re-emphasised his concerns over the number of inconsistencies that needed to be resolved and the need to avoid vagueness in the Constitution. He outlined that there were changes to figures that were questionable and there were issues around the openness and transparency with some of the proposals which he felt were leading towards cutting down or stifling debate.

The debate concluded and a recorded vote was requested on the amendment to refer this item back to the Constitution Working Party. Those voting for the deferral were Councillors Batley, Buckland, Coster, Daniells, Dixon, Gregory, Hamilton, Haywood, Huntley, Lury, Needs, Oppler, Stanley, Thurston, Walsh, Warr, Worne and Yeates [18]. Those voting against were Councillor's Bicknell, Bower, Caffyn, Chace, Chapman, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Dendle, Edwards, Elkins, Mrs English, English, Goodheart, Gunner, Hughes, Kelly, Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Pendleton, Rhodes, Roberts, Stainton and Staniforth [25]. Councillor Brooks abstained from voting.

The amendment was declared NOT CARRIED.

The Chair then called a short adjournment.

The Chair confirmed that he would now take debate on each amendment in turn.

The following key points were raised on the recommendations listed:

- 2.3 - Urgent Sub-Committees – could assurance be provided that these committees would only deal with exceptional matters? Was there a valid reason to introduce Urgency Sub-Committees which restricted other Members from taking part in debate when Special and Extraordinary Meetings could be called.
- 2.4 – Reducing the default length of meetings – this would reduce historically long meetings

- 2.5 – mixed views were expressed over reducing speaking times from 5 minutes to 3. Some Councillors felt this change should apply only to council meetings and not committee meetings. Would Chair's discretion over speaking times be applied for those Councillors who had difficulty articulating themselves?
- 2.6 – concern was raised over the redirection of public questions as Full Council was seen as the place where the public did attend to submit and ask questions. To refer questions at Full Council onto Committees would not be a good public experience.
- 2.10 – Planning Protocol for Planning Committee site visits – this was supported
- 2.11 – proposals to allow Councillors to film in line with the Council's Filming and Photographic Protocol. Did this apply to Exempt items and did Councillors have to abide by the same sanctions as members of the public. Would Members be able to film from within the Council Chamber or only from the Public Gallery not in the Chamber.

Councillor Bower, as proposer of the recommendations, reassured Members that a Members' Seminar on all procedural items would be held and that this would be compulsory for Members to attend to ensure that they would understand Council and Committee procedure rules.

The Chair then returned to the recommendations and confirmed that the voting on these would be taken individually.

Before doing so, Councillor Stanley confirmed that earlier in the debate alternative wording had been agreed in respect of Recommendation 2.2. This related to the wording in (iv) the Monitoring Officer in written consultation with the Chair of the Constitution Working Party **and distributed to Members** at least three **working** days before the relevant Full Council meeting to propose that for any other reason the proposed change be put direct to Full Council for consideration and decision. This amendment was proposed by Councillor Stanley and seconded by Councillor Walsh. On this being put to the vote it was CARRIED.

Following a range of Points of Orders raised as to the procedure for dealing with amendments on the recommendations, the Chair called a short adjournment.

The Interim Group Head of Law & Governance explained the procedure which the Chair had outlined at the beginning in that amendments would be taken at the end of debate when considering each of the recommendations.

Following further Points of Orders raised on the procedure for the meeting, the Chair called a two minute adjournment.

Full Council - 11.05.22

An amendment to recommendation 2.2 was then proposed by Councillor Roberts. This amendment is set out below with deletions shown using ~~strikethrough~~ and additions shown using **bold**:

2.2 That Full Council accepts the amendment to the Articles (Part 2 of the constitution Article 1.0 of the constitution) to insert the following sentence after the first sentence *“no person shall be eligible for ~~nomination~~ **appointment** as chair or vice chair for as long as they hold a position of responsibility as Leader or deputy leader within a political group **of this Council**”* (Appendix 1).

This amendment was seconded by Councillor Gunner.

Following further debate this was declared CARRIED.

An amendment to Recommendation 2.3 was then proposed by Councillor Walsh and seconded by Councillor Stanley. They in turn explained that although they were still uncomfortable with the principle behind the establishment of Urgent Sub-Committees the following additional wording was requested – as set out in **bold** below:

2.3 That Full Council accepts the amendment to Part 3 of the Constitution (Responsibility for Functions) to include a requirement that each service committee is to appoint an Urgency Sub-Committee composed of the Chair, Vice-Chair and one other Member of the Committee **one of whom would be an Opposition Member**.

Following some debate and clarifications this amendment was declared CARRIED.

An amendment to recommendation 2.5 was then proposed by Councillor Walsh which was seconded by Councillor Stanley. The wording is as set out below with deletions shown using ~~strikethrough~~.

2.5 That Full Council (with the exception of the Council Tax meeting) accepts amendments to the Council Procedure Rules (Part 5 Section 1 Paragraph 17.5) and ~~Committee Procedure Rules (Part 5 Section 2 Paragraph 13.3)~~ to reduce the length of speeches for ordinary council and ~~ordinary committee~~ meetings from 5 minutes to three 3 minutes.

Following some debate this amendment was put to the vote and was declared NOT CARRIED. The Chair therefore returned to the substantive recommendation to read:

That Full Council (with the exception of the Council Tax meeting) accepts amendments to the Council Procedure Rules (Part 5 Section 1 Paragraph 17.5) and Committee Procedure Rules (Part 5 Section 2 Paragraph 13.3) to reduce the length of speeches for ordinary council and ordinary committee meetings from 5 minutes to three 3 minutes.

On this being put to the vote it was declared CARRIED.

The Chair then returned to the other substantive recommendations listed in the report. In there being no other amendments proposed each recommendation was put to the vote and

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) It accepts the amendment to the Articles (Part 2 Articles 14.2 of the Constitution) (Changes to the Constitution) as set out in Annexe 1 and also Appendix 1;
- (2) It accepts the amendment to the Articles (Part 2 of the Constitution Article 1.0 of the Constitution) to insert the following sentence after the first sentence “no person shall be eligible for appointment as Chair or Vice-Chair for as long as they hold a position of responsibility as Leader or Deputy Leader within a political group of this Council (Appendix1)
- (3) It accepts the amendment to Part 3 of the Constitution (Responsibility for Functions) to include a requirement that each service committee is to appoint an Urgency Sub-Committee composed of the Chair, Vice-Chair and one other Member of the Committee one of whom would be an Opposition Member;
- (4) It accepts amendments to the Committee Procedure Rules (Part 5 Section 2 Paragraph 8.1) to reduce the default length of meetings to three hours (from four and a half hours);
- (5) It accepts (with the exception of the Council Tax meeting) amendments to the Council Procedure Rules (Part 5 Section 1 Paragraph 17.5) and the Committee Procedure Rules (Part 5 Section 2 Paragraph 13.3) to reduce the length of speeches for ordinary council meetings from five minutes to three minutes;
- (6) It accepts amendments to Part 5, Section 1, Paragraph 12 to make provision for valid Public Questions which in the opinion of the Monitoring Officer relate to the terms of reference of a Council Committee to be accepted at Full Council and be automatically referred by Full Council without discussion or debate to the relevant committee;
- (7) It accepts the amendments to Part 4 Section 1 (Chief Executive and Directors) and deletion of Part 4 Section 2 (Chief Executive and Directors) and Part 4 Section 3 (Group Heads). This means that Part 4 Sections 2 and 3 are removed from this part of the Constitution and

Full Council - 11.05.22

placed in Part 7 (Management Structure). (See appendix 2). The matters reserved scheme will not be continued in its present form.

(8) It accepts the changes to Part 6, Section 4 – Purchasing Procurement Contract Rules (Appendix 4);

(9) It accepts the changed to Part 6, Section 3 – Financial Procedure (Appendix 3);

(10) It accepts the changes to Part 8, Section 3 – Planning Protocol agreed by the Planning Committee on 2 February 2022 and the Constitution Working Party on 7 February 2022 relating to site visits;

(11) It accepts amendments to Part 9, Section 5 (Filming and Photographic Protocol) to clarify that the protocol applies to Councillors as it applies to Members of the Public and allows Councillors to record and film during meetings; and

(12) The consequential amendments as a result of organisational and legislative changed be noted.

844. ECONOMY COMMITTEE - 29 MARCH 2022

The Chair, Councillor Cooper, presented recommendations from the meeting of the Economy Committee held on 29 March 2022.

Councillor Cooper alerted Councillors to three recommendations contained within Minute 781 [Littlehampton Public Realm Improvements – Phase 1 [Terminus Road Contractor Appointment] which he duly proposed. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Gunner.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) It accepts and draws down £1.253 m from West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) to complete the Phase 1 (Terminus Road, Littlehampton) works and add the expenditure and funding to the 2022/23 Capital Programme.

(2) It approved authority to enter into a collaboration agreement with WSSCC that sets out the billing regime for the funds in Recommendation (1) approved by the Committee and approves the drawdown and expenditure of external funding and that the terms and conditions are agreed by Legal Services and in consultation with the Monitoring Officer; and

(3) As per Part 4 – Officer Scheme of Delegation (4.3 to 4.7 refers) and Under Part 7 of the Council’s Constitution, delegated authority be given to the Director of Place to plan, draw down and make budgetary decisions on the expenditure on this phase in accordance with the terms and conditions and in consultation with the Chair of the Economy Committee.

Councillor Cooper then alerted Councillors to a recommendation at Minute 786 [River Road Garage Site Arundel, West Sussex] highlighting that this would provide much needed holiday accommodation within the community and would go some way to assisting tourism need in the area. Councillor Cooper then proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Gunner.

The Council

RESOLVED

That a supplementary estimate of £485,625 be included within the capital programme to carry out the demolition and replacement of the garages at River Road, Arundel with a holiday let property [Option 5].

845. POLICY & FINANCE COMMITTEE - 31 MARCH 2022

The Chair of the Policy & Finance Committee, Councillor Gunner, presented recommendations from the meeting of the Policy & Finance Committee held on 31 March 2022.

Councillor Gunner referred Councillors to three recommendations at Minute 805 [Council Vision – Performance Management 2022-2026 which he duly proposed. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Pendleton.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) The proposed indicators to measure the outcomes for the council vision key themes be agreed;
- (2) The proposed Key Performance Indicators be agreed; and
- (3) These KPIs be refined to include more customer relevant feedback at the earliest opportunity.

846. MOTIONS [30 MINUTES]

The Chair confirmed that one Motion had been submitted for this meeting.

Full Council - 11.05.22

Points of Order were then raised by two Councillors seeking advice as to whether this Motion should stand deferred to an appropriate Service Committee. The Interim Group Head of Law & Governance outlined that as the subject matter of this motion did not fall within the terms of reference of any service committee it could be presented to and debated at Full Council.

Further Points of Orders were raised on whether this Motion should be presented or referred straight to the Housing & Wellbeing Committee. As the meeting was approaching the guillotine, the Chair ruled that the Motion was in order and that Councillor Staniforth should be allowed to present it.

Councillor Staniforth then presented her motion stating that this was an incredibly important matter which was particularly relevant at this time as it effected a certain age group within the district, being teenagers and young people, who were not quite adults, but old enough to be experiencing life's pressures.

Covid had undoubtedly affected this age group separating them from their peers during lockdown. They had missed a lot of school learning, and now had to endure extra sessions after school on weekdays and even on Saturdays and Sundays to catch up on work for upcoming exams, all adding extra pressure.

Half of all mental health conditions presented themselves by the age of 14, and three quarters by the age of 24 and so this was why early intervention was crucial. Often young people did not want to access school led services, meaning there was an enormous opportunity to help openly in the district's towns, and to bring mental health issues out of the shadows.

Mental health and suicide awareness was still not talked enough about, and sadly, there was still a link between mental health and social injustice, which often lead to isolation. This was why it was so necessary to bring this Motion to council now to show that the council wanted to offer support to people of this age, within the district.

There were many agencies that dealt with this issue with the County Council taking on a big role, but these services were hugely under-funded. As a district council, it was felt that the reliance should not just be on these agencies as there was much more that the council could do, including highlighting the help that was available; making services easy to find; and not expecting people to be passed from pillar to post to find support.

Another crucial element was that mental health pressures affected everyone at some point. Talking about this openly was key, as was to acknowledge what was happening and to try to see as a council, if further support could be offered.

Councillor Staniforth concluded by stating that she had undertaken some training with this council alongside the Samaritans, to further understand the issue. She wanted to see what the council could do in addition to the work of local agencies, to support young people with mental health and wellbeing. She therefore asked the council to support her Motion by initially asking for update from WSCC as to what services it was providing currently and what their plans were the future so that the council could identify some areas that it could support and develop by way of a presentation to all Councillors so that collectively the council could agree a wider plan as part of the Wellbeing strategy, of this Council's Vision.

Councillor Edwards then seconded the Motion and urged Members to support it.

The Chair invited debate. Councillor Walsh confirmed that he agreed with the Motion but wished to put forward some small amendments that would compliment it. The amendments are detailed below with deletions shown using ~~strikethrough~~ and additions shown using **bold**:

The Council recognises that responsibility for Mental Health Services for Young People is provided by both West Sussex County Council and Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust.

It resolves to ~~My motion is to propose the Council request a presentation from West Sussex County Council and NHS Foundation Trust to outlining what the services it currently provided for children and young people in the district and its plans for future provision. We may ADC may wish to then identify key priorities as a district council to better support the wellbeing of children and young people.~~

Councillor Walsh confirmed that he had been battling to enhance mental health support services for younger people for a very long time and was still pushing for this at West Sussex County Council. The problem always came down to funding and a lack of resource in terms of the priorities allocated to services for young people. Councillor Walsh confirmed that it was vital to have input from The NHS Foundation Trust and so he hoped that Councillor Staniforth and her seconder would accept the slight amendments made.

Councillor Bower then seconded this amendment.

Councillor Staniforth confirmed that she was happy to accept the amendments as was her seconder, Councillor Edwards.

Councillor Edwards was then invited to speak as seconder on the substantive. He outlined that youth services were still losing funding and that this affected not just children, but their siblings and parents. If there were residents in the district that needed help, the council should do all it could to assist. Councillor Staniforth echoes the points made.

The Chair then returned to the substantive motion.

Full Council - 11.05.22

The Council

RESOLVED

That the Council recognises that responsibility for Mental Health Services for Young People is provided by both West Sussex County Council and Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust.

It resolves to request a presentation from West Sussex County Council and NHS Foundation Trust outlining the services currently provided for children and young people in the district and its plans for future provision. The Council (ADC) may wish to identify key priorities to better support the wellbeing of children and young people.

In line with the Constitution at Part 5 – Rules of Procedure (Meetings) - Section 1 – Council Procedure Rules – Rule 11 [Duration of Meetings], a request was made for Councillors to vote on extending the meeting from 10.30 pm to 11.00 pm. At the voting on this was not carried, the meeting was adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 10.31 pm)