



Public Document Pack

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

This meeting will be live streamed – please use this link to access the Full Council web page to watch the meeting - [Arun District Council](#)

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

e-mail: committees@arun.gov.uk

30 April 2024

COUNCIL MEETING

To all Members of the Council

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL to be held on **Thursday 9 May 2024** at **6.00 pm** in **The Council Chamber at The Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF** to transact the business set out below:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "KAR", with a horizontal line underneath.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Philippa Dart." in a cursive style.

Karl Roberts/Philippa Dart
Interim Joint Chief Executives

Any members of the public wishing to address the Committee meeting during Public Question Time, will need to email Committees@arun.gov.uk by **5.15 pm** on **Wednesday, 1 May 2024** in line with current Council Meeting Procedure Rules.

For further information on the items to be discussed, or about attending the meeting or how to find the webcast link, please contact Committees@arun.gov.uk

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and Officers are invited to make any declarations of pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests that they may have in relation to items on this agenda, and are reminded that they should re-declare their interest before consideration of the item or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.

Members and Officers should make their declaration by stating:

- a) the item they have the interest in
- b) whether it is a pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interest
- c) the nature of the interest
- d) if it is a pecuniary or prejudicial interest, whether they will be exercising their right to speak under Question Time

3. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

To receive questions from the public (for a period of up to 15 minutes)

4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS WITH PECUNIARY/PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

To receive questions from Members with pecuniary/prejudicial interests (for a period of up to 15 minutes)

5. PETITIONS (Pages 1 - 32)

To consider any petitions received from the public.

A Petition has been submitted asking the Council to not install ticket machines and/or parking restrictions in the Shrubbs Field car park in Middleton-on-Sea.

As the Petition contains over 1,500 signatures it requires a debate by Full Council.

The procedure in place in the Council's Constitution for such debates confirms:

- The petition organiser will be given 5 minutes (maximum) to present the petition at the meeting.
- The relevant Committee Chair will be given 5 minutes (maximum) for a right of reply.
- Following the presentation of the Petition, Members are invited to debate the Petition for thirty minutes with each Councillor being allowed to speak for a maximum of 3 minutes.

Attached is a report from the Director of Growth and Joint Interim Chief Executive for the Council to consider in holding this debate.

6. MINUTES (Pages 33 - 48)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 13 March 2024, which are attached.

7. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

To receive such announcements as the Chair may desire to lay before the Council.

8. URGENT MATTERS

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.

OFFICER REPORTS

9. APPOINTMENT TO THE POST OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER (Pages 49 - 52)

The report informs members of the process followed by the Chief Executive's Recruitment and Selection Panel for the selection of a permanent Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service and recommends that Full Council confirms the appointment of the Panel's preferred candidate and appoints them as the Council's Returning Officer and its Electoral Registration Officer.

10. CALENDAR OF MEETINGS - 2024/2025 (Pages 53 - 56)

At the last meeting of Full Council, Members received the Calendar of Meetings for 2024/25 for approval.

In debating the calendar, a few concerns were raised regarding some of the dates proposed relating to the Environment and Corporate Support Committees. Subsequently, the dates for two meetings of the Environment Committee were changed from 12 to 19 September 2024 and 27 March to 2 April 2025. Two date changes were requested for the Corporate Support Committee from 6 February to 22 January 2025 and moving 25 March 2024 to a date later in April 2025.

The difficulties in moving these dates were summarised at the meeting and Officers were tasked to consider the requests made and re-present the meetings calendar to the next meeting of Full Council. The updated calendar is attached with changes highlighted.

Council is asked to approve that:

- (1) the dates for the Corporate Support Committee remain as 6 February and 25 March 2025.
- (2) three further changes as set out below are also approved:
 - Licensing Sub-Committee is changed from 8 July to 12 July 2024
 - Full Council is changed from 7 to 6 November 2024; and
 - Planning Committee is changed from 23 April to 8 May 2025

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SERVICE COMMITTEES, REGULATORY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEES AND FROM WORKING PARTIES

11. CONSTITUTION WORKING PARTY - 15 APRIL 2024 (Pages 57 - 66)

The Chair of the Constitution Working Party, Councillor Yeates, will present recommendations from the meeting of the Constitution Working Party held on 15 April 2024.

The minutes from the meeting are attached. The recommendations for the Council to consider can be found at Minute 20 [Sundry Debtors – Debt Management and Write-Off Policy, Reporting Debt Write Offs and Delegation Limits]. The Officer's report is also attached.

12. CORPORATE SUPPORT COMMITTEE - 30 APRIL 2024

The Chair of the Corporate Support Committee, Councillor Oppler, will present recommendations from the meeting of the Corporate Support Committee held on 30 April 2024.

The minutes from this meeting confirming recommendations for Council to consider will be circulated separately to this agenda.

13. MOTIONS

To consider any Motions submitted in accordance with Council Procedure 15.

14. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

To consider general questions from Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14.3.

15. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

Any changes to Committee Memberships that need noting by the Council will be reported at the meeting.

16. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES

The Council is asked to approve any changes to its representation on Outside Bodies.

Note : If Members have any detailed questions, they are reminded that they need to inform the Chair and relevant Director in advance of the meeting.

Note : 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 [PART 8 - CP - Section 5 Filming Photographic Protocol.pdf \(arun.gov.uk\)](#).

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO:	Full Council – 9 May 2024
SUBJECT:	Consideration of a Petition
LEAD OFFICER:	Karl Roberts, Joint Interim CEO and Director of Growth
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Wallsgrove – Chair – Environment Committee
WARDS:	All
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION:	
<p>We will provide safe, well-maintained car parks that meet the needs of residents, shoppers and visitors to Arun, providing support for economic growth, promoting a sustainable environment and creating a positive parking experience.</p> <p>To seek to identify the best way of using the Council’s car park assets to deliver the Arun Council Vision 2022-2026 aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulfilling Arun’s economic potential • Supporting our environment to support us. 	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT:	
<p>The Strategy aims to maximise the use of car parks in a way that supports the needs of businesses, workers, shoppers, commuters, and visitors.</p>	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY:	
<p>The full costs for the proposed changes have now been obtained and the details are set out in the main body of the report.</p> <p>The total cost for the proposed changes equates to £1,971.13 for Shrubbs Field car park. £1,877.53 of the total expenditure has already been committed as purchase orders have been raised for the installation of the machines, required poles and signage and for the necessary machine software.</p>	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The Council’s Petitions Scheme sets out the Council’s adopted procedure for dealing with Petitions that are received by the Council containing signatures in excess of 1,500 signatures.
- 1.2 This report provides Full Council with information to how it wishes to respond to the petition received regarding the Shrubbs Field Car Park in Middleton-on-Sea.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that Full Council considers the petition and the report and confirms how the Council wishes to respond to the Middleton-on-Sea Petition based upon the facts presented.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1 This report accompanies a petition received by the Council on 21 March 2024 entitled “Not to install ticket machines and/ or parking restrictions in the Shrubbs Field car park in Middleton-On-Sea”.

4. DETAIL

- 4.1. A petition was handed into the Council on 21 March 2024 petitioning the Council “not to install ticket machines and/or parking restrictions in the Shrubbs Field Car Park Middleton-on-Sea”.

- 4.2. The Petition contained a total number of 1,985 signatures of which 1,760 have been confirmed as meeting the requirements of the Petitions Scheme and allowing Full Council debate at this meeting.

- 4.3. The process for considering this petition is set out below and confirmed in the Council’s Constitution:

- Petition organiser presents their petition [5 minutes]
- The relevant Committee Chair, in this case the Chair of the Environment Committee, Councillor Wallsgrove, will have a right to reply [5 minutes]
- Councillors to have the opportunity to discuss the petition [maximum of 30 minutes] with each Councillor allowed to speak for a maximum of 3 minutes.
- The length of the debate can be extended at the Chair of the Council’s discretion.
- The Council will decide how to respond to the petition at this meeting. It may decide to take/support the action the petition requests; not to take/support the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate; or to commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant Committee.
- Where the issue is one which a committee is required to make the final decision, the Council will decide to make recommendations to inform that decision.
- The petition organiser will receive written confirmation of this decision with the decision also being published on the council’s web site.

- 4.4. The Environment Committee on 21 November 2023 resolved that:

“Authority be delegated to the Group Head of Technical Services to advertise, consider representation and determine the following proposed amendments to the Parking Order:

...

(c) To agree the installation of parking ticket machines within the three free car parks operated in partnership with Middleton-On-Sea Parish and Felpham Parish Councils.”

The report to Environment Committee stated that this would occur alongside the introduction of a non-return period.

- 4.5. Shrubbs Field car park has for many years had a maximum stay time of 24 hours, but there are practical challenges to enforcing this due to the absence of a non-return period, leaving the car park open to long-staying misuse and vehicles being abandoned.
- 4.6. Arun District Council has some usage data for its car parks from the number of tickets obtained. The Council does not have any usage data for Shrubbs Field car park. Usage data improves the Council’s understanding of how its assets perform and enables the Council to make better informed decisions about its assets.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Middleton-On-Sea Parish Council was consulted ahead of the Environment Committee meeting on 21 November 2023 regarding the proposed changes within Shrubbs Field Car Park. Middleton-On-Sea Parish Council’s comments, which were reported to Environment Committee, are summarised below.
 - a. Middleton-On-Sea Parish Council oppose the introduction of a free parking ticket machine and a no-return period describing it as counterproductive, unnecessary, bureaucratic and self-defeating and citing the following concerns:
 - i. Residents, many are elderly or infirm use the car park when accessing the pharmacy, local shops and Health Centre. They would be required to walk to a machine to get a ticket and then walk back to their car and walk again to where they wish to go – this will cause drivers to park outside of the shops on no parking areas. There is no enforcement in place to stop them.
 - ii. The Parish Council is trying to encourage residents and visitors to use the free car park. These proposals will not allow this to happen.
 - iii. We could have an unused car park with drivers parking on zig-zag lines by pedestrian crossings causing accidents.
 - iv. The car park works without bureaucratic interference, who is ensuring people get a ticket, who is going to ensure that they do not come back within a designated time period. Who will pick up all the tickets that will be thrown away in the car park.
 - v. What about anti-social behaviour and the possible abuse of ticket machine.

- 5.2 The proposed maximum stay time and non-return period consulted on for Shrubbs Field Car Park was proposed, taking account of the needs of local amenities, in particular the doctors' surgery, nursery, recreation ground and shops/food businesses.
- 5.3 Middleton-on-Sea Parish Council, who made representations to the Environment Committee opposing the changes remain opposed to the proposed changes.
- 5.4 West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) as highway authority were consulted on the proposals within the report that went to Environment Committee in November 2023 and no objections were raised. Following further consultation in January 2024 WSSCC raised that their consent is also required for the proposed amendment to the parking order.
- 5.5 The public were consulted between 29 February and 21 March 2024, with a public notice in a local newspaper, within the affected car park, via post across three social media platforms, the front-page of the Council's website, along with an FAQ document explaining the changes proposed which was brought to Ward Members' attention.
- 5.6 Comments received on the proposed changes are captured in Appendix A. A total of 34 responses were received by Arun District Council during this period. All representations were considered as they were received throughout the consultation period and, where appropriate, follow-up enquiries were made to better understand the issues raised.
- 5.7 Concerns and queries have been raised by residents, visitors, employees and businesses regarding the proposed changes, during the consultation period. These have all been carefully considered and are summarised and responded to below:
 - a. Consequent to the representations made it has been decided that the maximum stay time at Shrubbs Field Car Park between 0800-1800 should be increased from the proposed 8 hours to 9 hours. It is now considered that the proposed changes will have a negligible impact on businesses and local facilities and amenities due and will ensure visitors have ample time to utilise the village's amenities.
 - b. Visitors with multiple appointments throughout the day will be able to obtain a ticket for free parking and can come and go during this time provided the ticket is retained and displayed each time upon parking.
 - c. Vehicles will be permitted to park overnight from 1800 to 0800 without needing to display a free pay and display ticket in Shrubbs Field Car Park.
 - d. The impact on carers visiting patients is also considered to be negligible due to the 9-hour free parking period. Carers will be able to obtain a ticket for free parking and can come and go during this time as long as the ticket is retained and displayed each time upon parking.

- e. It is accepted that whilst Buckingham Court have their own car park for their residents, some residents have been parking their cars at Shrubbs Field car park in breach of the existing 24-hour maximum stay time. In order to avoid displacing such vehicles onto the highway, as a transitional measure the operators of Buckingham Court will be offered in the region of 20 parking permits for use within Shrubbs Field Car Park, for a period of one year.
- f. Following the consultation responses and concerns raised by Middleton-On-Sea Parish Council and a Ward Member for Middleton, regarding potential abuse of the ticketing system (via pushing the ticket button repeatedly in protest causing the machines to run out of tickets with the associated environmental impact risk including littering), keypads will be installed on the front of the pay & display machines. Motorists will need to input their vehicle registration details in order to obtain a free ticket. This will reduce the risk of the data collected being tainted by misuse and will significantly reduce the possibility of anti-social behaviour (ASB). This will also reduce ongoing revenue costs as tickets will not need to be replaced as a result of ASB and will also improve enforcement efficiency.
- g. The free parking period offered is considered to be ample for visitors to the villages and the nearby beach and it is considered unlikely that visitors would be displaced onto the highway.
- h. To clarify in response to concerns raised regarding costs of implementing the proposed changes, enforcement of the car park is encompassed under the Council's existing parking enforcement contract and is not an additional cost to Arun District Council. In addition, Arun District Council employ a full-time machine engineer to remedy any machine faults, which is also encompassed under our existing contract.
- i. Personnel working in nearby businesses can park for free in Shrubbs Field Car Park for up to 9 hours. The free parking period is considered sufficient for those working 9am-5pm shifts, or similar. There are no restrictions between 1800-0800, meaning someone starting work after 0900 can park until 0800 the following day. Those people who start work before 0800 can obtain a ticket when they park which will allow them to park for 9 hours from 0800 (as well as any time in advance of 0800).
- j. The data that will be collected from the machines will be usage data. This will provide information on when people use the car park, providing information on the extent to which they are used, as well as on peaks and troughs in usage and will provide Arun District Council with information that can be used to inform future decisions. This includes when the car park is at its busiest. While respondents' suggestions of surveys would provide some data, the proposed changes will provide data every day, which can be subsequently analysed.

- k. Concerns were raised that the proposal was to introduce charges. There are no current proposals to introduce charges for parking in Shrubbs Field Car Park. Any such decision would be a matter for the Environment Committee to consider in the future, as would be the case in respect of any of the Council's car park where charging is not currently in place.
 - l. Concerns were raised regarding on-street parking within the villages on zigzags and yellow lines. The Parking Services team endeavour to reach as many areas of the district as often as possible within the Civil Enforcement Officer resource available. It is not considered that the changes will exacerbate this issue, and civil enforcement officers will be made aware of the concerns raised which can be monitored whilst monitoring the car park.
 - m. Concerns were raised that council tax income is being used to fund these changes and maintenance of this car park. The funding comes from income generated from Council-owned car parks throughout the district.
 - n. Concerns were raised regarding potholes in the highway. These are the responsibility of West Sussex County Council.
- 5.8 As indicated in section 4.7 above, the consultation responses provide evidence that the current 24-hour maximum stay time is regularly breached, with cars remaining in situ for several days/ weeks at a time. To ensure that the parking restrictions can be enforced, the maximum free parking time has been reduced to 23 hours in Shrubbs Field Car Park, as there is no requirement to obtain a ticket between 18:00 and 08:00. Having taken account of the consultation responses and amended the proposal, the decision was taken under delegated authority to proceed with the installation of free ticket machines and amend the parking order, consent for which has been sought from WSCC Highways.

6. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 6.1 Withdrawing the proposed changes. The proposals have been agreed to by the Environment Committee on 21 November 2023 subject to consultation. The consultation comments have been carefully considered and some minor changes have been made to mitigate issues raised. There were no insurmountable issues raised. It is not considered that withdrawing the proposal is appropriate as the benefits of the changes are set out in detail above.
- 6.2 To reduce the free parking time given. Having considered the consultation responses and the representations from the Parish Councils and the doctors' surgery, it was considered this may have a detrimental impact on amenity/risk displacement to the highway. Having considered the consultation responses, the free parking time in Shrubbs Field Car Park has been increased to reflect concerns raised.
- 6.3 To not offer permits to the doctors' surgery and/or Buckingham Court. It was considered appropriate to offer these permits to avoid displacing such vehicles onto the highway and potential disruption to surgery staff.

6.4 To leave the machines without keypads - this would leave the machines open to abuse. A consultation response suggested that the following has been put on to social media - "that locals walking by should just take a ticket or two, has received a large number of "likes", so any data collected at all would be totally unreliable" and Middleton-On-Sea Parish Council raised similar concerns. If people obtain numerous tickets at one time, the usage data collected would be tainted and unreliable. It could also increase the amount of litter in the car park, increasing cleansing costs/unsightliness. While the software upgrade for the machines does have initial outlay costs, these are considered to be mitigated by the collection of reliable usage data, a fully and efficiently enforceable car park, and a significant reduction in the possibility of ASB and cleansing costs.

7. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF FINANCE/SECTION 151 OFFICER

7.1 The full costs for the proposed changes have now been obtained and are set out below:

- a. The installation cost is £150 per machine and the machines themselves are stock and are not an additional cost to the council. There are 2 machines located within Shrubbs Field car park.
- b. The ongoing maintenance and restocking of the machines will be encompassed under our existing car park contract.
- c. The main boards for Shrubbs Field car park were due to be upgraded this year due to weathering and the overall condition deteriorating. The cost for two new boards is £420.33.
- d. The cost for new poles for signage is £365.
- e. The cost for other car park signage is £261.60.
- f. Enforcement within the car park is covered under our exiting car park contract.
- g. Due to unknown usage figures, the cost of tickets for the two machines within Shrubbs Field Car Park is estimated to be £93.76 per year.
- h. To ensure effective and efficient enforcement and to deter anti-social behaviour concerns raised by members of the public and residents during the consultation period, a software upgrade for the five repurposed pay & display machines has been necessary. This upgrade is to add keypads to the front of all machines. Visitors to the car park will need to input their vehicle registration details to obtain a free ticket. The cost for this upgrade is £517.60.

7.2 The total cost for the proposed changes equates to £1,958.29 for Shrubbs Field Car Park.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

8.1. No risk assessment considerations are necessary.

9. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

9.1 The procedure for Full Council to follow when considering the petition is set out at paragraph 4.3 of the report.

9.2 Full Council must decide how to respond to the petition at the meeting, and it may:

- Take the action the petition requests; or
- Not take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate; or
- Commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant committee.

Where the issue is one on which a committee is required to make the final decision, Full Council will decide whether to make recommendations to inform that decision.

9.1 The petition organiser will receive written confirmation of the decision and confirmation will be published on the Council's website.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

10.1 The proposals do not have Human Resource Implications.

11. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

11.1 There are no direct health and safety impacts from the proposed changes to Shrubbs Field Car Park.

12. PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

12.1 The Council's car parks require regular maintenance to ensure that they remain in a good and safe condition to be used by members of the public.

13. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

13.1 The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the Council, when exercising its functions to have due regard to:

- a. The need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010,
- b. The need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share protected characteristics and those who do not; and
- c. Foster good relations between those who have protected characteristics and those who do not.

13.2 Note: 'Protected characteristics' are age, sex, race, disability, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnerships, religion or belief, pregnancy and maternity and gender reassignment.

13.3 The Council is committed to all of the above which will be considered and included within the parking strategy as it is developed improving the quality of life and wellbeing for all residents in respect of socio-economic and health determinants.

13.4 An equality impact assessment has been undertaken which identifies that there is an impact on older users of Shrubbs Field Car Park. All drivers require a certain degree of mobility and memory retention to be able to drive a vehicle safely. Due to the size of Shrubbs Field Car Park, there are two pay and display machines to limit the travel distances to and from the machines. It is considered that the requirement to input a vehicle registration number would not be disadvantageous. The Council also offers free all-day car parking in all its car parks to disabled people displaying a "blue badge". There is not, therefore considered to be an adverse impact on protected characteristics.

13.5 The EIA for the review identifies positive impacts for the following protected groups:

- a. Age – any vulnerable person, regardless of age will be able to access suitable parking for their needs.
- b. Disability – any person with a disability, regardless of their disability will be able to access suitable parking for their needs.

14. CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

14.1 The proposals are not considered to have a detrimental environmental impact.

15. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

15.1 Shrubbs Field Car Park currently holds the "Park Mark" award. The Safer Parking Scheme is managed by the British Parking Association (BPA) on behalf of Police Crime Prevention Initiatives Ltd. A Park Mark is awarded to parking facilities that have met the requirements of a risk assessment conducted by local police. These requirements mean the parking operator has put measures in place to help deter criminal activity and anti-social behaviour, thereby doing everything they can to prevent crime and reduce the fear of crime in their parking facility.

15.2 Good design, effective lighting, CCTV and increasing their use can be useful in deterring crime and anti-social behaviour.

16. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

16.1 The proposals do not adversely impact on human rights.

17. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

17.1 There are no specific Freedom of Information or Data Protection Consideration issues arising from the proposals of this report.

17.2 Any personal data will be handled in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulations and in line with the requirements of the Petitions Scheme set out in the Council's Constitution.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name: Lisa Emmens
Job Title: Parking Services Manager
Contact Number: 01903 737500

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

[Report to Environment Committee on 21 November 2023](#)

[Minutes of Environment Committee meeting 21 November 2023](#)

[Record of Delegated Decision - Free car parks](#)

Appendix of consultation responses - [Consultation Results](#)

[Equalities Impact Assessment - Free Car Park Change](#)

Number	Related Car Park	Changes to Free Car Parks	Comments
1	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>Surely this has not been given enough thought, by charging for parking in the only carpark for our village it will cause chaos when the field is being used for football events, village fete, and other events in the village. The other roads in the area that don't already have restrictions are generally private estates and quite narrow, for some residents the car park is the only place available for their vehicle.</p> <p>I do ask that this proposal is quietly dropped.</p> <p>Before anyone says don't use a car not everyone is capable of walking or cycling, no buses are available on Sundays</p>
2	Grassmere/ Links Avenue	Against	<p>I understand Arun District Council have said they will be installing two ticket machines at Grassmere and one at Links Avenue from the 1st April this year, the tickets will be for 8 hours and this will enable ADC to find out who is using the car park and for how long.</p> <p>In my view having a fee paying car park will be damming for the village, imagine your in the dentist or hairdressers and your ticket runs out. I imagine St Marys Church is upset over this as well, it is wrong for people to pay to leave flowers on a grave or to visit the church.</p> <p>At this time when money is tight spending £3000+ to install each machine is a waste of council payers money. Then there is also the cost of an ADC employee checking and maintaining these machines.</p> <p>It is hard enough as it is for the Felpham shop owners and then putting this in place will cause the end of retail shops in Felpham.</p> <p>Also it will upset local house owners as cars will start to be parked in local streets causing home owners having to park away from their homes</p> <p>I hope as a council you will listen to local people and realise there are better ways of spending our money and this nonsense is stopped.</p>
3	All	Against	<p>This will dramatically affect the activities of all people using this facility to go about their daily lives & pastimes.. it's hard enough for our local businesses to build back up lost trade and encourage people to start getting on side! there must be other ways to bring in revenue!!</p> <p>We've lived locally for over 50 years and contributed so many voluntary hours in support of the next generation!! Help protect their future and that of our villages..</p>
4	Grassmere/ Links Avenue	Against	<p>I am writing this e mail regarding the idea that you have of installing machines into Grassmere Car Park and Links Avenue Car Park on 1st April this year, so that you can see who is using the car park and for how long.</p> <p>I find this idea an absolute waste of taxpayers money and the reasons for not continuing with this action are noted below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Each machine is costing £3,00 and there will be two machines at Grassmere and one at Links Avenue, that is without the cost of a days work to someone installing them. 2.There are other ways much cheaper to find out usage at a car park (strips across the entrance etc) 3.The car park at Grassmere is used by people who visit the church, the hairdressers, the dentists and St Marys Hall which has a number of events there daily, especially at weekends. We cannot allow this small village to suffer and die due to car park charges. At the Gateway Lodge opposite Grassmere there is a continual influx at the car park of carers for the elderly at this warden assisted building, why should they be burdened. 4.I fully believe that ADC intention is to use these machines at a later date to charge on parking, what I cannot foresee is after a number of months ADC removing the machines and saying there is not a need for them. Come on ADC we are not stupid. 5.I agree that Links Avenue car park is full of garage cars parked there off road, however I do believe that Felpham Parish Council need to take a firmer grip on this problem. I have also been told that University students park at Grassmere, if this is true then it is another problem that Felpham Parish Council need to take in hand. 6.The local people are up in arms already about installing machines at these sites, and will remember this issue at the polling stations. <p>I ask you to reconsider your actions on this and to look elsewhere at your saving costs for ADC, this is not a good move for you to do.</p>
5	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>I would like to register my opposition to the plan to start charging for parking in the Shrubbs Car Park adjacent to the playing field and Village Hall.</p> <p>Whwn there is several football matches taking place on the playing field over a weekend there is a great number of vehicles making use of the car park, if charging is introduced it will promaote a lot of on road parking, of which there is a very limited amount available. All it will do is cause a lot of annoyance to local residents of the surrounding area. Likewise a similar problem would arise when there is a function in the Village Hall.</p> <p>With a Doctors Surgery on site, are you expecting the patients who are attending an appointment to pay?, yet another penalty for being unwell.</p> <p>So please register my onjection to the plan to charge for parking in Shrubbs Field Car Park.</p>
6	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>I understand that the council plans to introduce parking charges at the Shrubbs Field Car Park.</p> <p>I wish to register my objection to this proposal for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.As a resident in (a retirement block of flats), often people are unable to park in our car park as there are only 37 spaces serving two blocks of flats. Many of the residents with cars have restricted mobility for a number of medical conditions, and when our car park is full we use the Shrubbs Field car park. The only alternative is to park in Shrubbs Drive, although this is almost impossible as there are often three motorhomes parked there. 2.In my opinion, shared by many residents, will cause additional strain on our car park as all visitors and carers will use it, instead of using the Shrubbs Field Car Park opposite, which we have already had many attempts to discourage, despite signs "Residents parking only". 3.Additionally, I believe this move will adversely affect our local businesses, and the Medical Centre located within the car park. 4.I also believe this will cause a large increase in parking in the local residential areas which will, I am sure, result in parking disputes, and in more parking on double yellow lines. 5.Finally, the council has made this decision without public advanced notice. If it had not been for someone seeing this on the council website, at this time we would be completely unaware of this action. <p>Furthermore, I understand that all councils are looking at where they can make financial cuts and ways of generating revenue, but this will penalise those of us that pay council taxes. The car park is well used by people outside the Middleton-on-sea area. With this in mind, would it not be possible to offer local residents (especially those of us with mobility difficulties, either a free 'parking permit', or at the very least a 'concession permit' for a small annual fee?</p> <p>I feel very strongly that this move by the council will cause many problems with parking issues and disputes to local residents, not only in (a retirement block of flats), but also especially Shrubbs Drive. Of course, not to mention the probable impact to our local businesses and the Avisford Medical Centre.</p>
7	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>I look forward to your comments and response to the possibility of some kind of "concession" for local residents.</p> <p>I am a resident at the block of flats at (a retirement block of flats) in Shrubbs Drive right opposite the car park.</p> <p>As there aren't enough car parking spaces in the residents car park I often have to park in the free car park during the day and overnight.</p> <p>I strongly object to any restrictions as regards parking or any charges.</p> <p>It means myself, plus many others, will have to park in the road at Shrubbs Drive. This will cause all sorts of issues, not least the impact on the residents there.</p> <p>Can you think about a dispensation for residents such as myself like a season ticket or residents parking permit system?</p> <p>Can I add my voice to reconsider this decision. Please feel free to contact me if you would like further input from myself.</p> <p>Thank you for your reconsideration.</p>

			<p>The proposed changes to the Shrubbs Field car park at Middleton on Sea, that would require all cars to have to obtain a printed ticket will deter people from using the car park. It is likely to lead to visitors choosing to park on streets nearby, which is already an issue for local residents. I believe that the proposed changes are not user friendly and will deter people from using local businesses, with individuals choosing to drive to areas offering easy use free parking instead. I certainly would not choose to park there if these proposed changes were implemented.</p> <p>I would also question how much revenue is expected to be generated from a small community car park, and the trustworthiness of any parking firm selected to enforce these new rules.</p> <p>The car park is utilised by those using the surgery, attending activities at the Jubilee Hall and Scout Hall, and for those visiting the convenience store, gift shop and new coffee shop across the road.</p> <p>Drivers visiting the Jubilee Hall in order to drop off children to the preschool or Scouts are unlikely to use the car park due to having to get a ticket first and concerns regarding returning to the car park to pick people up after 4 hours. Having to find a working ticket machine once parked, and then return to the car once a ticket is obtained is incredibly inconvenient for those with small children (likely to be using the preschool or surgery) and those with mobility issues. It feels thoughtless and an opportunity to catch people out and make money from them. There will be many completely innocent individuals who are caught out by this system. How on earth can visiting a car park twice within a certain timeframe require additional payment or be deemed worthy of a fine?</p> <p>Given upcoming elections, this blatant attempt to exploit users of local car parks feels incredibly unwise. I would strongly advise against changing the current parking at this car park.</p>
8	Shrubbs Field Grassmere/ Links Avenue	Against	
9		Against	<p>My Dad lives in (a retirement block of flats). He is 93 and I visit him sometimes up to three times a day. Given you say I can't return, where should I park? I often have to bring him shopping which prohibits parking further afield.</p> <p>I am responding to your article regarding the pay meters in the Felpham and Middleton Area.</p> <p>As I local resident I would like to address your comment about this scheme supporting local business and residents.</p> <p>I can not express how problematic it is to park in the lay-by at the front of the row of a terraced houses and those opposite. Particularly in the Summer at weekends, it is impossible to park as it is already and will only increase congestion along Links Avenue further with residents scrabbling over parking that has no restrictions. This said, evenings and weekdays it dies down but as residents will have limited parking 24 hours a day, every day.</p> <p>Will you be supplying residents permit parking to combat this issue?</p> <p>We must have somewhere that we can leave our vehicles and Barn Mews, Links Avenue and the lay-by outside is problematic as it is.</p> <p>If your defence is combating abandoned vehicles why can't they have a FPN issued and penalise them directly as I have seen the CEO's do previously.</p> <p>There are petitions in place within the surrounding businesses as it will affect day trade along the beach. So as a resident with first hand experience of the parking situation I can not agree with your statement that it will improve anything for local businesses and residents unless we can have a solution that is not taking away more parking for those that live and work here.</p> <p>Thank you for your reply.</p> <p>Although if this goes ahead in the long run every person who lives locally with no off street parking may aswell have to sell their vehicles because visitors will take up the advantage of street parking even more so.</p> <p>In the winter and mid week the car park will be empty so I'm yet to be convinced this is for the interest of the residents and businesses in the local community.</p> <p>Please ensure the comments are included in the consultation as I'm sure there will be many of the same.</p>
10	All	Against	
11	All	Against	<p>ADC are currently proposing to restrict parking at Grassmere & Shrubbs car parks to a max 8 hours per day with no return within 2 hours from 8am to 6pm.</p> <p>This raises a number of concerns:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Where do you suggest that people who are at work locally for more than 8 hours per day (including lunch breaks) between 8am & 6pm (10 hours!) and currently park in these car parks are expected to park their vehicles from 1 April? 2.The No Return within 2 hours means that anyone working locally cannot return to the car park if they wish to leave the car park for their lunch break or a personal appointment, collect children from school etc. 3.Where do the likes of solicitors, estate agents etc who are constantly in and out of their offices during the day park after they leave the car park for the first time each day and return to their office within 2 hours? 4.Currently I can park at Grassmere for my haircut appointment and return later at a time suitable to me to visit a shop, cafe, dentist or walk the dog. In future I will have to wait 2 hours before returning and have to remember this stupid 2 hour rule. So any appointments made in the village must be at least 2 hours apart from leaving the car park! How long is an appointment? 5.Shrubbs car park has the doctors surgery within it. This means you can't park for 2 hours before or after a doctors appointment or visit to request or collect prescriptions etc <p>I cannot see what benefit there is to either Felpham or Middleton villages by restricting parking. It will deter visitors, it will make it more difficult for employers to attract staff and the shops, restaurants, cafes etc will likely lose trade and in the worst case scenario their business. We already have the Felpham Village Post Office closing at lunchtime every day. Making parking more difficult will not encourage a thriving village.</p> <p>Apart from Special Events, such as last years Felpham Halloween Walk, I have never been unable to find a parking space in either Grassmere or Shrubbs car parks between the hours of 8-6 during the 25+ years I have lived in Felpham.</p> <p>Please reconsider and for once apply some common sense. If ADC really need ticket machines make them available for any time 8am-6pm with no return restrictions.</p>
12	Grassmere/ Links Avenue	Against	<p>I would prefer these car parks to remain free of charge and be maintained by the councils with funds generated via local council taxes.</p> <p>The Grassmere car park in Felpham is mainly used by those attending events at the local halls or visiting the health centre and local shops/pubs/restaurants. Charging at these centres will be damaging to both local centres.</p> <p>The other car park in Felpham seems to be entirely misused and is rarely available for local parking. It would improve safety if it was easier to park at this end of the village as the current on street parking appears dangerous.</p> <p>Please consider the health of our local communities before installing ticketing systems.</p>
13	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>The one civic amenity in Middleton-on-Sea is the free car park. By installing these machines it is not far from them becoming paid tickets. This is not acceptable. Petition is being driven by residents to stop these money grubbing effort by ADC.</p> <p>Please rethink this idea.</p>
14	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>I wish to register my objection to the above proposal for the Shrubbs Field Car Park in Middleton-on-sea, on the basis that, even at a small cost, it is a complete waste of taxpayer's money. Unfortunately, the minutes of the Environment Committee meeting on 21 November 2023 do not give the full details of the proposal, but they do show that the local view has been completely dismissed. I have not spoken to a single resident, local trader, user of the adjacent halls, or the doctor's surgery who is in favour of the introduction of a ticket machine, even if it remains free to park. I see that the ticketing restrictions will only apply between 8am - 6pm, and that the free tickets will be for an 8 hour period. If that is the case, then what data can be expected to be collected, which is stated as the reason for the introduction of the ticket machines. The only data that can be obtained is how many tickets have been taken from the machine - whether that is for a 5 minute visit to the shops, a trip to the surgery, a 2-3 hour group meeting at one of the local halls, or someone parking there all day cannot be ascertained. Indeed, you should be made aware that a suggestion on social media, that locals walking by should just take a ticket or two, has received a large number of "likes", so any data collected at all would be totally unreliable.</p> <p>Then there is the question of enforcement. Will more taxpayer's money be spent on enforcement officers patrolling the car park to see who hasn't taken a ticket? The proposal that fines will be issued to people who don't take, or forget to obtain, a free ticket becomes more ludicrous the more one thinks about it!</p> <p>In the 8 years that I have now lived in the village I have only ever seen the car park full when the village fete is on, or when Felpham Colts have a football tournament on the field - both once a year occurrences. At all other times there is always adequate parking and there has been no evidence of any abandoned vehicles - I am sure it would quickly be reported on social media and to the council if there was. What has been reported regularly is the number of people who park on double yellow lines, or on the zig-zag markings for the pedestrian crossing, outside the convenience store opposite the car park. If people can't be bothered to use the free car park when they don't need a ticket, it doesn't take too much imagination to see what could happen when they do, especially if the machines are as far in the opposite direction as they shop they want to quickly visit. In closing, can I please appeal for some common sense to be applied to this proposal so that my, and other taxpayer's money, is well used and not wasted in this way.</p>

15	Grassmere/ Links Avenue	Against	<p>My company has an office (in Felpham), I have noted your car park policy for Links Avenue changes on 1st April 2024.</p> <p>Two of my female staff park in this car park for 9 hours each day as it is 2 minutes walk from our office, as a local business I wondered if there was any way of obtaining a free car park place for 10 hours each day? Parking in Felpham is hard enough and my Operators are worrying about where they will park as residential parking spaces are almost impossible to find?</p> <p>As all my staff are female and some finish at 1am so parking close to our office is essential to ensure there safety.</p> <p>Please let me know if such a free parking scheme for local businesses could be looked into, say one free parking pass for each local business?, this would appease local businesses and stop local residents getting upset about local workers parking outside their properties.</p> <p>We would be happy to have an allocated bay outside our current premises, if this is easier?</p>
16	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>I am emailing to express my severe and extreme concern over the proposed parking machines at Shrubbs Drive car park. There is already a very well known problem of vehicles parking outside the One Stop on the zig zags of the pedestrian crossing, blocking the junction to the flats next to the pharmacy and parking on the double yellows outside the mandarin chef. This is because people are too lazy to use the free car park. How do you think these ticket machines will help the situation at all? You really don't need to 'collect usage data' to that extent, you could achieve this by conducting parking surveys at various times of the day/week should you really need that information. This method is suitable for car parking capacity surveys required by planning officers and WSCC highways planning consults, so a random sample should be sufficient for ADC's limited requirement for 'decision making about changes to the car park' - how often can you need to make difficult and complex decisions about these car parks?!! We don't need restrictions on how long people park there for, there are always plenty of spaces available at all times of the day, week and year, with the very odd exception of annual events like the summer fete. Having to unload my two children into prams is already a hassle to pop to One Stop/the doctors/ the pharmacy for a few minutes, and having to go and get a pointless ticket for absolutely no reason adds to further stress and is absolutely unnecessary and unacceptable to be expected to do this. Even in bognor and Littlehampton we can get an annual parking disc to at least save the environment and not waste paper or time/effort at stupid machines. Why don't you propose a free parking disc for 8 hours, that the local shops can give out? I think the decision to put these machines in shows that clearly ADC intend to charge for the car park in the future, which is disgraceful as it will further deter parking within the car park and create even more parking issues on street. It is already dangerous at times to cross the road even with the pedestrian crossing, because of dangerous parking, and adding to the inconvenience of using the car park for already lazy drivers will further exacerbate the issue. Tax payers money, and ADC's time and effort would be much better spent educating drivers on safe parking, and monitoring, ticketing and patrolling the existing unsafe on-street parking practices that occur. This pointless exercise in making everyone obtain an irrelevant ticket is wasting paper, time, effort and money on complete nonsense. I have lived in Middleton for 30+ years and have only ever seen one abandoned car in Shrubbs car park, so not really what I would call a justifiable reason for a ticket machine. Please rethink this nonsensical proposal...</p>
17	Grassmere	Against	<p>With regard to the proposed parking restrictions in Grassmere car park in Felpham.</p> <p>I have a predicament and would appreciate your advice.</p> <p>I work in Felpham village for 3 days each week.</p> <p>I arrive at the car park at approximately 8 20 am as I have to be in the shop in time to set up for the days trading as we open at 9 am. The shop closes at 4 30 pm and after spending time cashing up and securing the safety of the shop, I usually get back to the car park at approximately 5 pm.</p> <p>Within the guidelines of your new policy re the the car park, I would be parked there for over the 8 hours maximum parking limit.</p> <p>I'm sure I'm not the only person amongst the village traders who will be in this situation when the new regulations come into force.</p> <p>I'd be grateful if you could advise me as to what you think I should do about this. Obviously I can't leave the shop after 8 hours to move my car to a side street as often I am alone in the shop and we are still within our trading hours. Nor do I think that parking all day in a side street will be beneficial for the neighbouring residents.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing your thoughts on this matter and please do reply as this is of great concern to me.</p>
18	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>There are many issues that need addressing in our area - and wouldn't it be nice if those were tackled!</p> <p>So why, when there are such financial and social pressures on residents and councils are ADC even considering the ticket machines in Shrubbs Drive car park? Due to the limited safe and legal on-street parking in the area, this car park is vital:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for those attending the Health Centre and the pharmacy; bearing in mind patients of Avisford Medical Centre often have to travel from Yapton to this site, so the surgery is therefore not on their doorstep or within walking distance - for the health and wellbeing of those attending fitness and social classes /events at Jubilee Hall, the Scout Hall and Shrubbs Field - for the safety of the children attending playgroups / events whose parents have to drive there as it's beyond walking distance - for the outside exercise and fun that children need from visits to the playpark and Shrubbs Field. <p>No-one is fooled by the free tickets scenario - we are all aware that once these machines are installed, it's only a matter of time before they will become pay machines. There is not a problem in that car park; there are always spaces and people park considerately. If dumped cars or whatever the given excuse is, become an issue, then let it be dealt with on an as-and-when basis. The council is simply looking to raise money, in what feels like an underhand way, that is detrimental to residents' health and wellbeing and the environment (all those paper tickets) for absolutely no genuine reason.</p> <p>Shame on you Arun District Council!</p>
19	Grassmere	Against	<p>I have seen that you have put up a sign in St Marys car park threatening to put in expensive machines to monitor how the car parks are used.</p> <p>This is plainly a ploy to put in cash machines! You have a massive petition on its way to you ready for the closing date. I sincerely hope that you have not spent our council tax payers money on machines that cost £3000 without listening to your voters.</p>
20	Grassmere	Against	<p>I (work in Felpham) and as such come and go a number of times during the day. How can I avoid the no return in 2 hours if I need to come back within that time????</p> <p>Why are you going to the expense of installing machines and having wardens visit every 2 hours whilst not receiving any income? Who pays for this? The local tax payer???</p>

21	Grassmere	Against	<p>I am writing in response to your notice that you are introducing a 'free' 8 hour parking regulation in Grassmere Close car park from 1st April 2024.</p> <p>I live in (Felpham) at the end of Grassmere Close and we are all very concerned regarding this. Firstly no-one in Felpham that I have spoken to believes that this is to monitor usage of the car parks as we believe that this is the pre-cursor to paid parking in Felpham which will decimate local businesses, which ADC purport to support.</p> <p>One of the issues is that you have implemented a 'no return within 2 hours' policy. This will seriously affect the carers who attend to our elderly in Felpham Village in Gateway Lodge. The carers will not be able to return within two hours, how will this affect their patients? Many of the carers attend more than one patient at different times.</p> <p>The issue that we will find in (Felpham) is that people will start to park in our parking which is for the houses in our cul de sac. Many of the residents living here are elderly and they need to be able to park near their houses - how do you propose to stop this - will you make this small parking bay residents only and then monitor this when you are monitoring the Grassmere Close car park? We have already seen this happen when you closed the car park and, whilst I understand that most people will not be affected by this, until you start to charge which I know you will, there are only 6 parking bays for all of our houses and any additional people parking will affect us hugely</p> <p>This is a vote losing policy hiding behind pretense that cars are 'dumped' in the car park - which I can assure you is not true as I can see the car park from my house.....</p>
22	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>Can I please say that as a user of the car park for three years now I have never had a problem so I am very confused as to what ADC are trying to fix. As a resident of (a retirement block of flats in Middleton-On-Sea), we have used the car park as an overspill car park. We have not been chased out on a day to day basis but the proposed changes will force us to on road parking to avoid having to get a ticket at 8am and have to drive around for 2 hours in the afternoon before we can return. It appears that there is some kind of parking concession on Shrubbs Drive as it is constantly used to park 3 motor homes and also often coaches park there. Where does ADC suggest we old age pensioners go to park bearing in mind our age and health.</p>
23	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>I'm sure you're getting a lot of emails about this. My point is that there is a surgery in the car park. People don't go to the doctor unless they are ill, why penalise those who drive there and need to park?</p> <p>The Green Party wants us all to use the buses. Services are being cut, so are the council expecting us to wait in the rain, wind, and cold for restricted services whilst ill, to avoid using the car park? We all know that the free tickets will soon change to paid ones.</p> <p>Plus penalising the elderly residents in the flats opposite the car park who will need to keep coming out to put tickets on their cars as the times run out.</p> <p>Arun residents are currently getting such a raw deal from the council on so many levels despite having to pay our increasing council taxes, for which we get road gridlocks, destruction of the environment by over development, endless sink holes and potholes to negotiate, flooded roads, sewage running into homes.....perhaps less greed and apathy and more duty of care to us all might be a good idea.</p>
24	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>I wish to register my objection to this ludicrous scheme. To install ticket machines in a free car park that serves a medical centre, a community hall and a scout hut for no purpose other than to force users to display a ticket in their car is a complete and utter waste of time, money and resources. I respectfully suggest those responsible for this hare-brained scheme should be removed from office at the earliest opportunity as they are an embarrassment to Arun District Council.</p>
25	Grassmere	Against	<p>I have recently just started a new job in Felpham within walking distance from the Grassmere Close car park.</p> <p>I now understand that parking charges are going to be introduced at this carpark imminently.</p> <p>Once I have paid out for parking charges to yourselves, it hardly seems worth me working at minimum wage as most of my earnings will be heading its way to the council coffers just for the privilege of being there!</p> <p>Is there an alternative that can be suggested for parking in that area? I would like to hear that! Also, if/when this is introduced, how would it work?</p> <p>We are all currently strapped for cash, and I begrudge giving the council my hard earned money.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you regarding this matter.</p>
26	Grassmere	Against	<p>I have just become aware of plans to introduce a maximum stay period at some car parks in the Bognor area, including Grassmere Car Park. I currently park in that car park for work, and my car is parked in that car park for over 8 hours each day which will mean that I will constantly overstay the maximum period and therefore I will be liable to receive PCN's.</p> <p>Is there not any provision for employees of local businesses to receive special permits to avoid charges? On your website it states this will ensure availability for residents - however residents will not be able to park here all day if they already do due to the fact they would exceed the 8 hours maximum stay if they do not move their car.</p> <p>This car park doesn't have much of an issue, if any, with abandoned vehicles as most people who park there either work for local businesses or they are visiting them.</p>
27	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>I write to you to register my disgust at the proposed car parking charges proposed at Shrubbs car park in Middleton on Sea. It is becoming ridiculous that the council are bankrupting local businesses with their parking fees.</p> <p>There have been numerous complaints sent to you for the illegal parking outside the One Stop and it has already been in the Express online due to the fact that neither the council deal with the matter nor the police! The parking machines will only exacerbate this. It will also affect the Middleton Elmer Road during the summer months where cars come to the beach and park on the double yellow lines all the way to Elmer which is not regularly policed by Arun.</p> <p>I should like to know how much this will be costing us tax payers for you to implement this parking as in these current times, I thought there were huge cutbacks in council funding and feel this is wasting tax payers money.</p> <p>Please do let me know the reasoning behind charging for parking? It will surely mean people will choose to park in residential roads rather than pay!</p> <p>I can honestly say that the council really has no interest in local business and saving them from going under. We will all be shopping in trade parks where it is free parking or purchasing more online to avoid the hefty parking charges which constantly increase year on year.</p> <p>I absolutely am against this ridiculous installation and totally object to it. In these difficult times of recession, the council really need to be looking into other matters and not constantly charging people for parking. Maybe invest in filling in the potholes and making our roads safer would be a very good start. Please provide me with the costings? I am asking for this by way of a freedom of information request.</p>
28	Grassmere/ Links Avenue	Against	<p>I would like to lodge an objection to the proposed changes/charges to the 2 car parks in Felpham Village - Links Avenue & Grassmere.</p> <p>I live in (a retirement block of flats), where we only have 16 car parking spaces for 50 flats and although at least half the residents of the Flats do not own cars, it still means that often I cannot park in our own car park so use the Grassmere car park, sometimes overnight.</p> <p>If that car park becomes ticketed, is it intended that local residents would be given some kind of permit to allow us to use the car park if our own (retirement block of flats) car park is full?</p> <p>I also feel it would be a very negative step for the Village, where local businesses are struggling to survive. If it becomes a paying car park it will further deter people from coming to the village to support the local businesses/cafes etc.</p> <p>I would ask that you consider these points before coming to any decision.</p>

29	Grassmere/ Links Avenue	Against	<p>I am writing to put in an objection and point of view regarding this change in our car park . Links avenue Grassmere I am not commenting on others as they do not affect me and I feel that it is not my place to. Felpham links : Details</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am a resident (in Felpham) my house is one of the many older houses on that road with no off road parking having been built in the 1800's as are (other properties in the area). 2. We use the lay-by opposite and parking down barn field which has no restrictions on it for time (we have campaigned to maintain that jas do all our neighbours in that area both in the flats and houses by the lay-by . 3. Some times after work I have to park in links avenue car park from 4pm on a Thursday for example but I do not work on a Friday . Currently I can move my car before 4pm and it is all ok . Under the new system I would have to go to the car park and obtain a ticket repeatedly. <p>My concerns are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. People visiting the beach or shops will now use the local lay-by and parking instead of the car park due to the time limit if you are eg visiting family or at the beach . 2. Local people who do not have off road parking will be put under pressure for parking by this 3. Our visitors will have to return to their car repeatedly to fill the machine - currently they have 24 hours or they can park in grasmere a ten minute walk not ideal but a solution which also is changing . 4. Our neighbourhood has aprox 15 families around the lay-by with parking needs , we all manage currently to respectfully park and negotiate parking between us . 5. I know that people are concerned about how many vehicles the garage Park in the car park - I feel this is a separate issue to be taken up with the garage and that a warden could control if possible. I can see it is an issue <p>This is a concern as many families like ours work and need to be able to park locally and this change will impact us greatly.</p> <p>My suggestions : 1. For that car park we could buy a yearly car pass or discs that would give us 24 or 48 hours parking like the ones you have in bognor so the traffic warden would know we are not there permanently and if as I suspect visitors to the beach are using our free parking spaces we will at least be able to park after work knowing we do not have to return. Or 2. 1 per household with no off road parking could buy a yearly pass for the car park like a permit either vehicle specific or interchangeable that means we can continue to manage our parking but you can limit how many of us have them.</p>
30	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>I wanted to Register my objection to the proposed ticket machine at the car park in Middleton on sea.</p> <p>It makes no sense on so many different levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The costs involved in installing the machines at a time when we are all told that the council is facing funding difficulties. The money would be better spent fixing potholes. 2. The extra staff costs in policing the area. 3. People visiting the beaches currently use the car park. Setting time limits and issuing fines would mean that they would likely park dangerously in neighbouring roads. 4. No one believes that this move won't lead to parking charges being introduced at a later date with all the ramifications that this implies. 5. It will be detrimental to local businesses. For example, I currently use the car park to pop into One Stop. If I have to get a ticket, regardless of whether it is free or not, I may as well drive up to Tesco opposite the Southdown. Same goes for the chemist. 6. People will find that the two halls serviced by the car park will be less attractive to hire. The same goes for sports teams using the field <p>I hope that the elected councils takes all of the objections into account when making their decision.</p>
31	Grassmere	Against	<p>I understand that you are considering charging for car parking in Felpham village outside the St Mary's centre and I would like to send in my objections to this move. The village already struggles to attract people to the shops and charging for parking would just make this worse. Many people use the facilities at the adjoining St Mary's Centre and having to pay car parking charges in addition to the fees for the fitness classes etc could well price out many of the people who enjoy these facilities, especially the elderly on limited incomes. People attending services in the church would also be adversely affected.</p> <p>Finally, I know some people living in the Gateway Lodge Retirement Apartments and they often need to use this car park as there is very limited parking on the site. The added costs would make this very difficult, especially on the occasions when they need to park overnight.</p> <p>I hope you will bear these points in mind as you make your decision.</p>

32	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>Thank you for your reply below confirming some details of the proposed changes to free car parks in Middleton (Shrubbs Field) and Felpham (Grassmere & Links Ave) and the current consultation. Please accept this response as a comment in reply to the consultation. I would like to submit that this proposal for 'free' ticket machines is seriously flawed and, if you proceed, will immediately give rise to maladministration claims against the Council, for which the Environment Committee and its leadership, as well as responsible officers, will get the blame. This will be on the grounds of gross irresponsibility in imposing parking restrictions in complete, self-acknowledged ignorance of how the car parks are used and causing severely disruptive negative impacts on existing legitimate long-stay users, including residents and local businesses. In my original email (below) I asked whether you think it is a reasonable way to treat elderly and likely vulnerable residents of retirement complexes neighbouring these cars parks, who legitimately use these car parks (by ADC planning design), to force them to leave their homes every single morning before 8am, in all weathers, regardless of their health or mobility, to put a 'free' ticket on their car so it can remain where it's parked next to their homes? You didn't answer that, but I hope you are considering it. Because that is what you are proposing to do. Worse, these people will later every single day, regardless, then be forced to move their car out of that car park, given the proposed operating hours of 8am - 6pm is a ten hour period, but a 'free' ticket only valid for 8 hours. Coupled with a no return period of two hours, where do you propose these people park their cars instead for that period of the day? If you don't know where, and you don't know how many will be affected - and it appears you know neither - then you cannot proceed responsibly with this proposal, because the result in these villages could be chaos and huge problems for residents, visitors and traffic more generally. Occasionally-used cars legitimately parked in these cars parks without a problem will instead be parked all over the streets. It's not just elderly local residents. You are going to require the same of their visitors, relatives, carers and others who visit them and may perhaps stay for a few days. Forcing cars to move every day that would otherwise likely stay parked for much of the week is also not a very green way to conduct policy and must contradict the council's aims to reduce climate change emissions. Is it permissible for the Council to introduce policies that can only increase emissions, in a declared climate emergency? In addition, what account have you taken of those who, quite normally, work locally to these cars parks for an eight hour shift - say 9am - 5pm - and naturally need to arrive slightly before, and leave slightly after? They will instead need to come out of work every single day and move their cars elsewhere, or risk an abusively large Penalty Charge Notice for slightly overstaying the free ticket period. Why can't they be allowed to work their shift without this inconvenience? Notwithstanding residents and business staff, you are also going to require everyone who pops to the shops in these villages to do a merry dance obtaining free tickets. This in itself causes problems. For example, someone who drops off dry cleaning in Felpham village, obtaining a free ticket, will not be able to return for at least two hours to pick it up again. I can also offer a personal example. A relative of mine drove to the GP surgery, located in the Shrubbs Field car park Middleton, and was immediately taken by ambulance to hospital, where she stayed overnight. Under your proposal, she would also have been hit with a massive Penalty Charge Notice, when she eventually returned to her car, and would have been forced additionally through the stress of appealing, which may not even have proved successful. What account have you taken of people in these circumstances, given the GP surgery located in the Shrubbs Field car park? Have you even spoken with GP surgery staff about how they and their patients use the car park? There are a huge number of practical problems to these proposals that will cause severe disruption and inconvenience to local residents. You have admitted you have no idea how many such people will be impacted, or how badly, which then makes the proposals irresponsible. I do appreciate that there is a problem with overstayers, especially in the Links Ave car park in Felpham. Possibly in the other car parks, Shrubbs Field (Middleton) and Grassmere (Felpham), but no-one ever reports an inability to obtain spaces there. I certainly never have a problem. Everyone who uses Links Ave can see very clearly which cars/vans are always there. Why do you not take direct action against those? This problem should be dealt with by the council in many other possible ways, including enforcement of existing 24hr max stay rules, that does not involve massively inconveniencing entire villages at also additional cost to the Council. Why not deal with the actual problem, rather than cause hassle for everyone else who is using the car parks legitimately? Your priorities appear completely wrong. When I asked previously (below) about costs, you referred only to the machines and an engineer. What about fault repairs? What about the running costs of all the tickets? What about the extra enforcement? It appears you have not considered all the extra costs this proposal will heap on council taxpayers, for no gain. If you are worried about the costs of operating these free car parks, why make that worse? I believe it is unacceptable to propose to abuse and inconvenience thousands of local residents, their visitors, carers, shoppers, users of the GP surgery (in Middleton) and others merely to 'gather data' or resolve a problem with overstayers that could be tackled many other ways. Your statement about 'data gathering' effectively admits you are doing this in ignorance. It suggests you have no clue how many usage examples of the types I have mentioned above occur. How many people will be impacted. How many people's routines severely disrupted. That is what will give rise to maladministration claims, because it is very evidently irresponsible governance and there are many other ways you could gather this usage data or tackle the overstaying problem other than erecting barriers to, and inconveniencing, thousands of people in the delicate commercial ecosystem of our villages who are using the car parks legitimately and fairly. These proposals are unreasonable on residents, unfair on local business staff, ill-considered in a range of other ways and likely very disruptive and damaging to the communities, for all costs and no gains that could not easily be achieved other ways that avoid such a widespread negative impact. I would therefore ask you please to withdraw and review these proposals in more responsible depth before considering whether to proceed.</p>
33	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>My complaint is that ADC is wasting money in introducing car park machines without a business case. Please deal with my complaint promptly, the next stage is take it to the Ombudsman.</p> <p>The proposed is to instal the machines in April 2024, any delay will frustrate this complaint and add to the cost if the Ombudsman upholds this complaint. I am told by the Deputy Chair of the Environment Committee that this cannot be reversed in time for April.</p> <p>In 2022 the introduction of charging machines was turned down after a public consultation as there was no business case, it would lose money. ADC don't need a consultation for machines that don't charge, but of course there is a huge cost in installing the machines, plus signage, maintenance etc. The Car Park Manager has not disclosed, may not know? the full cost of installation and ongoing maintenance. Is this because when parking and the business case when it's reviewed in 2 years (2026) the business case becomes valid (we paid for it in 2024) so no cost in 2026, but income. Democracy has failed there is no representation for Middleton on Sea residents on the Environment Committee.</p> <p>The Environment Committee decision in November 2023 was flawed it did not consider the proposal in full and gave the Car Park Manager carte blanc, no costs were presented or agreed. I have read the ADC FAQ's just posted. Re my complaint : The Car Park Manager has not disclosed, may not know? the full cost of installation and ongoing maintenance. ADC Have posted:- "We have noticed that there has been speculation about the cost of the machines and their installation and maintenance. We can confirm the installation cost is £150 per machine, not the £3000 that has been shared. The machines themselves are stock and are therefore not an additional cost to the council. The ongoing maintenance and restocking of the machines will be encompassed under our existing car park contract."</p> <p>This is misleading: Digging a hole and dropping in each machine and ancillary costs to be £150? It is actually far higher. Two men in preparation, transport, removal of earth and disposal, making good ground, testing, risk assessment, taking down the old parking signs manufacturing and installing many new large signs all for £150, this is not believable. Maintenance etc under and an existing contract at no cost for three extra car parks, needs to be proven and that this will continue when the contract is renewed with no increase in cost. Unlikely.</p>

<p>33 Cont.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>I have been trying to understand why this is being introduced. I now understand.</p> <p>We hear from Cllr Wallsgrove (Chair of the Environment Committee who are implementing this) at last night's Full Council meeting when she was challenged, that she did not believe that people should be driving anywhere. This dogmatic view to punish car drivers is not held by the public or the Cllrs for the local ward who have spoken out against but again ignored. Probably also not held even by the majority of the ward Cllr Wallsgrove represents. This committee is using its powers to fulfil a doctrine which is not supported by the local population and is not acting in the interest of the public.</p> <p>Councils are there to act in the interests of the local population and spend money wisely. Local government is responsible for a range of vital services for people and businesses not to pursue a Green political vendetta against the interest of the local population where some 4000 people have completed petitions against this imposition. They will be presented in the next few days. However, it appears these will be ignored, as to also the 100's of comments, many rude, many funny illegal solutions, which I don't support or condone but they did make me laugh. There is none in favour on Social Media.</p> <p>You do not say that Middleton on Sea Parish Council opposed this strongly, I believe they pay towards the upkeep, surely they will now withdraw this support?</p> <p>With implementation on the 1st April, comments by 20th March! Its being forced through.</p> <p>ADC have continued to quote the cost as being £150. This is not believable. There is no breakdown. There will be no reduction in costs just the opposite, unless you can quantify how, and it was clear from last night's (Q&A's) meeting you cannot.</p> <p>You say "We can assure you that the purpose of the installation of the machines is to gather usage data" and to deter long term parking. You already have the power according to the signage to enforce stays of longer than 24hrs, but yet the one (only one) black obviously broken and long abandoned, not insured or taxed van in Shrubbs Car park is left without even a parking ticket. This is the only vehicle in what for a large part of the time a car park which is a quarter full at the most. So how does the proposal increase availability?</p> <p>You do not say what the data will tell ADC. I can, cars use the car park. Its otherwise meaningless given the free regime and 8 hr ticket times.</p> <p>Local government is there to make responsible decisions for the community. To provide and coordinate public services and facilities. encourage and develop initiatives to improve quality of life and represent the interests of the local area to the wider community.</p> <p>In this respect I believe that ADC is failing in its responsibilities.</p> <p>My request for the Local Government Ombudsman has been received and a reference number given. I need to complete ADC's complaints process and they will then review the actions of ADC.</p>
<p>33 Cont.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>The installation of Car Park Machines in Middleton and Felpham on the 1st April is a political move to deter car usage and then to further deter by getting ready to bring in charging at a future point.</p> <p>Even though there is no business case and ignoring the damage that will be done, this change is being forced through.</p> <p>There is no consultation, just comments requested, which could be ignored. There is nothing said about what will happen after the comments are collected. What is the point of asking for comments, and what will happen next? Go ahead anyway?</p> <p>The figure of £150 to install is misleading. It does not reflect the hours of work at a rate for work carried out by ADC in all respects of the installation and ancillary costs such as manufacture and installation of new signage. The ability of the Council or its contractor to absorb the extra costs of maintenance is not believable. This will cost far more now and increase at some point in the future. This is of course unless ADC have workers that are very underemployed at the present.</p> <p>The reason given is to collect data, but the data will be meaningless given the 8 hours ticket validity and free overnight parking. If you go to expense of collecting data you need to know why and what it will tell you and what you will do differently. This will tell you cars use the car park.</p> <p>The other reason given is to stop long term usage and dumping of cars. There is one black damaged van that has no parking ticket and nothing done about it in the MonS car park. It has been there for weeks probably longer. So what changes?</p> <p>It's clear that this is being used to punish car drivers and drive a dogmatic unrealistic view of how residents should travel around Arun.</p> <p>The Green Party Chair of the Environment Committee, The Member for Barnham said on Wednesday, 13th March 2024 in the Full Council meeting when challenged over the installation:- " you should not be driving your cars anywhere....." See the link below and look at 2hr.24 mins and 2.26, 2.27, 2.30 and 2.32. More was said confirming this unrealistic anti car dogmatic view.</p> <p>Not all of us can cycle and the buses don't suit all our requirements and bus services are being cut in Middleton and Felpham (600). There is also no train from Elmer.</p> <p>https://aisapps.sonicfoundry.com/AuditelScheduler/Player/Index/?id=49b0dac4-6801-4d66-8c7c-ca859733e4a7&presID=74ec1e2e498e4c53a7e97241f4cb30211d</p> <p>Is the ADC Officers and the Environment Committee and the Councillors involved acting correctly in accordance with ADC Constitution?</p> <p>Extracts from ADC Constitution: Article 1 of the constitution commits the council to being open and responsive to the needs and aspirations of the community and to providing clear leadership in the community in partnership with residents, business and other organisations. To demonstrating efficient, effective and accountable decisionmaking with the active involvement of residents. To effective representation by councillors of their constituents; and to continuous improvements in service delivery.</p> <p>Overriding duty of councillors is to the whole community even though Middleton is not represented on this Committee</p> <p>Is ADC responsive to the 4000 signatures on the petitions following the active involvement of residents and their Ward Councillors and Middleton Parish Council who have opposed this?</p> <p>Is ADC acting in partnership with residents and local business, when there is a genuine view that this will damage business and will impact on the local area as motorists avoid the car park and park in adjacent roads where there are no restrictions.</p> <p>This will also make the daily illegal (not policed) parking on the crossing area more attractive to motorists who stop for the shop or the cash point, leading at some point to injury. Have WSSC agreed to this change and have they considered this point?</p> <p>Is this an improvement in service delivery or simply the Green Party forcing its extreme anti car doctrine on a community that clearly is not in agreement?</p>

34	Shrubbs Field	Against	<p>I write in connection with the proposal to limit parking in the above car park. I am very concerned with your handing of this issue.</p> <p>Currently the limit on parking is 24 hours, this being displayed on the notice in the car park. I have read the paper from officers to the council meeting on 21/11/23 which states the authority (you) is concerned over cars parking for more than the allowed period. This cannot be enforced now as there is no way of knowing when a vehicle has arrived. Your proposal in the report to councillors was to install meters, force everyone to collect and display a ticket and penalise those transgressors. Very complicated and time consuming for the car park users but I guess it is one way of solving the suggested problem.</p> <p>Only at the start of March did you display a small sign stating there was a PROPOSAL to install machines and require users to display a ticket. There was no mention in the notice of a time limit for parking or if it was to be 24/7.</p> <p>From the content of the notice most people could reasonably assume that the 24 hour limit would remain but be enforced.</p> <p>However I have only just received my free copy of the "Felpham in focus" magazine which includes a letter from yourselves to Felpham Parish Council. In that letter it seems you have decided to limit parking to 8 hours, yet you state that the only reason for the machines is to "collect usage data...to inform decisions by ADC and the Parish Councils regarding FUTURE changes". Clearly you have already decided!</p> <p>More worrying is that I can find no record of any such changes to the parking period being agreed by Councillors in either the District or Parish Councils.</p> <p>In addition since the consultation (if that is what it was) only closed a week ago, has the order already been made and has WSCC given their necessary approval?</p> <p>The car park works well for the community, there are very few problems with its use. There are very few abandoned vehicles dumped there. We use the car park daily and can only recall a couple in the last several years.</p> <p>No more than on the public roads I suggest. There is one van abandoned there at present. It has been there some weeks and the only reason it's still there is because you haven't removed it!</p> <p>To enforce this change you would need a permanent presence to ensure users don't merely obtain a second ticket after 8 hours. There are many businesses in both Middleton Road and Elmer Road whose staff park their cars in the car park whilst at work. This includes the nursery that uses the Jubilee community hall and the doctors surgery sited in the car park. Additionally there are residents who do not have off road parking spaces.</p> <p>The only alternative for workers and residents will be to park on the public roads in the area. The only public unrestricted road in the area is Shrubbs Drive itself. This is a residential no through road and will very soon become very congested.</p> <p>Please reconsider your decision.</p>
----	---------------	---------	--

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
DECISION TAKEN UNDER OFFICER SCHEME OF DELEGATION

To be completed for decisions taken in accordance with Part 4, Officer Scheme of Delegation, Section 1, paragraph 5.2.

DATE DECISION TAKEN	22 nd March 2024
SUBJECT	Proposals to introduce repurposed pay & display machines with the requirement to obtain a free ticket, alongside the implementation of a no return period.
DECISION TAKEN	<p>Pursuant to Environment Committee resolution on 21st November 2023, having carefully considered public consultation responses, to amend the parking order such that to park in Grassmere, Links Avenue and Shrubbs Field car parks between the hours of 0800-1800 drivers must enter their vehicle registration number to obtain a free ticket which must be displayed. The associated maximum stay period to be 9 hours for Shrubbs Field and Grassmere car parks with a non return period of 1 hour. The maximum stay period to be 2 hours with a non-return period of 6 hours at Links Avenue car park.</p> <p>To agree the installation of the associated parking ticket machines.</p> <p>To offer those staff who would be affected by the changes a permit to park in Shrubbs Field car park.</p> <p>To offer in the region of 20 parking permits for Shrubbs Field car park to Buckingham Court residents.</p>
REASON FOR THE DECISION	<p>Environment Committee on 21 November resolved that authority be delegated to the Group Head of Technical Services to advertise, consider representation and determine the following proposed amendments to the Parking Order: (c) To agree the installation of parking ticket machines within the three free car parks operated in partnership with Middleton-On-Sea and Felpham Parish Councils. The report to Environment Committee stated that this would occur alongside the introduction of a non-return period.</p> <p>The three free car parks have for many years had a maximum stay time of 24 hours, but there were practical challenges to enforcing this due to the absence of a non-return period, leaving them open to long-staying misuse and vehicles being abandoned.</p>

This record to be maintained for six years or such period as statute requires with the relevant subject file

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
DECISION TAKEN UNDER OFFICER SCHEME OF DELEGATION

	<p>because there was not a non-return period, it was impracticable to enforce.</p> <p>Arun District Council has some usage data for its car parks from the number of tickets obtained. The Council does not have any usage data for these three free car parks. Usage data improves the Council's understanding of how its assets perform and enables the Council to make better informed decisions about its assets.</p> <p>WSSC as highway authority were consulted on all the proposals within the report that went to Environment Committee in November 2023 and no objections were raised. Following further consultation in January 2024 WSSC raised that their consent is also required for the proposed amendment to the parking order.</p> <p>Meetings took place with Middleton-on-Sea Parish Council and Felpham Parish Council to obtain their views and input on the non-return periods. Middleton-on-Sea Parish Council, who made representations to the Environment Committee opposing the changes remain opposed.</p> <p>Felpham Parish Council who were supportive of the proposals suggested maximum stay times/non-return periods which were carefully considered in arriving at the proposal on which the public were then consulted. FPC's proposal was for maximum stay times of 2 hours at Links Avenue with a non-return period of 6 hours. This was consulted upon unchanged by ADC. FPC's proposed maximum stay time of 4 hours with 2 hour non-return period for Grassmere car park was increased to 8 hours prior to public consultation in order to avoid any unnecessary loss of amenity, taking account of the businesses and amenities in the area. One of the Felpham Ward members also emphasised the need to ensure there was no adverse impact on any of the amenities the car park serves including the church hall and local shops and dental practices.</p> <p>The proposed maximum stay time and non-return period consulted on for Shrubbs Field car park mirrored that of Grassmere, taking account of the needs of local amenities, in particular the doctors' surgery, nursery, recreation ground and shops/food businesses.</p>
--	--

This record to be maintained for six years or such period as statute requires with the relevant subject file

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
DECISION TAKEN UNDER OFFICER SCHEME OF DELEGATION

	<p>The public were consulted between with public notice in a local newspaper, social media post, front-page of ADC's webpage along with an FAQ document explaining the changes proposed which was brought to Ward Members' attention.</p> <p>Comments received on the proposed changes are captured in an appendix. They were considered as they were received throughout the consultation period and where appropriate follow-up enquiries were made to better understand the issues raised.</p> <p>Concerns and queries have been raised by residents, visitors, employees and businesses regarding the proposed changes, during the consultation period. These have all been carefully considered which are summarised and responded to below –</p> <p>Consequent to the representations made it has been decided that the maximum stay time at Grassmere and Shrubbs Field car parks between 0800-1800 should be increased from the proposed 8 hours to 9 hours. It is now considered that the proposed changes will have a negligible impact on businesses and local facilities and amenities due and will ensure visitors have ample time to utilise the villages amenities.</p> <p>Visitors with multiple appointments throughout the day will be able to obtain a ticket for free parking and can come and go during this time provided the ticket is retained and displayed each time upon parking.</p> <p>Vehicles will be permitted to park overnight from 1800 to 0800 without needing to display a free pay and display ticket in each of the three car parks.</p> <p>The impact on carers visiting patients is also considered to be negligible due to the 9 hour free parking period. Carers will be able to obtain a ticket for free parking and can come and go during this time as long as the ticket is retained and displayed each time upon parking.</p> <p>It is accepted that whilst Buckingham Court have their own car park for their residents, some residents have been parking their cars at Shrubbs Field car park in breach of the existing 24 hour maximum stay time. In order to avoid displacing such vehicles onto the</p>
--	--

This record to be maintained for six years or such period as statute requires with the relevant subject file

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
DECISION TAKEN UNDER OFFICER SCHEME OF DELEGATION

	<p>highway, as a transitional measure, residents within Buckingham Court will be offered in the region of 20 parking permits for use within Shrubbs Field car park, for a period of one year.</p> <p>Following the consultation responses and concerns raised by Middleton-On-Sea Parish Council and a Ward Member for each of Middleton and Felpham, regarding potential abuse of the ticketing system (via pushing the ticket button repeatedly in protest causing the machines to run out of tickets with the associated environmental impact risk including littering), keypads will be installed on the front of the pay & display machines. Motorists will need to input their vehicle registration details in order to obtain a free ticket. This will reduce the risk of the data collected being tainted by misuse and will significantly reduce the possibility of anti-social behaviour (ASB). This will also reduce ongoing revenue costs as tickets will not need to be replaced as a result of ASB and will also improve enforcement efficiency.</p> <p>The free parking periods offered are considered to be ample for visitors to the villages and the nearby beach and it is considered unlikely that visitors would be displaced onto the highway.</p> <p>To clarify in response to concerns raised regarding costs of implementing the proposed changes-enforcement of the car parks is encompassed under our existing parking enforcement contract and is not an additional cost to Arun District Council. In addition, Arun District Council employ a full time machine engineer to remedy any machine faults, which is also encompassed under our existing contract.</p> <p>Personnel working in nearby businesses can park for free in either Grassmere or Shrubbs Field car parks for up to 9 hours. The free parking period is considered sufficient for those working 9-5 shifts, or similar. There are no restrictions between 1800-0800, meaning someone starting work after 0900 can park until 0800 the following day. Those people who start work before 0800 can obtain a ticket when they park which will allow them to park for 9 hours from 0800 (as well as any time in advance of 0800).</p> <p>The data that will be collected from the machines will be usage data. This will provide information on when</p>
--	--

This record to be maintained for six years or such period as statute requires with the relevant subject file

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
DECISION TAKEN UNDER OFFICER SCHEME OF DELEGATION

	<p>people use the car park, providing information on the extent to which they are used, as well as on peaks and troughs in usage and will provide Arun District Council with information that can be used to inform future decisions. This includes when the car parks are at their busiest. While respondents' suggestions of surveys would provide some data, the proposed changes will provide data every day, which can be subsequently analysed.</p> <p>Concerns were raised that the proposal was to introduce charges. There are no current proposals to introduce charges for parking in any of the three free car parks. Any such decision would be a matter for the Environment Committee to make.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised regarding on-street parking within the villages on zig-zags and yellow lines. The Parking Services team endeavour to reach as many areas of the district as often as possible within the Civil Enforcement Officer resource available. It is not considered that the changes will exacerbate this issue, and civil enforcement officers will be made aware of the concerns raised which can be monitored whilst monitoring the car parks.</p> <p>Concerns were raised that council tax income is being used to fund these changes and maintenance of these car parks. The funding comes from income generated from Council owned car parks elsewhere in the district.</p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding potholes in the highway. These are the responsibility of West Sussex County Council.</p> <p>The equalities impact assessment has been updated with the amendments to the proposals and has not identified any significant impacts.</p> <p>Two petitions have been submitted asking Arun District Council not to install ticket machines and/or parking restrictions in the car parks. objecting to the changes. These are being verified. If they meet the relevant criteria of Arun District Council's constitution, they will which are to be submitted to a Full Council meeting for discussion.</p>
--	---


*This record to be maintained for six years or such period as statute requires
with the relevant subject file*

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
DECISION TAKEN UNDER OFFICER SCHEME OF DELEGATION

	<p>The decision here is made in pursuance of the Environment Committee decision on 21 November 2023.</p> <p>The consultation responses provide evidence that the current 24 hour maximum stay time is regularly breached, with cars remaining in situ for serval days/ weeks at a time. To ensure that the parking restrictions can be enforced, the maximum free parking time has been reduced to 23 hours in Grassmere and Shrubbs Field, and 16 hours in Links Avenue as there is no requirement to obtain a ticket between 18:00 -08:00.</p> <p>These changes will enable the Parking Services team to enforce breaches of the parking restrictions effectively and efficiently ensuring they are available to users of local amenities.</p>
<p>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED OR REJECTED</p>	<p>Withdrawing the proposed changes. The proposals have been agreed to by Environment Committee on 21st November 2023 subject to consultation. The consultation comments have been carefully considered and some minor changes have been made to mitigate issues raised. There were no insurmountable issues raised. It is not considered that withdrawing the proposal is appropriate as the benefits of the changes are set out in detail above.</p> <p>To reduce the free parking time given. Having considered the consultation responses and the representations from the Parish Councils and the doctors' surgery, it was considered this may have a detrimental impact on amenity/risk displacement to the highway. Having considered the consultation responses, the free parking time in Grassmere and Shrubbs Field car parks has been increased to reflect concerns raised.</p> <p>To not offer permits to the doctors' surgery and/ or Buckingham Court. It was considered appropriate to offer these permits to avoid displacing such vehicles onto the highway and potential disruption to surgery staff.</p> <p>To leave the machines without keypads - this would leave the machines open to abuse. A consultation response suggested that the following has been put on to social media - "that locals walking by should just</p>

This record to be maintained for six years or such period as statute requires with the relevant subject file

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
DECISION TAKEN UNDER OFFICER SCHEME OF DELEGATION

	<p>take a ticket or two, has received a large number of “likes”, so any data collected at all would be totally unreliable” and Middleton-On-Sea Parish Council raised similar concerns. If people obtain numerous tickets at one time, the usage data collected would be tainted and unreliable. It could also increase the amount of litter in the car parks, increasing cleansing costs/unsightliness. While the software upgrade for the machines does have initial outlay costs, these are considered to be mitigated by the collection of reliable usage data, fully and efficiently enforceable car parks, and a significant reduction in the possibility of ASB and cleansing costs.</p>
<p>ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARED BY ANY MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL <i>Only needed if the decision is under an express authorisation</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>NAME OF THE DECISION TAKER</p>	<p>Nat Slade</p>
<p>SIGNATURE</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Name of activity:	Introducing free ticket machines, maximum stay and no return periods to three free Car Parks	Date Completed:	22/03/2024
Directorate / Division responsible for activity:	Technical Services	Lead Officer:	Nat Slade
Existing Activity	No	New / Proposed Activity	Yes
		Changing / Updated Activity	Yes

What are the aims / main purposes of the activity?

The car parks are currently open to abuse as motorists can park for up to 24 hours, but there isn't currently a no return period. In practice, this means that motorists can park for an unlimited amount of time, without the need to move their vehicles. This makes it extremely challenging to identify abandoned vehicles and the process of identifying and removing these vehicles takes a significant amount of officer time and results in legal costs for ADC.

The aim of these changes is to enable Arun District Council to gather data on the usage of the car parks, which can be used to inform future decisions regarding the car parks. It is also to encourage a higher turnover of vehicles and increase parking availability for residents and visitors to the area. The proposed changes will also enable Arun District Council to identify abandoned vehicles as soon as possible which will facilitate their removal at the earliest opportunity, increasing amenity and reducing costs to ADC.

What are the main actions and processes involved?

To install repurposed pay & display machines within the three free car parks (Grassmere, Links Avenue and Shrubbs Field).

Once parked within the car park, motorists would be required to obtain a free parking ticket from a machine located within the car parks. They will be required to enter their vehicle registration number into the machine in order to be given a ticket. Once a ticket is obtained, this must be clearly displayed on the dashboard of the vehicle.

Vehicles will be permitted to park for 9 hours for free within Grassmere and Shrubbs Field car parks and for 2 hours within Links Avenue car park. No return periods will also be introduced – 1 hour for Grassmere and Shrubbs Field and 6 hours for Links Avenue.

Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO's) will attend the car parks and may issue Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's) to vehicles either not displaying a ticket or for the display of an expired ticket.

Arun District Council's Parking Order will be updated to reflect these changes.

Who is intended to benefit & who are the main stakeholders?

These car parks are currently operated in partnership with Middleton-On-Sea and Felpham Parish Councils. Felpham and Middleton-On-Sea Parish Councils both pay an annual contribution towards the upkeep and maintenance of the car parks. Under the terms of the contracts with both Councils, this annual fee is paid to ensure that the car parks remain free for the use of residents and visitors.

The other main stakeholders are users of our Car Parks. This includes residents and people who work within Felpham and Middleton-On-Sea. The car parks support significant volumes of visitors to the area, particularly during summer season and school holidays. Local businesses rely upon availability of car parking spaces for their customers and staff. The Council's car parks help facilitate events run by a variety of organisers, including Councils. Disabled users of our car parks who display a blue badge will not be required to obtain a ticket and will not be subject to the maximum free parking or no return periods.

All car park users are intended to benefit from the proposed changes, as this will increase parking availability and enable the removal of abandoned vehicles at an earlier stage.

Any data gathered by the machines can be used to better inform decisions taken regarding the car parks, in consultation with both Parish Councils.

Have you already consulted on / researched the activity?

Consultation has been undertaken with both Middleton-On-Sea and Felpham Parish Council regarding the proposed changes to the free car parks. Middleton-On-Sea Parish Council oppose the introduction of a free parking ticket machine and a no-return period describing it as counterproductive, unnecessary, bureaucratic and self-defeating and cited the following concerns:

- Residents, many are elderly or infirm use the car park when accessing the pharmacy, local shops and Health Centre. They would be required to walk to a machine to get a ticket and then walk back to their car and walk again to where they wish to go – this will cause drivers to park outside of the shops on no parking areas. There is no enforcement in place to stop them.

Felpham Parish Council are in full support of the proposed changes due to ongoing issues within Links Avenue and Grassmere car parks. The Parish Council report they have received numerous concerns and complaints regarding the use of Links Avenue car park by one business for business purposes, and the abuse of Grassmere car park by students as charged parking has recently been introduced on campus. The introduction of the proposed changes is aimed at increasing amenity within these car parks for genuine users of village amenities.

Public consultation has concluded within Felpham and Middleton-On-Sea to gather the views and comments of people who use the car parks.

Formal consent will be sought from WSCC to commence with the proposed changes, once public consultation has concluded.

Impact on people with a protected characteristic (What is the potential impact of the activity? Are the impacts high, medium or low?)

Page 29

Protected characteristics / groups	Is there an impact (Yes / No)	If Yes, what is it and identify whether it is positive or negative
Age (older / younger people, children)	No	<p>Middleton-On-Sea Parish Council have raised concerns regarding the proposed changes to Shrubbs Field car park and the impact this would have on elderly and infirm drivers.</p> <p>The requirement to input a registration number into the pay and display machine in order to obtain a ticket is reliant on the driver being able to remember the registration number between leaving their car and obtaining a ticket from the machine.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised regarding the residents of a sheltered housing block, opposite one of the car parks, having to move their vehicles everyday due to the introduction of a no return period. It is accepted that whilst Buckingham Court have a car park, it is not sufficient for the quantity of resident vehicles. Arun District Council accept that the proposed changes could displace a large number</p>

		<p>of vehicles on to the highway, impacting local residents. Therefore, as a transitional measure, residents within Buckingham Court will be offered in the region of 20 parking permits for use within Shrubbs Field car park, for a period of one year.</p> <p>All drivers require a certain degree of mobility and memory retention to be able to drive a vehicle safely. Due to the size of Grassmere and Shrubbs Field car parks, there would be two pay and display machines to limit the travel distances to and from the machines. It is considered that the requirement to input a vehicle registration number would not be disadvantageous.</p> <p>Arun District Council car parks throughout the district have ticket machines installed, where motorists are required to either pay by phone or obtain a ticket to display in their vehicles.</p> <p>Whilst Arun District Council appreciate that moving a vehicle can be frustrating, the purpose of the car park is to cater for visitors to the village amenities, alongside residents. The introduction of a no return period is aimed at increasing parking availability and ensuring spaces for those wishing to use the local amenities.</p> <p>The installation of repurposed pay and display machines with keypads, alongside the requirement to obtain a ticket, is not considered to have an adverse impact on elderly residents or visitors.</p>
<p>Disability (people with physical / sensory impairment or mental disability)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Middleton-On-Sea Parish Council have raised concerns regarding the proposed changes to Shrubbs Field car park and the impact this would have on elderly and infirm drivers. All drivers require a certain degree of mobility to be able to drive a vehicle safely. Due to the size of Grassmere and Shrubbs Field car parks, there would be two pay and display machines to limit the travel distances to and from the machines.</p> <p>Arun District Council car parks throughout the district have ticket machines installed, where motorists are required to either pay by phone or obtain a ticket to display in their vehicles.</p>

		All valid blue badge holders would be exempt from having to obtain a ticket and from the maximum free parking and no return periods. These proposed changes are not considered to have an adverse impact on disabled residents or visitors.
Gender reassignment (the process of transitioning from one gender to another.)	No	
Marriage & civil partnership (Marriage and registered civil partnerships)	No	
Pregnancy & maternity (Pregnancy is the condition of being pregnant & maternity refers to the period after the birth)	No	
Race (ethnicity, colour, nationality or national origins & including gypsies, travellers, refugees & asylum seekers)	No	
Religion & belief (religious faith or other group with a recognised belief system)	No	
Sex (male / female)	No	
Sexual orientation (lesbian, gay, bisexual, heterosexual)	No	
Whilst Socio economic disadvantage that people may face is not a protected characteristic; the potential impact on this group should be	No	Car parks will remain free to use.

also considered		
-----------------	--	--

What evidence has been used to assess the likely impacts?
Consultation submissions from both Parish Councils and the consultation with the wider community have been used to inform the impacts detailed above.

Decision following initial assessment			
Continue with existing or introduce new / planned activity	Yes	Amend activity based on identified actions	No

Action Plan			
Impact identified	Action required	Lead Officer	Deadline

Page 32

Monitoring & Review	
Date of last review or Impact Assessment:	n/a
Date of next 12 month review:	n/a
Date of next 3 year Impact Assessment (from the date of this EIA):	n/a

Date EIA completed:	22/03/2024
Signed by Person Completing:	Jasmine Gander – Principal Parking Services Officer

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 6

Subject to approval at the next Full Council meeting

537

**MINUTES
OF A
MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
HELD IN THE ARUN CIVIC CENTRE
ON 13 March 2024 AT 6.00 pm**

Present: Councillors Mrs Cooper (Chair), Dr Walsh (Vice-Chair), Ayling, Batley, Bicknell, Birch, Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Bower, Brooks, Butcher, Cooper, Edwards, Elkins, J English, Goodheart, Greenway, Gunner, Hamilton, Haywood, Huntley, Jones, Kelly, Long, Lury, Madeley, May, McAuliffe, McDougall, Nash, Needs, Northeast, O'Neill, Oppler, Partridge, Patel, Penycate, Pendleton, Mrs Stainton, Tandy, Turner, Wallsgrove, Wiltshire, Woodman, Worne, Worne and Yeates.

[Note: The following Councillors were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters detailed in the Minutes indicated – Councillors Batley, Oppler and Miss Worne – Minute 695 to 698 (Part) and Councillor Bicknell – Minute 695 to Minute 703 (Part)].

695. WELCOME

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

A special welcome was extended to members of the Independent Remuneration Panel who were in attendance in relation to recommendations for Council to consider on the Members' Allowances Review forming part of Agenda Item 12.

The Chair welcomed:

- John Thompson, Chair of the Panel
- Celia Thomson-Hitchcock, and
- Alan Ladley
- Apologies had been received from Panel Members Sarah Miles and Andrew Kelly

696. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Bence, Harty, Lawrence, Lloyd, Stanley and Warr.

Apologies for Absence had also been received from the Council's Honorary Aldermen Mr Dingemans and Mr English.

Full Council - 13.03.24

697. 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 [WSSC]
Councillor Kenton Batley	Bognor Regis
Councillor Trevor Bence	WSSC and Aldwick
Councillor Paul Bicknell	Angmering
Councillor Billy Blanchard-Cooper	Littlehampton
Councillor Jim Brooks	Bognor Regis
Councillor Alan Butcher	Littlehampton
Councillor Andy Cooper	Rustington
Councillor Alison Cooper	Rustington and WSSC
Councillor Roger Elkins	Ferring and WSSC
Councillor Steve Goodheart	Bognor Regis
Councillor Keir Greenway	Bersted and WSSC
Councillor Thomas Harty	Felpham
Councillor Shirley Haywood	Middleton-on-Sea
Councillor David Huntley	Pagham
Councillor Lesley-Anne Lloyd	Rustington
Councillor Jill Long	Littlehampton
Councillor Martin Lury	Bersted
Councillor Stephen McAuliffe	Arundel and Walberton
Councillor Roger Nash	Bognor Regis
Councillor Claire Needs	Bognor Regis
Councillor Mike Northeast	Littlehampton
Councillor Peggy Partridge	Rustington
Councillor Jacky Pendleton	Middleton-on-Sea and WSSC
Councillor Guy Purser	Aldwick
Councillor Matt Stanley	Bognor Regis
Councillor Freddie Tandy	Littlehampton
Councillor Sue Wallsgrove	Barnham and Eastergate
Councillor Jeanette Warr	Bognor Regis
Councillor Christine Wiltshire	Littlehampton
Councillor Bob Woodman	Littlehampton
Councillor Amanda Worne	Ford and Yapton
Councillor Amelia Worne	Littlehampton
Councillor Gillian Yeates	Bersted and Bognor Regis

Councillor Walsh asked that his membership of West Sussex County Council and Littlehampton Town Council be added to the schedule and confirmed these declarations.

698. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chair confirmed that five questions had been submitted for this meeting. The questions have been very briefly summarised below:

- 1) From Mr Attreed to the Chair of the Economy Committee, Councillor Nash regarding Littlehampton High Street;
- 2) From Mr Chester to the Chair of the Planning Committee, Councillor Hamilton regarding planning application A/129/21/PL and conditions relating to surface water drainage;
- 3) From Mr Allen to the Chair of the Environment Committee, Councillor Wallsgrove regarding the works permitted by planning application EP/145/23/PL;
- 4) From Mr Rogers to the Chair of the Environment Committee, Councillor Wallsgrove regarding the introduction of parking meter machines in Middleton-on-Sea and Felpham;
- 5) From Mr and Mrs Smith to the Chair of the Planning Committee, Councillor Hamilton regarding a Breach of Condition Notice in relation to Plot 1 at land west of Fontwell Avenue.

The Chair then drew Public Question to a close.

(A schedule of the full questions asked, and the responses provided can be found on the Public Question Web page at: [Arun District Council](#))

699. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS WITH PECUNIARY/PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

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

700. PETITIONS

The Chair confirmed that no Petitions had been received.

701. MINUTES

The minutes from the Special Meeting of the Council held on 21 February 2024 were approved by the Council as a correct record and would be signed by the Chair at the end of the meeting.

Full Council - 13.03.24

702. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair confirmed that she wished to update Councillors on some of the events and activities she had attended since the last meeting of Full Council held on 10 January 2024. These have been summarised below:

- 12 January 2024 – Hall and Woodhouse Community Chest Award
- 18 January 2024 – Wreath laying with school children at South Bersted Church in the memory of Sir Richard Hotham
- 8 February 2024 – it had been a privilege to have attended the funeral of Bill Kelsey, MBE a much respected and longstanding member of RAFA
- 15 February 2024 – the 15th anniversary and long service awards at the Martlet Care Home at East Preston to honour long serving members of staff completing 20, 30 and 40 years' service.

Finally, the Chair asked Councillors to support her Easter Egg Fundraiser, which was raising funds for her charity, AJ's charity.

703. URGENT MATTERS

The Chair confirmed that there were no urgent items for the meeting to consider.

704. CALENDAR OF MEETINGS FOR 2024/2025

The Group Head of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer presented the Calendar of Meetings for 2024-2025 to Members for approval.

Councillor Nash then proposed that the calendar of meetings for 2024-25 be approved and this was seconded by Councillor Oppler.

In debating the calendar of meetings, concerns were raised regarding some of the dates proposed. These were:

- The week commencing 9 September there were four Committee meetings scheduled.
- The week commencing 16 September there was only one Committee meeting scheduled.
- Why could the Environment Committee planned for 12 September not be moved to 19 September to even out the number of meetings?
- Similarly, the week commencing 24 March 2025, there were four Committee meetings scheduled.
- Could the Environment Committee on 27 March be moved to 2 April to even out the number of meetings?

- Between October 2024 and February 2024 there was a long gap where no meetings of the Corporate Support Committee would be held. Could the Corporate Support Committee of 6 February 2025 be moved back to 22 January 2025 and then the meeting on 25 March 2025 be held later to evenly apply the pattern of meetings and regularise the number of reports being submitted to these meetings.

Following these points raised, Councillor Gunner confirmed that he wished to make an amendment to the calendar of meetings for 2024/2025, with the calendar being amended to accommodate the changes he had highlighted. This amendment was seconded by Councillor Cooper.

The Group Head of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer confirmed that there was potential difficulty in bringing forward the date of the Corporate Support Committee from 6 February 2025 to 22 January due to Key Performance Indicator lead-in time and in preparing quarterly reports. Although he saw no issue in changing the revised date for the Environment Committee, if this was what Members confirmed that they wanted to do, a request was made that the Corporate Support Committee dates be checked against KPI reporting deadlines and submitted to the next Full Council meeting on 9 May 2024 for further consideration.

In response, as proposer to the amendment, Councillor Gunner confirmed that he would be happy to withdraw the amended dates for the Corporate Support Committee if consultation would be undertaken prior to the next Council meeting.

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

The Chair then returned to the substantive recommendation.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.1 in the Council's Constitution, the Calendar of Meetings for 2024-25 be approved, as amended; and

(2) In respect of changes requested to meeting dates for the Corporate Support Committee, a revised calendar be presented to the next meeting of Full Council on 9 May 2024.

Full Council - 13.03.24

705. STANDARDS COMMITTEE - 18 JANUARY 2024

The Chair, of the Standards Committee, Councillor Huntley, presented a recommendation from the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 18 January 2024.

Councillor Huntley drew Members' attention to a recommendation at Minute 538 [Review of Local Assessment Procedures] which he formally proposed. In proposing the recommendation, Councillor Huntley confirmed that the Council had to have in place arrangements under which allegations that a councillor had failed to comply with the Code of Conduct could be considered and decisions made on such allegations. At Arun District Council these were its Local Assessment Procedures and its Assessment Panel Procedures, and both were reviewed annually by the Standards Committee.

At the Standards Committee meeting on 18 January 2024 the Committee considered a report from the Monitoring Officer and resolved to recommend changes to the Local Assessment Procedures to Full Council. These changes had been illustrated within the agenda papers. Councillor Huntley confirmed that no changes were proposed to the Assessment Panel Procedures.

The recommendation was then seconded by Councillor May.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the revised Local Assessment Procedure be adopted.

706. CORPORATE SUPPORT COMMITTEE - 31 JANUARY 2024

(During the course of the discussion on this item, the following Councillors declared Personal Interests and confirmed that they would not take part in the discussion or vote on this item:

Councillor Northeast as he was married to a member of staff and Councillor Blanchard-Cooper as he was related to members of staff).

The Chair of the Corporate Support Committee, Councillor Oppler, presented recommendations from the meeting of the Corporate Support Committee held on 31 January 2024.

Councillor Oppler drew Members' attention to two recommendations at Minute 592 [Pay Policy Statement] which he formally proposed. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Tandy.

In considering the recommendations, concern was raised regarding the Pay Policy Statement and in relation to Paragraph 3.5.2 [pay progressions is by annual increment on 1 April each year until the employee has reached the top of the grade]. It was felt that as the Council was needing to make significant savings, this automatic pay progression should be questioned. Councillor Gunner then confirmed that he wished to make an amendment and he proposed that this paragraph be removed from the Pay Policy Statement as he felt that it was not appropriate at this time and in view of the savings that the Council was needing to make and in recognition that staff were being made redundant.

This amendment was seconded by Councillor Cooper.

Advice was sought from the Group Head of Law & Governance and/or Monitoring Officer and Interim Joint Chief Executive.

The Joint Interim Chief Executive and Director of Growth confirmed that the amendment could not be retrospectively applied to existing members of staff due to already agreed contractual arrangements. If approved, it could only apply to new staff. It was highlighted that pay progression via annual increment in this way was common practice across most authorities and so he urged Councillors to bear this in mind in considering the amendment and to think about how this could affect the Council in the longer term when recruiting staff. The Council had worked very hard in recent months to reduce its reliance upon agency staff.

The Group Head of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer reminded Members of the contractual rights and employment arrangements already in place for staff, which was a Group Head responsibility. He therefore urged Members to tread very carefully in considering making any changes to existing staff payment arrangements. He held concerns over the amendment from a legal perspective and as there had been no opportunity to undertake required consultations, especially with Human Resources.

The Chair then invited debate on the amendment. There were Councillors who also expressed the concern confirmed by the Interim Joint Chief Executive and Group Head of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer. They felt that Full Council was not the correct forum to be making changes to existing employment contracts and as it was customary to firstly consult with the officers concerned and then staff representatives. There were concerns expressed over the lawfulness of making such a decision at this meeting and it was suggested that the matter be referred to the Corporate Support Committee. Other reservations expressed were that no concerns had been raised by the Corporate Support Committee and that this proposal would be damaging to the council's reputation in attracting new staff and at a time when it was seeking to recruit staff and reduce its reliance upon agency staff.

Full Council - 13.03.24

Councillor Cooper, as seconder to the amendment, spoke in support of it. He confirmed that the amendment was to address why a 'given' annual increment was awarded which was not subject to an assessment of the employee's performance. He confirmed that if it affected staff morale and wages and effectiveness, then the Council should look at its policy of paying a good market rate up front without the need to add in automatic increments. Councillors were needing to make hard decisions during a time of financial difficulty. Now was the time to remove the annual automatic increment and look at staff pay and performance related opportunities.

Councillor Gunner, as the proposer of the amendment, reminded Councillors that this amendment was not including the inflationary increase paid to staff each year. He outlined that he had listened to the debate and concerns raised and so confirmed that he would be happy to withdraw the amendment if the matter addressed by it would be referred to the Corporate Support for review.

The Group Head of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer reminded Councillors it was a statutory requirement for the Council to approve its Pay Policy Statement for 2024/2025 and that it needed to be published by 1 April 2024. The concerns raised by Councillor Gunner would therefore be referred to the Corporate Support Committee but would need to be in respect of next year's statement.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) The Pay Policy Statement 2024/2025 for publication on the Arun website by 1 April 2024 be approved; and
- (2) Delegated authority be given to the Group Head of Organisational Excellence to make changes to the Pay Policy Statement should the need arise because of new legislation being introduced or changes to the pay structure resulting from national pay negotiations during the forthcoming year.

707. AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE - 19 FEBRUARY 2024

The Chair, Councillor Walsh, presented recommendations from the meeting of the Audit & Governance Committee held on 19 February 2024.

Councillor Walsh firstly alerted Members to recommendations at Minute 645 [Review of the Members' Allowances Scheme – Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel]. Councillor Walsh confirmed that he had great pleasure in presenting the Independent Remuneration Panel's [IRP's] report and recommendations which had been approved by the Audit & Governance. Councillor Walsh reminded Councillors that the Council must have regard to the recommendations of the Panel when determining the scheme of Members' Allowances. In formally proposing the Panel's recommendations, Councillor Walsh paid tribute to the Panel for its time in gathering its evidence and for the work undertaken. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor O'Neill.

Debate on the recommendations proposed then took place. There were varying statements made. Some Councillors who despite thanking the Panel for their work, held concern over the conclusions reached. It was felt that some of the recommendations did not reflect or compare to the findings of other councils and that the report needed to be more substantial, and so an opportunity had been missed, though no evidence was provided to support these opinions. Further concerns were expressed over the Special Responsibility Allowances being paid to the Chair of the Council, the Chair of the Licensing Committee, Councillors that chaired the Licensing Sub-Committee, the Leader of the Opposition and the increase proposed in the Basic Allowance which were too low. It was felt that there had been an opportunity to do something more substantial with this review to reflect the balance of responsibilities and that some opinions expressed by Councillors at interview had not been taken on board. It was felt that the SRA for the Leader of the Council, although increasing significantly, was still low compared to other authorities. The Panel was asked if it could include comparative data illustrating the variances in payments by other Councils in future reports. It was felt that the report downgraded the council when comparing it with other Council's in West Sussex and was more like an interim report because there remained to be outstanding issues that required addressing.

Further comments were made about the SRA paid to the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed reduction in this allowance which could not be justified. It was felt that the role could not be compared to the Chair of a Service Committee and had a much wider brief. It was felt that the SRA needed to be increased reflecting the number of Councillors within that political group. The reasons for reducing the SRA paid to the Vice-Chairs of Service Committees were accepted and an argument was put forward that perhaps they should not receive any SRA and this saving be used to increase the SRA paid to the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition. It was felt that the SRA paid to the Leader of the Opposition should be half of the Leader of the Council's SRA.

Full Council - 13.03.24

As proposer of the recommendation, Councillor Walsh responded to some of the points raised and he thanked Members for their debate. He confirmed his view that the Independent Remuneration Panel had done a great job in balancing all the competing demands in terms of time, finance and responsibilities and remembering that the Council had, since the last review, changed its governance structure from a Leader and Cabinet form of governance over to a Committee System and so a more thorough review had been undertaken. Councillor Walsh was of the view that the Panel had got the balance right; had taken account of the national and local financial situation and the responsibilities involved and the shifts and changes resulting from the change in structure. He commended the recommendation to the Council.

A recorded vote was requested on the recommendation to approve the new Members' Allowances Scheme.

Those voting for the recommendation were Councillors Ayling, Batley, Bicknell, Birch, Blanchard-Cooper, Mrs Bower, Bower, Brooks, Butcher, Edwards, Elkins, Goodheart, Greenway, Haywood, Huntley, Jones, Long, Lury, Madeley, May, McAuliffe, McDougall, Nash, Needs, Northeast, O'Neill, Oppler, Partridge, Patel, Pencyate, Stainton, Tandy, Turner, Wallsgrove, Walsh, Wiltshire, Woodman, Mrs Worne, Miss Worne and Yeates [40]. Councillor Gunner voted against [1]. Councillors Mrs Cooper, Cooper, English, Hamilton, Kelly and Pendleton abstained from voting [6].

The Council

RESOLVED

That the new scheme of Members' Allowances be approved for final adoption.

Councillor Walsh then alerted Members to the next set of recommendations which were at Minute 651 [Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy 2024/25]. In formally proposing the recommendations, Councillor Walsh thanked the Council's Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer and his team for the excellent and prudent treasury management strategy that they had stewarded over the last year. The Investment Strategy was a sound investment strategy for the Council and due to the upturn in the market had produced excellent rates of return for the Council. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor O'Neill.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) The Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2024/25 be approved and adopted;
- (2) The Annual Investment Strategy for 2024/25 be approved and adopted;
- (3) The Prudential Indicators within the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy for 2024/25, be approved;
- (4) An operational boundary borrowing limit of £78m for 2024/25, as shown in Appendix 2 be approved; and
- (5) An Authorised Borrowing Limit of £83m for 2024/25, as shown in Appendix 2 be approved.

708. CONSTITUTION WORKING PARTY - 29 FEBRUARY 2024

The Chair, Councillor Yeates, presented recommendations following the meeting of the Constitution Working Party held on 29 February 2024. The minutes had been circulated separately to the agenda and had been added to the Full Council web page on 11 March 2024 and emailed to Councillors.

Councillor Yeates drew to Members' attention recommendations at Minute 14 [Constitution Changes] and confirmed that the amendments made at the Working Party meeting had been set out within the minutes. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Jones.

The Chair then invited debate. Many Councillors spoke stating that they had difficulty in accepting the added restrictions for Public Question Time. The area of difficulty was the proposal to add "relate to matters personal to the questioner, his or her spouse, partner or relative". It was felt that adding this would be making the rejection criteria too restrictive and was a step too far and could lead to good questions and many questions being rejected on these grounds.

Following further debate, Councillor McAuliffe confirmed that many questions were submitted by the public because they had not received answers to matters of concern elsewhere within the Council. If members of the public could not ask questions at Full Council, where could their questions be directed to. Councillor McAuliffe confirmed that he wished to make an amendment which was to delete this restriction from being added to the rejection criteria. This was because he felt that adding this was eroding the accountability of this administration to its residents. The amendment was then seconded by Councillor Gunner.

Full Council - 13.03.24

The Chair invited debate on the amendment. This saw mixed views expressed. Members who were also Members of the Constitution Working Party confirmed that this had been discussed in length at the Working Party and various scenarios in terms of when this exemption might or might not apply had been provided. It had also been confirmed that this restriction existed in many other Council's constitutions and was not unusual.

Those agreeing with the amendment felt that the Council and its Members had a responsibility to listen to residents. If they had a concern or an issue, then they should have the ability to be able to attend meetings and ask questions about their issues and especially if these had not been resolved elsewhere. This view was strongly supported by many Members.

The voting on the amendment was then undertaken and this was confirmed as CARRIED.

The Chair then returned to the substantive recommendation as amended.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the changes outlined in Appendix 1 to the report, as amended at this meeting, be approved.

709. POLICY & FINANCE COMMITTEE - 7 MARCH 2024

In the absence of the Leader of the Council and the Chair of the Policy & Finance Committee, Councillor Nash, as Deputy Leader of the Council and Vice-Chair, presented recommendations from the meeting of the Policy & Finance Committee held on 7 March 2024. The minutes had been circulated separately to the agenda and had been added to the Full Council web page on 11 March 2024 and emailed to Councillors. It was explained that in error the minutes from the Policy & Finance Committee held on 7 March 2023 had formed part of that supplement pack. The correct minutes from the meeting of the Policy & Finance Committee held on 7 March 2024 had therefore been published to the Full Council web site and circulated to Members on 12 March 2024.

Councillor Nash alerted Members to the first of a series of recommendations at Minute 682 [Urgent Matters – Swimming Pool Support Fund Phase 2] which was asking the Council to add the amount of £135,470 from the Swimming Pool Support Fund to the Council's capital programme for 2024/25. Councillor Nash formally proposed the recommendations which were then seconded by Councillor Oppler.

The Council

RESOLVED - That

- (1) The amount of £135,470 from the Swimming Pool Support Fund is added to the Council's capital programme for 2024/25; and
- (2) The contents of the report and process of achieving grant funding be noted.

Councillor Nash then presented to Members the next recommendation which was at Minute 688 [The Webcasting of Meetings – Future Options]. Councillor Nash outlined that there had been a good debate at the Committee in examining the Options being presented and so he formally proposed that Options 1 and 2 at a value of £61.5k be added to the Council's capital programme. This recommendation was seconded by Councillor Oppler.

In debating the recommendation, most Councillors confirmed their support acknowledging that the existing equipment had reached end of life and required replacement. Despite concerns expressed over borrowing the cost of the equipment, the opportunity for members of the public to be able to view meetings live was seen as a way of encouraging democracy and public participation.

The Council

RESOLVED

That Options 1 and 2 at a value of £61,500 be added to the Council's capital programme.

Councillor Nash then alerted Members to the final recommendation at Minute 691 [Council Tax – Empty and Second Homes] which he formally proposed. The recommendation was then seconded by Councillor Oppler.

In debating the recommendation, various questions that had been asked at the Policy & Finance Committee were repeated. It was confirmed that the responses to the questions raised at the Committee had been answered and emailed to Committee members. The questions raised had been confirmation as to what the definition of a second home was; would the reduction from 2 years to 1 year allow time for more complicated probate cases to be concluded and would flexibility in such instances be applied; and what would happen with a business property containing domestic accommodation such as a shop or pub that was used occasionally. The responses to these questions were provided and it was confirmed that the responses provided to the Committee would be circulated to all Members.

Full Council - 13.03.24

Following further debate, the Council

RESOLVED

That a Council Tax premium of up to 100% in respect of second homes be introduced with effect from 1 April 2025.

A recorded vote was required in line with Council Procedure Rule 20.6.

Those voting for the recommendation were Councillors Ayling, Batley, Bicknell, Birch, Blanchard-Cooper, Mrs Bower, Bower, Brooks, Butcher, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Edwards, Elkins, English, Goodheart, Greenway, Gunner, Haywood, Huntley, Jones, Kelly, Long, Lury, Madeley, May, McDougall, Nash, Needs, Northeast, O'Neill, Oppler, Partridge, Patel, Pendleton, Penycate, Stainton, Tandy, Turner, Wallsgrove, Walsh, Wiltshire, Woodman, Mrs Worne, Miss Worne and Yeates [45]. No Councillor voted against the recommendation. Councillor McAuliffe abstained from voting [1].

710. MOTIONS

The Chair confirmed that no Motions had been submitted for this meeting.

711. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

The Chair referred Councillors to the Questions from Members that had been submitted in line with Council Procedure Rule 14.3 and the schedule of questions that had been circulated to the meeting. This confirmed that nine questions had been received.

The Chair invited questioners to read out their questions which would be responded to by the appropriate Committee Chair or Vice-Chair in their absence. It was explained that the schedule of questions would be updated to include the responses provided, supplementary questions and responses and would be uploaded to the Council's web page within ten working days of the meeting, in line with the Council's Constitution.

Nine questions had been submitted as bullet pointed below:

Question (1) From Councillor Haywood to the Chair of the Environment Committee, Councillor Wallsgrove regarding Car Parking at Felpham and Middleton-on-Sea

Question (2) From Councillor Haywood to the Chair of the Environment Committee, Councillor Wallsgrove regarding Car Parking at Felpham and Middleton-on-Sea

Question (3) From Councillor Haywood to the Chair of the Environment Committee, Councillor Wallsgrove regarding Car Parking at Felpham and Middleton-on-Sea

Question (4) From Councillor Gunner to the Chair of the Corporate Support Committee, Councillor Oppler regarding the Financial Strategy and staff redundancies

Question (5) From Councillor Gunner to the Chair of the Policy & Finance Committee, Councillor Stanley regarding Car Parking Charges – In the absence of Councillor Stanley a written response would be provided.

Question (6) From Councillor Gunner to the Chair of the Policy & Finance Committee, regarding car parking at Felpham and Middleton-on-Sea. It was confirmed that in the absence of Councillor Stanley, Councillor Nash as Vice-Chair of the Policy & Finance Committee would respond.

Question (7) From Councillor Pendleton to the Chair of the Environment Committee, Councillor Wallsgrove regarding car parking at Felpham and Middleton-on-Sea

Question (8) From Councillor Pendleton to the Chair of the Environment Committee, Councillor Wallsgrove regarding car parking at Felpham and Middleton-on-Sea

Question (9) From Councillor Pendleton to the Chair of the Environment Committee, Councillor Wallsgrove regarding car parking at Felpham and Middleton-on-Sea

712. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

The Chair confirmed that there were no changes to Committee memberships to report to this meeting.

713. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES

The Chair confirmed that there were no changes to representations on Outside Bodies to report to this meeting.

-

(The meeting concluded at 8.35 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Arun District Council

REPORT TO:	Full Council – 9 May 2024
SUBJECT:	Appointment to the post of Chief Executive Officer
LEAD OFFICER:	Jackie Follis, Group Head of Organisational Excellence
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Stanley as Leader of the Council
WARDS:	All
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION:	
<p>The role of the Head of Paid Service and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is to provide the leadership to deliver the Council’s vision and strategic direction, working with members and officers to create and implement the Council’s Corporate Plan. The position of CEO and Head of Paid Service is a statutory position, and the post holder is also the Returning Officer for the Council.</p>	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT:	
<p>It is important that the process for recruiting a permanent CEO is recognised as fair and robust allowing the Council to appoint the best possible candidate, including decisions on the remuneration for this post. These processes are set out in the Constitution under the Terms of Reference for the Chief Executive’s Recruitment and Selection Panel and for the Chief Executive’s Remuneration Committee. The appointment of the CEO is a decision of Full Council based on a recommendation from the Recruitment and Selection Panel.</p>	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY:	
<p>The total full year cost of the proposals in this report is £209,000, which includes the basic salary, on-costs and recruitment costs.</p>	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide a report on the steps taken by the Chief Executive Recruitment and Selection Panel in identifying, evaluating, and selecting a candidate to fill the Head of Paid Service and Chief Executive position and to recommend the appointment of the Panel’s preferred candidate to be confirmed by Full Council.
- 1.2 Due to the need to complete formal elements of the normal recruitment process and protect the details of the candidate until we can formally confirm the job offer to them, details of the recommended candidate are set out in [(Exempt) Appendix X (to follow)]. Due to the need to maintain the confidentiality of the preferred candidate ahead of Full Council’s decision, any discussion of the candidate would need to take place in exempt business.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 It is recommended that Full Council

- (i) confirms the appointment of the preferred candidate as recommended by the Chief Executive's Recruitment and Selection Panel and set out in [(Exempt) Appendix X]; and
- (ii) appoints the Chief Executive's Recruitment and Selection Panel's preferred candidate as the Council's Returning Officer and Electoral Registration Officer with effect from the start date of their employment with Arun District Council.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3.1 The report informs members of the process followed by the Chief Executive's Recruitment and Selection Panel for the selection of a permanent Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service and recommends that Full Council confirms the appointment of the Panel's preferred candidate and appoints them as the Council's Returning Officer and its Electoral Registration Officer.

4. DETAIL

4.1 James Hassett (Chief Executive) left the Council on 31 May 2023. On 31 May 2023 Full Council appointed Philippa Dart (Director of Environment and Committees) and Karl Roberts (Director of Growth) to the positions of Interim Joint Chief Executives (acting as joint Heads of Paid Service). (See link to meeting in background papers.)

4.2 At its meeting on 10 January 2024 Full Council agreed to proceed with external recruitment for a permanent Chief Executive Officer using a specialist recruitment agency. The annual salary was agreed at £140,000, this to be all-inclusive with no other allowances being paid. It was also agreed that the annual pay award for the CEO should continue to be aligned with the national pay award for Chief Executives. (See link to meeting in background papers.)

4.3 The executive recruitment agency Starfish supported the recruitment process which included identification of potential candidates via advert and personal contact. Longlist candidates then had individual technical interviews with a former Chief Executive Officer from elsewhere in the country. The final part of the process for three shortlisted candidates took place over two days and included a stakeholder panel meeting, a staff panel meeting, and a meeting with the Leader and Deputy Leader. Candidates were then formally interviewed on Tuesday 23 April 2024 and a meeting of the Chief Executive's Recruitment and Selection Panel followed to enable the Panel to agree its preferred candidate and put forward their recommendation to Full Council.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Full Council, and therefore all members, will decide upon the recommendation from the Recruitment and Selection Panel and this decision is set out above.

6. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 6.1 By law the Council must designate one of its officers as its Head of Paid Service. At Arun District Council it is the Chief Executive post that is designated as such. At its meeting on 31 May 2023 Full Council agreed to appoint the Council's Directors as interim joint Heads of Paid Service until such time as a permanent Chief Executive Officer and Head of Paid Service were appointed. Therefore, Full Council must consider the recommendation set out in this report and no alternative options are available.

7. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF FINANCE/SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1 The full year cost of the proposals in this report is £209,000 including salary, pension, national insurance, and recruitment costs. Full provision has been made for this in the revenue budget but as the postholder will not commence employment until later in the financial year, there will be a one-off underspend in 2024/25.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 The CEO vacancy was identified as a significant risk factor in the Corporate Risk Register. Although appropriate arrangements have been in place to cover the post since the resignation of the previous CEO, the appointment to the permanent post is now required as agreed previously by Full Council in January

9. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

- 9.1 The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001 Schedule 1 Part II paragraph 4(1) ('the Regulations') state that the function of the appointment of an authority's head of paid service must be exercised by the authority (that is, its Full Council) before an offer of appointment is made.
- 9.2 Section 4 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 requires a local authority to designate one of its officers as its Head of Paid Service, and at Arun District Council the Chief Executive Officer is designated as such.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 10.1 The Council needs to ensure that it has a Head of Paid Service, a requirement under section 4 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

11. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

- 11.1 There are no such implications under this heading.

12. PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

12.1 There are no such implications under this heading.

13. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

13.1 The recruitment process was carried out in line with the fair and legal recruitment processes set out in Council's Constitution and employment policies.

14. CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

14.1 There are no such implications under this heading.

15. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

15.1 There are no such implications under this heading.

16. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

16.1 There are no such implications under this heading.

17. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

17.1 There are no such implications under this heading.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name: Jackie Follis

Job Title: Group Head of Organisational Excellence

Contact Number: 01903 737580

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

[Full Council Report and Minutes 31 May 2023](#)

[Full Council report and minutes 10 January 2024](#)

MEETING DATES 2024/25
For Full Council Approval – 13 March 2024 [Revised Following Council Debate]

	May 2024	June 2024	July 2024	August 2024	September 2024	October 2024
Mon			1 LGA Conference – Harrogate – travel day if attending		2	30 Conservative Party Conference Week
Tues			2 LGA Conference		3	1
Wed	1		3 LGA Conference		4	2
Thurs	2 PCC Elections		4 LGA [finishes am]	1	5	3 Audit & Governance (2)
Fri	3		5	2	6	4
Mon	6 Bank Holiday	3	8 Licensing Sub [if needed]	5	9 Licensing Sub [if needed]	7 Green Party Conference week – tbc?
Tues	7	4	9 Policy & Finance (1)	6	10 Housing & Wellbeing (2)	8
Wed	8	5 Planning	10 Planning	7 Planning	11 Planning	9
Thurs	9 Council (5)	6 Planning Policy (1)	11	8	12	10 Corporate Support (2)
Fri	10	7	12 Licensing Sub [if needed]	9	13	11
Mon	13	10 Constitution WP	15	12 Licensing Sub [if needed]	16 Lib Dem Party Conf Week	14 Licensing Sub [if needed]
Tues	14	11	16	13	17	15
Wed	15 Annual Council and Reception	12	17 Council (1)	14	18	16 Planning
Thurs	16	13 Economy (1)	18	15	19 Environment (2)	17 Standards (2)
Fri	17	14	19	16	20 Licensing (2)	18
Mon	20	17	22 School holidays	19	23 Labour Party Conference Week	21
Tues	21	18 Housing & Wellbeing (1)	23 Audit & Governance (1)	20	24	22 Economy (2)
Wed	22	19	24	21	25	23
Thurs	23	20 Environment (1)	25	22	26 Planning Policy (2)	24 Policy & Finance (2)
Fri	24	21	26	23	27	25
Mon	27 Half Term/Bank Holiday	24	29	26 Bank Holiday		28 Half Term
Tues	28	25 Standards (1)	30	27		29
Wed	29	26	31	28		30
Thurs	30	27 Corporate Support (1)		29		31
Fri	31	28 Licensing (1)		30		

MEETING DATES 2024/25
For Full Council Approval – 13 March 2024 [Revised Following Council Debate]

	November 2024	December 2024	January 2025	February 2025	March 2025	April 2025	May 2025
Mon		2		3	3		
Tues		3 Audit & Governance (3)		4 Housing & Wellbeing (4)	4	1 Economy (4)	
Wed		4	1 Bank Holiday	5	5	2 Environment [5]	
Thurs		5	2	6 Corporate Support (3)	6 Standards (4)	3 Special P&F [If needed]	1 WSCC Elections
Fri	1	6	3	7	7	4	2
Mon	4	9	6	10	10	7 Easter Holidays	5 Bank Holiday
Tues	5	10	7	11	11	8	6
Wed	6 Council (2)	11 Policy & Finance (3)	8 Council (3)	12	12	9	7
Thurs	7 Council (2)	12	9	13 Policy & Finance [For the Budget] (4)	13 Policy & Finance (5)	10	8 Planning
Fri	8	13 Licensing (3)	10	14	14	11	9
Mon	11 Licensing Sub [if needed]	16 Licensing Sub [if needed]	13 Licensing Sub	17 Half Term	17	14	12
Tues	12	17	14	18	18 Planning Policy (5)	15	13
Wed	13 Planning	18 Planning	15 Planning	19 Planning	19 Council (4)	16	14 Council (5)
Thurs	14 Environment (3)	19	16 Standards (3)	20	20 Housing & Wellbeing (5)	17	15
Fri	15	20	17	21	21	18 Good Friday	16
Mon	18	23 School Holidays	20	24 Licensing Sub [if needed]	24 Licensing Sub [if needed]	21 Easter Monday	19
Tues	19	24	21	25	25 Corporate Support (4)	22 Elections take over Civic Suite	20
Wed	20	25 Bank Holiday	22	26 Special Council [Budget]	26 Planning	23 Planning	21 Annual Council
Thurs	21 Housing & Wellbeing (3)	26 Bank Holiday	23 Economy (3)	27 Audit & Governance (4)	27	24	22
Fri	22	27	24	28 Licensing (4)	28	25	23
Mon	25	30	27		31	28	26 Bank Holiday Half Term
Tues	26	31	28 Planning Policy (4)			29	27
Wed	27		29			30	28
Thurs	28 Planning Policy (3)		30 Environment (4)				29
Fri	29		31				30

MEETING DATES 2024/25
For Full Council Approval – 13 March 2024 [Revised Following Council Debate]

NOTES

Areas shaded in green are school holidays and Bank Holidays

Meetings have been set in accordance with the frequency of meetings approved by Full Council when it changed its governance structure over to a Committee system – this being:

- Policy & Finance – 5
- Corporate Support – 4
- Planning Policy – 5
- Housing & Wellbeing – 5
- Environment – 5
- Economy – 4
- Council – 5 plus the Special for the Budget and Annual Council
- Audit & Governance (4), Standards (4) Licensing (4) Planning and Licensing Sub (monthly) – their frequency remains unchanged

Of concern is the Economy Committee where 2 Special Meetings were required in June and November 2023 to accommodate the workload of the Committee. Any request to change the frequency of meetings would need to be considered by the Constitution Working Party

Other Dates Avoided are:

Party Conference Weeks in September and October 2024 – some dates are still to be confirmed due to a pending General Election
Avoiding the Summer School Holidays as much as possible – only exception is Audit & Governance on 23 July 2023 and Planning in maintaining monthly meetings and Licensing Sub [where required]

Fitting in around the timescales for KPI performance reporting

Fitting in around the timescales that Finance works to in terms of Budget Setting and preparing the Annual Budget and consultation with all Committees as well as Budget Monitoring Report timescales

The Dates for Audit & Governance may have to be adjusted once Ernst & Young – audit deadlines have been confirmed

When the General Election is called – any clashes in meetings will be addressed at that time

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 11

Subject to approval at the next Constitution Working Party meeting

1

CONSTITUTION WORKING PARTY

15 April 2024 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Yeates (Chair), Jones (Vice-Chair), Bower, Butcher, Haywood, Penycate, Purser and Turner (Substitute for Councillor Greenway).

16. APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE

An Apology for Absence had been received from Councillor Greenway.

17. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

18. MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting of the Working Party held on 29 February 2024 were approved as a correct record, subject to a minor amendment as set out below:

Page 4 – 12.1 – Addressing a Committee

That the word **the** in the sentence below be deleted:

A member of the council shall have the right to attend a meeting of any committee of the council (~~except the Standards Committee~~) of which they are not a member, but they shall not be entitled to take part in any discussion or vote on **the** any matter under consideration.

19. ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA THAT THE CHAIR OF THE MEETING IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

The Chair confirmed that there were no urgent matters for this meeting.

20. SUNDRY DEBTORS - DEBT MANAGEMENT AND WRITE-OFF POLICY, REPORTING DEBT WRITE OFFS AND DELEGATION LIMITS

The Working Party received a report from the Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer proposing changes to the Council's Constitution in respect of the Debt Management and Write Off Policy and passing responsibility of it from the Policy & Finance Committee to the Corporate Support Committee.

Constitution Working Party - 15.04.24

The report also proposed consolidating responsibility of the delegated write off limits and debt write off reporting requirements covering the subsequent reporting of sundry debts, including write offs for irrecoverable council tax and business rates so that the process in place for reporting these could be streamlined and made easier to manage. Currently the reporting of these write offs were managed under three different service committees, the Policy & Finance Committee, the Housing & Wellbeing Committee and the Corporate Support Committee.

Such inconsistencies were reflected in the current Debt Management and Write Off Policy and would be addressed and updated when the Policy would next be revised. The report proposed that a revised Policy be presented to the Corporate Support Committee on 27 June 2024 for adoption with that Committee assuming responsibility for the Policy rather than the Policy & Finance Committee.

It was explained that the Corporate Support Committee would also have the responsibility of approving the writing off of irrecoverable council tax and business rates debts over the approved limits falling under its responsibility instead of the Housing & Wellbeing Committee.

The Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer then explained each of the constitutional changes proposed. It was highlighted that none of the proposals for change related to housing tenancy debts which would continue to report into the Housing & Wellbeing Committee. Members were also reassured that proposals to increase delegation limits would not result in any change in approach to debt management and the approach taken to writing off debts.

The Working Party then discussed the proposals. One question asked was if the changes were approved by Full Council, how would any future amendments be dealt with and could the Corporate Support Committee be granted delegated authority to change the delegation levels in the future, if needed, and if so, could this be considered as an additional recommendation.

It was explained by the Group Head of Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer that although Full Council held responsibility for approving constitutional changes, it could decide to give delegated authority to a committee to review an item moving forward and following initial review by Full Council. The Working Party agreed that the proposal to grant the Corporate Support Committee authority to be able to change write-off delegation limits in the future was sensible. It then discussed Member consultation on the proposals and some questioned whether each committee should have received a report on the proposals in advance of this meeting. Following debate, it was accepted that the membership of the Constitution Working Party consisted of a wide range of members from different Committees that could raise any concerns with other Members, this was the consultation process. It was also accepted that all Members would be able to debate the proposals when recommended onto Full Council.

Following further debate, the Working Party

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL – That

- (1) The Debt Management and Write-Off Policy be submitted to the Corporate Support Committee for future adoption as set out in Paragraph 4.3.1;
- (2) The proposed changes to the delegation levels outlined in paragraph 4.3.2 to 4.3.4 and 4.3.6 be approved;
- (3) The proposed changes to the constitution to transfer the responsibility of approving writing off of irrecoverable council tax and business rates debts over the limits set out in paragraphs 4.3.5 and 4.3.7 transfer from the Housing & Wellbeing Committee to the Corporate Support Committee; and
- (4) Delegated authority be given to the Corporate Support Committee to review and reset write off delegation levels in respect of irrecoverable sundry debts, council tax and business rate debts if and when required.

21. REVIEW OF WORKING PARTY WORK PROGRAMME

The Group Head of Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer confirmed that the scoping report regarding considering the reintroduction of a formal scrutiny function within the Committee system had been deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.

22. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Working Party

RESOLVED

That the date of its next meeting be 10 June 2024 at 6.00 pm.

(The meeting concluded at 6.37 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Arun District Council

REPORT TO:	Constitution Working Party - 15 April 2024
SUBJECT:	Sundry Debtors – Debt Management & Write Off Policy, Reporting Debt Write Offs and Delegation Limits
LEAD OFFICER:	Antony Baden, Group Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Gill Yeates - Chair
WARDS:	All
CORPORATE PRIORITY / POLICY CONTEXT / CORPORATE VISION: The Debt Management & Write Off policy and delegation limits support the efficient management of Sundry Debtors across the Council.	
DIRECTORATE POLICY CONTEXT: The policy is managed within the Finance Group and applies to sundry debts across all Directorates. It does not apply to Housing tenants' arrears.	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY: There are no additional costs arising from the proposals in this report.	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The Council's constitution sets out the arrangements for the management and reporting of sundry debts across the organisation. It also requires the Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer to submit periodically a Debt Management & Write Off Policy for approval and adoption by the Policy & Finance Committee. The policy is underpinned by several delegations to the Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer, which allows him/her to authorise writing off debts below certain amounts.
- 1.2 Responsibility for the Debt Management & Write Off Policy currently sits with the Policy & Finance Committee whilst the delegation levels and the subsequent reporting of write offs are currently within the remit of three different service committees, depending on the type of debt. This report sets out proposals to amend the Constitution by streamlining the responsibility for managing and reporting sundry debts and delegation limits under a single service committee.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Constitution Working Party recommends to Full Council that:
 - 2.1.1 The Debt Management and Write Off Policy be submitted to the Corporate Support Committee for future adoption as set out in paragraph 4.3.1;
 - 2.1.2 The proposed changes to the delegation levels outlined in paragraphs 4.3.2 to 4.3.4 and 4.3.6 be approved; and

- 2.1.3 The proposed changes to the constitution to transfer the responsibility of approving writing off of irrecoverable council tax and business rates debts over the limits set out in paragraphs 4.3.5 and 4.3.7 transfer from the Housing & Wellbeing Committee to the Corporate Support Committee be approved.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1 All Sundry Debts are considered recoverable, and every effort is made by Officers to collect the monies due, however, there will be some circumstances when it is necessary to write off a debt. The Debt Management and Write Off Policy outlines the Council's approach to managing this process.
- 3.2 Under Part 6, section 3, sub section 5.2 of the constitution, the Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer is required to update and submit the Debt Management and Write Off Policy for adoption by the Policy and Finance Committee.
- 3.3 The Debt Management and Write Off Policy is managed by the Group Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer, and is supported by several write off limits, which currently sit in various parts of the constitution under the Policy & Finance, Housing & Wellbeing and Corporate Support Committees.
- 3.4 Depending on the type of sundry debt, write offs approved under delegation must be reported to the relevant committee.
- 3.5 This report seeks to consolidate responsibility of the Debt Management & Write Off Policy, the delegated write off limits and debt write off reporting requirements under the Corporate Support Committee. None of the proposals in this report apply to housing tenancy debts.

4. DETAIL

- 4.1 The constitution contains several references to the management and reporting of sundry debts, including write offs. They span across three different service committees and whilst not presenting an operational risk, the debt write off limits and reporting requirements to committees are both inconsistent and inefficient.
- 4.2 The inconsistencies referred to in paragraph 4.1 are also reflected in the current Debt Management & Write Off Policy. This will be addressed and updated when the policy is next updated. If members approve the recommendations in this report a revised policy will be presented to the Corporate Support Committee currently scheduled for 27 June 2024.
- 4.3 The following outlines the current position set out in the constitution and the proposals to streamline the sundry debts management and reporting process:
- 4.3.1 Debt Management and Write Off policy – the Group Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer submits the updated policy to Policy & Finance Committee for adoption, (Part 6, section 3, sub section 5.2).

Proposal: the Group Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer submits the updated policy to Corporate Support Committee for adoption.

- 4.3.2 Irrecoverable debts up to £8,000 or aggregate debts up to £8,000 for any debtor in any one financial year – authority is delegated to the Group Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer, (Part 6, section 3, sub section 5.2).

Proposal: Increase the delegated authority to £10,000.

- 4.3.3 Irrecoverable debts over £8,000 – approval must be sought from the relevant committee, (Part 6, section 3, sub section 5.2).

Proposal: Increase the delegated authority to £10,000 to keep it in line with the proposal in 4.3.2 above. This would also bring the delegation level in line with Part 7, section 2, sub section 1.1.9 of the constitution whereby the Group Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer has authority to write off irrecoverable sundry debts up to £10,000 subject to a subsequent report presented to the Corporate Support Committee.

- 4.3.4 Irrecoverable Council Tax debts up to £10,000 – authority is delegated to the Group Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer but must be subsequently included in a written report to the Corporate Support Committee. (Part 7, section 2, sub section 1.1.10).

Proposal: Increase the delegated authority to £15,000, retaining the requirement to present a subsequent report to the Corporate Support Committee.

- 4.3.5 Irrecoverable Council Tax debts up to £5,000 – approval to write off such debts is required by the Housing & Wellbeing Committee. (Part 3, section 4.4, specific function 6). Members will note that this conflicts with the existing delegation outlined in 4.3.4 where the Group Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer has authority to write off debts up to £10,000.

Proposal: Remove the responsibility for this function from the Housing & Wellbeing Committee as it would effectively transfer to the Corporate Support Committee if the proposal in 4.3.4 is agreed.

- 4.3.6 Irrecoverable Business Rates debts up to £25,000 – authority is delegated to the Group Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer but must be subsequently included in a written report to the Corporate Support Committee. (Part 7, section 2, sub section 1.1.10).

Proposal: Increase the delegated authority to £30,000, retaining the requirement to present a subsequent report to the Corporate Support Committee.

- 4.3.7 Irrecoverable Business Rates debts up to £10,000 – approval to write off such debts is required by the Housing & Wellbeing Committee. (Part 3, section 4.4, specific function 6). Members will note that this conflicts with the existing delegation outlined in 4.3.6 where the Group Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer has authority to write off debts up to £25,000.

Proposal: Remove the responsibility for this function from the Housing & Wellbeing Committee as it would effectively transfer to the Corporate Support Committee if the proposal in 4.3.6 is agreed.

- 4.4 The aim of this report is to streamline the responsibility for managing and reporting sundry debts, council tax debts and business rates, and the associated delegation limits by bringing them under a single service committee. Part 3 of the constitution deals with the responsibilities of individual service committees. The Corporate Support Committee has delegated authority to exercise the council's functions relating to the delivery of several service areas, including Finance, (Part 3, Section 4, sub section 4.2). It is therefore considered the most appropriate committee to undertake the responsibilities set out in paragraphs 4.3.1 to 4.3.7.
- 4.5 The above proposals have different write off levels for each type of irrecoverable debt, i.e. £10,000 for sundry debts, £15,000 for Council Tax and £25,000 for Business Rates. There is no legal directive for adopting write off levels but as a rule, Business Rates debts tend to be higher than other debts whilst Council Tax debts are usually lower and sundry debts the lowest of all debt types.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Consultation has taken place with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Policy & Finance Committee and Corporate Management Team, all of whom are supportive of the recommendations in this report.
- 5.2 Members of the Housing & Wellbeing Committee have also frequently expressed a desire to see the matter of non-Housing tenancy sundry debt write off reported to the Corporate Support Committee and for officer delegation limits to be raised.

6. OPTIONS / ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 6.1 The only other option is to leave the constitution unamended. This would not represent any risk of financial loss but the current system of managing and reporting sundry debt write offs is inefficient and members have regularly expressed a desire for this to be addressed.

7. COMMENTS BY THE GROUP HEAD OF FINANCE/SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1 There are no existing or new financial implications associated with this report. Its focus is on the management and reporting of sundry debts.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 The recommendations in this report will facilitate a consolidated approach to debt management and there no risks associated with it.

9. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP HEAD OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

- 9.1 The Council's constitution sets out how the Council operates, how decisions are made, and the procedures that are followed to ensure decisions are efficient, transparent, and accountable. It is therefore important that the constitution is itself consistent and operates to deliver consistent and efficient decision-making.
- 9.2 The amendments proposed within this report are designed to address current inefficiencies in the way in which sundry debts are agreed by the Council's service committees and through delegation to officers. The proposals therefore support the sound governance principles set out in paragraph 9.1.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 10.1 The proposals in this report will have a beneficial impact upon the use of limited human resources in that the changes will make the debt management processes more efficient without losing appropriate member oversight.

11. HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT

- 11.1 None.

12. PROPERTY & ESTATES IMPACT

- 12.1 None.

13. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) / SOCIAL VALUE

- 13.1 None.

14. CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/SOCIAL VALUE

- 14.1 None.

15. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 15.1 None.

16. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

- 16.1 None.

17. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION / DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

- 17.1 None.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name: Antony Baden
Job Title: Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer
Contact Number: 01903 737558

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Constitution January 2024