



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

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

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

**Members are reminded to bring their Agendas from the Cabinet Meeting held on 9 December 2019 with them to the meeting**  
**NOTE: This meeting will be webcast but available to view on demand on 16 January 2020**

19 December 2019

## **COUNCIL MEETING**

To all Members of the Council

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL to be held on **Wednesday 15 January 2020 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 "N. V. Lynn".

Nigel Lynn  
Chief Executive

## **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**

To consider any petitions received from the public.

6. **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 22)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Special Meeting and the Minutes of the Full Council meeting both held on 13 November 2019, which are attached.

7. **Chairman's Announcements**

To receive such announcements as the Chairman 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.

**REPORTS FROM CABINET, OVERVIEW SELECT, REGULATORY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEES, AND FROM WORKING PARTIES AND WORKING GROUPS**

9. **Development Control Committee - 6 November 2019** (Pages 23 - 30)

The Chairman, Councillor Bennett, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 6 November 2019. There are no recommendations.

10. **Environment & Leisure Working Group - 7 November 2019** (Pages 31 - 36)

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Staniforth, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Environment & Leisure Working Group held on 7 November 2019.

The Chairman will confirm that the recommendation at Minute 9 [Urgent Item – Bognor Regis Disc Parking Scheme] has been withdrawn as this was superseded by the resolution made at Full Council on 13 November 2019 (*Minute 300 – Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee of 28 October 2019 refers*).

11. **Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee - 18 November 2019** (Pages 37 - 44)

The Chairman, Councillor Miss Seex, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee held on 18 November 2019. There are no recommendations.

12. **Audit & Governance Committee - 21 November 2019**

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Erskine, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Audit & Governance Committee held on 21 November 2019. There are recommendations at:

- Minute 310 [Treasury Management Mid-Year Report] – to view the Officer's report and appendices – please click on this link - please click here – [Report and Appendices](#)
- Minute 315 [Updates to the Council's Anti-Fraud, Corruption & Bribery Policy] – to view the Officer's report and Appendix – please click here - [Report](#) and [Appendix](#)
- Minute 316 [Updates to the Council's Corporate Policy & Procedure Document on the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (as amended, including The Investigatory Powers Act 2016)] – to view the Officer's report and appendix – please click here - [Report](#) and [Appendix](#)

13. **Cabinet - 9 December 2019**

The Chairman, Councillor Dr Walsh, will present the Minutes from the meeting of Cabinet held on 9 December 2019.

*The Minutes will be circulated separately and any recommendations will be reported to the meeting.*

14. **Planning Policy Sub-Committee - 17 December 2019**

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Yeates, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Planning Policy Sub-Committee held on 17 December 2019.

*The Minutes will be circulated separately and any recommendations will be reported to the meeting.*

15. **Chief Executive's Remuneration (CEO) Committee - 18 December 2019**

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Gregory, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Chief Executive's (CEO) Remuneration Committee.

*The Minutes will be circulated separately and any recommendations will be reported to the meeting.*

16. **Outcome of the Governance Working Party's Review** (Pages 45 - 58)

The Council agreed on 18 September 2019 that the outcome of the review conducted by the Governance Working Party to explore advantages and disadvantages of moving to a Committee system and whether there should be any change to its governance arrangements would be reported to this meeting. In support of its deliberations, the Council is being presented with:

**a) Governance Working Party – 12 November 2019**

The Chairman, Councillor Oppler, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Governance Working Party held on 12 November 2019. There are no recommendations.

**(b) Governance Working Party – 3 December 2019**

The Chairman, Councillor Oppler, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Governance Working Party held on 3 December 2019. There are no recommendations.

**(c) Special Audit & Governance Committee – 19 December 2019**

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Erskine, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Special Audit & Governance Committee held on 19 December 2019.

*The Minutes will be circulated separately and any recommendations will be reported to the meeting.*

**(d) Governance Working Party – 6 January 2020**

The Chairman, Councillor Oppler, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Governance Working Party held on 6 January 2020.

*The Minutes will be circulated separately and any recommendations will be reported to the meeting.*

**(e) Background Papers**

The reports considered by the Governance Working Party and Audit & Governance Committee are set out below – links have been provided so that you can view these documents:

Addendum 1	Report to the Governance Working Party (21.10.19) set how to approach the review <a href="#">Addendum 1</a>
Addendum 2	Report to the Governance Working Party (12.11.19) Fe from survey questionnaire with Councillors and the Management Team <a href="#">Addendum 2</a>

Addendum 3	Report to the Governance Working Party (03.12.19) setting out the background to the proposals for a draft Committee Structure <a href="#">Addendum 3</a> and <a href="#">Addendum 3A</a>
Addendum 4	Report to the Governance Party (03.12.19) setting out the pros and cons of a Hybrid structure, based on the Tunbridge Wells model <a href="#">Addendum 4</a>
Addendum 5A	Report from Tunbridge Wells Borough Council which sets out the background to the hybrid proposals they introduced in 2012 <a href="#">Addendum 5A</a>
Addendum 6	Snapshot of the role of Tunbridge Wells' Overview and Scrutiny Committee in their hybrid model <a href="#">Addendum 6</a>
Addendum 7	Alternative Hybrid structure which has been in operation in Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council since 2002 <a href="#">Addendum 7</a>
Addendum 8	Report to the Audit & Governance Committee (19.12.19) covering the consultation phase of the review ( <i>the addendum documents are not reproduced as these are provided as part of this agenda</i> ) <a href="#">Addendum 8</a>
Addendum 9	Local Government Association and Centre for Public Scrutiny guidance "Rethinking governance – practical steps for councils considering changes to their governance arrangements" <a href="#">Addendum 9</a>
Addendum 10	Centre for Public Scrutiny briefing "Musical Chairs – Practical issues for local authorities in moving to a committee system" <a href="#">Addendum 10</a>

**(f) Report from the Chief Executive**

The Chief Executive will present a report setting out the legal and technical issues that the Council will need to consider in response to the conclusions of the Governance Working Party. If a recommendation for change is proposed to move to an alternative governance arrangement, the Council will be asked to:

- (i) Agree the formal resolution for any change to governance arrangements' and
- (ii) Instruct Officers to take forward the re-design rules and procedures

Please note that this report will be circulated separately to this agenda and after the meeting of the Governance Working Party held on 6 January 2020.

17. **Motions**

The following Motion has been received from the Liberal Democrat Group in accordance with Council Procedure 14.1 and 14.2, the detail of which is set out below:

The Council is asked to support a request for Officers to explore what options might exist for introducing further controls on the definition, number and quality of Homes in Multiple Occupation and prepare appropriate reports for the relevant decision body of the Council. The reasons why such additional controls are considered necessary is that HMO's are often concentrated in clusters. These are areas that can often suffer from poor housing conditions and high levels of deprivation, crime and anti-social behaviour. Introducing further controls would be expected to contribute to an improvement in the social and economic conditions in the areas; a reduction in anti-social behaviour; an improvement in general housing conditions; and a reduction in the level of deprivation; and a reduction in crime.

18. **Questions from Members**

To consider general questions from Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.3.

**OFFICER REPORTS**

19. **Adoption (Making) of the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan Review - 2018-2031**  
(Pages 59 - 62)

On 19 November 2019, there was a referendum held on the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan Review 2018-2031. More than 50% of those voting on the day, voted 'yes', which triggers the requirement for the Local Planning Authority under section 61E(4) of the 1990 Act, to 'make' (adopt) the Plan. This adoption will give the Plan legal force and it will form part of the statutory Development Plan for Arundel. Consequently, decisions on planning applications in Arundel neighbourhood area will need to be made in accordance with the Neighbourhood Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

20. **Committee Memberships**

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

21. **Representation on Outside Bodies**

The Council is asked to approve any changes to its representation on Outside Bodies. Any changes can be reported verbally to the meeting by the Leader of the Council.

- Members are reminded that if they have detailed questions, would they please inform the relevant Cabinet Member/Chairman and/or Director in advance of the meeting in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules
- Copies of the reports on the recommendations from the Cabinet Meetings have been previously circulated to Members and Members are asked to bring their copies with them to the meeting. Further copies are available from the Committee Manager.
- Copies of the reports on the recommendations from the other Committees are provided via an e-link, where appropriate
- Filming, Photography and Recording at Council Meetings - The District Council supports the principles of openness and transparency in its decision making and permits filming, recording and the taking of photographs at its meetings that are open to the public. This meeting may therefore be recorded, filmed or broadcast by video or audio, by third parties. Arrangements for these activities should operate in accordance with guidelines agreed by the Council and as available via the following link – [Filming Policy](#)

This page is intentionally left blank



# Public Document Pack Agenda Item 6

Subject to approval at the next Full Council meeting

205

**MINUTES  
OF A  
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL  
HELD IN THE ARUN CIVIC CENTRE  
ON 13 NOVEMBER 2019 AT 6.00 PM**

Present: Councillors Mrs Warr (Chairman), Mrs Worne (Vice-Chairman), Batley, Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, C Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Brooks, Buckland, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Dendle, Dixon, Edwards, Elkins, English, Mrs Erskine, Mrs Gregory, Goodheart, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Jones, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Purchase, Miss Rhodes, Roberts, Miss Seex, Smith, Mrs Stainton, Mrs Staniforth, Stanley, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates.

Honorary Alderman Mrs Stinchcombe was also present at the meeting.

280. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Councillors, Honorary Alderman Mrs Stinchcombe, special guests and members of the public and press to this Special Council Meeting.

281. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mrs Daniells and Miss Needs and from Honorary Aldermen Mrs Goad, MBE, Mrs Morrish and Squires.

282. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor C Blanchard-Cooper declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 3 [Conferment of the Title of Honorary Alderman] as a Member of Littlehampton Town Council].

A Declaration of Interest Sheet had been circulated to the meeting setting out 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. This table is set out below:

Full Council - 13.11.19

<b>Name</b>	<b>Town or Parish Council or West Sussex County Council [WSSC]</b>
Councillor Tracey Baker	Littlehampton
Councillor Kenton Batley	Bognor Regis
Councillor Jamie Bennett	Rustington
Councillor Paul Bicknell	Angmering
Councillor Billy Blanchard-Cooper	Littlehampton
Councillor Jim Brooks	Bognor Regis
Councillor Ian Buckland	Littlehampton and WSSC
Councillor Mike Clayden	Rustington
Councillor Andy Cooper	Rustington
Councillor Alison Cooper	Rustington
Councillor David Edwards	WSSC
Councillor Roger Elkins	Ferring and WSSC
Councillor Paul English	Felpham
Councillor Inna Erskine	Bognor Regis
Councillor Steve Goodheart	Bognor Regis
Councillor Pauline Gregory	Rustington
Councillor June Hamilton	Pagham
Councillor Shirley Haywood	Middleton-on-Sea
Councillor David Huntley	Pagham
Councillor Henry Jones	Bognor Regis
Councillor Martin Lury	Bersted
Councillor Francis Oppler	WSSC
Councillor Jacky Pendleton	Middleton-on-Sea and WSSC
Councillor Vicky Rhodes	Littlehampton
Councillor Dan Purchase	WSSC
Councillor Emily Seex	Littlehampton
Councillor Martin Smith	Aldwick
Councillor Samantha Staniforth	Bognor Regis
Councillor Matt Stanley	Bognor Regis
Councillor Isabel Thurston	Barnham & Eastergate
Councillor James Walsh	Littlehampton and WSSC
Councillor Jeanette Warr	Bognor Regis
Councillor Amanda Worne	Yapton
Councillor Gillian Yeates	Bersted

283. CONFERMENT OF THE TITLE OF HONORARY ALDERMAN

The Council

RESOLVED

That in pursuance of Section 249(1) of the Local Government Act 1972, the title of Honorary Alderman be conferred on Norman Dingemans who has, in the opinion of the Council, rendered eminent services to this Council as a past Member of this Council.

A commemorative certificate and Honorary Alderman's Jewel were then presented to Mr Dingemans by the Chairman.

(The meeting concluded at 6.20 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES  
OF A  
MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL  
HELD IN THE ARUN CIVIC CENTRE  
ON 13 NOVEMBER 2019 AT 6.30 PM**

Present: Councillors Mrs Warr (Chairman), Mrs Worne (Vice-Chair), Mrs Baker, Batley, Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, C Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Brooks, Buckland, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Dendle, Dixon, Edwards, Elkins, English, Mrs Erskine, Goodheart, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Jones, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Purchase, Miss Rhodes, Roberts, Miss Seex, Smith, Mrs Stainton, Mrs Staniforth, Stanley, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates

Honorary Alderman Mrs Stinchcombe was also in attendance at the meeting.

284. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Councillors, representatives of the public, press and officers to the Council Meeting. A special welcome was extended to Honorary Mrs Stinchcombe.

285. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mrs Daniells and Miss Needs and from Honorary Aldermen Dingemans, Mrs Goad, MBE, Mrs Morrish and Squires.

286. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Coster declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 12 [Development Control Committee – 9 October 2019] in relation to Planning Application AW/134/19/HH. He stated that he needed to make this meeting aware that he may have made public statements as part of his election campaign and or in other circumstances that he had concerns about this particular application. He emphasised that these were his views held at this time, however, he had held an open mind regarding this application.

A Declaration of Interest Sheet had been circulated to the meeting setting out 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. This table is set out below:

Full Council - 13.11.19

<b>Name</b>	<b>Town or Parish Council or West Sussex County Council [WSCC]</b>
Councillor Tracey Baker	Littlehampton
Councillor Kenton Batley	Bognor Regis
Councillor Jamie Bennett	Rustington
Councillor Paul Bicknell	Angmering
Councillor Billy Blanchard-Cooper	Littlehampton
Councillor Chris Blanchard-Cooper	Littlehampton
Councillor Jim Brooks	Bognor Regis
Councillor Ian Buckland	Littlehampton and WSCC
Councillor Mike Clayden	Rustington
Councillor Andy Cooper	Rustington
Councillor Alison Cooper	Rustington
Councillor David Edwards	WSCC
Councillor Roger Elkins	Ferring and WSCC
Councillor Paul English	Felpham
Councillor Inna Erskine	Bognor Regis
Councillor Steve Goodheart	Bognor Regis
Councillor Pauline Gregory	Rustington
Councillor June Hamilton	Pagham
Councillor Shirley Haywood	Middleton-on-Sea
Councillor David Huntley	Pagham
Councillor Henry Jones	Bognor Regis
Councillor Martin Lury	Bersted
Councillor Francis Oppler	WSCC
Councillor Jacky Pendleton	Middleton-on-Sea and WSCC
Councillor Vicky Rhodes	Littlehampton
Councillor Dan Purchase	WSCC
Councillor Emily Seex	Littlehampton
Councillor Martin Smith	Aldwick
Councillor Samantha Staniforth	Bognor Regis
Councillor Matt Stanley	Bognor Regis
Councillor Isabel Thurston	Barnham & Eastergate
Councillor James Walsh	Littlehampton and WSCC
Councillor Jeanette Warr	Bognor Regis
Councillor Amanda Worne	Yapton
Councillor Gillian Yeates	Bersted

287. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chairman invited questions from members of the public who had submitted their questions in advance of the meeting in accordance with the rules of the Council's Constitution.

The Chairman announced that one question had been received. This asked the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Stanley, if the Council could consider organising a national contest for a best designed shelter as there was a serious lack of proper shelters for rest and cover from inclement weather when walking along the river and seafront promenades at Littlehampton.

The Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Stanley, responded stating that there were currently a number of opportunities to obtain shelter from the elements in this area. In addition to the Coastguard Tower there was another shelter to the rear of the kiosks to the east and a shelter to the north. There were also two structures known as the "Stage by the Sea" and the two shelters within the Longest Bench all providing opportunities to shelter if the weather unexpectedly turned inclement.

Councillor Stanley also pointed out that there were a number of cafes in this area where shelter could be taken. He confirmed that there were no plans to review or expand on the number of sheltering spaces in Littlehampton in the near future due to the fact that there were a number of opportunities where shelter could currently be taken. However, as plans progressed for Littlehampton regeneration, the questioner's suggestions would be something that he would keep in mind.

The Chairman then invited the questioner to ask a supplementary question.

The questioner recommended the Cabinet Member to visit the seafront at Littlehampton next time a south westerly gale was blowing and whilst it was raining as the result was that in these instances anyone walking along the promenade area would become soaked due to being open to the elements. It was the questioner's view that none of the suggestions made were any good as not everyone wanted to enter a café and have to purchase food or drink just to take shelter. He referred to Worthing seafront that had many excellent shelters situated all along its promenade and asked again if the Council would look at this very strongly and bring this forward.

Councillor Stanley responded stating that he took the comments and observations on board.

The Chairman then drew Public Question Time to a close.

288. PETITIONS

The Chairman confirmed that no petitions had been received.

Full Council - 13.11.19

289. MINUTES

The Chairman announced that since the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 18 September 2019 had been agreed as a correct record at the Special Meeting of the Council held on 10 October 2019, a clerical error had been identified in Minute 221 [Motions] and the resolution on Motion 3 [Membership of the Development Control Committee]. The amended Motion carried by the Council was for the number of Members that could also be Cabinet Members be increased from 2 to 4. This decision had not been reflected in Resolution (1).

The Council was therefore being asked to agree that the final sentence of Resolution (1) at Minute 221 should read as follows:-

“I make a request to change the following section of the Council’s Constitution – Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions – Paragraph 4.2 – Development Control Committee in terms of the stipulation that no more than 2 Members can also be Cabinet Members and increase this figure from 2 to 4”.

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

The Chairman then asked Council to approve the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Council held on 10 October 2019.

Councillor Coster confirmed that he felt that there was an inaccuracy at Minute 264 [A27 Trunk Road – Improvements at Arundel] on page 200 of the Minutes [Page 10 of the agenda] in terms of the comment summary provided in respect of the Crimson route. The final paragraph at this section stated that this route would destroy 21 hectares of ancient woodland.

Councillor Coster referred to the consultation document provided by Highways England [Page 17] confirming that the correct figure was in fact 9.2 hectares not 21. Councillor Coster stated that this was also the figure outlined on Page 14 of the document.

Following some debate, it was agreed that the statement highlighting 21 hectares of ancient woodland would be amended to read 9.20 hectares of ancient woodland, in line with the public consultation document.

The Minutes were then approved as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

290. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman alerted Members to the list of engagements and events that had been attended since the Special Meeting of the Council held on 10 October 2019 – these had been emailed to Councillors recently.



291. URGENT MATTERS

There were no items for this meeting.

292. HOUSING & CUSTOMER SERVICES WORKING GROUP - 19 SEPTEMBER 2019

The Chairman, Councillor Bennett, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Housing & Customer Services Working Group held on 19 September 2019.

Councillor Bennett alerted Members to a recommendation at Minute 8 [Work Programme 2019/2020] in which the Council was being asked to approve the Working Group's Work Programme for this Municipal Year 2019/2020. Councillor Bennett then duly proposed the recommendation which was then seconded by Councillor Coster.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the Housing & Customer Services Working Group's Work Programme for 2019/20 be approved.

293. LICENSING COMMITTEE - 20 SEPTEMBER 2019

The Chairman, Councillor B Blanchard-Cooper, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 20 September 2019.

Councillor B Blanchard-Cooper then alerted Members to two recommendations at Minute 230 [Statement of Licensing Policy – Revision] and in formally proposing the recommendations stated that he wished to thank Officers for providing such a succinct and easy to read report. Councillor Clayden then duly seconded the recommendations.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) The Statement of Licensing Policy be approved for adoption to take effect from 1 January 2020; and

(2) Authority be delegated to the Group Head of Technical Services to make minor changes to the Policy, in consultation with the Chairman.

294. CABINET - 7 OCTOBER 2019

The Chairman, Councillor Dr Walsh, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 7 October 2019.

Full Council - 13.11.19

295. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 9 OCTOBER 2019

*(Councillor Coster redeclared his Personal Interest in this item in line with his Declaration made at the start of the meeting).*

The Chairman, Councillor Bennett, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 9 October 2019.

296. PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE - 15 OCTOBER 2019

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Yeates, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Planning Policy Sub-Committee held on 15 October 2019.

Councillor Mrs Yeates firstly alerted Members to the first of a series of recommendations at Minute 12 [Planning Policy and Climate Change Emergency] which she duly proposed. The three recommendations were then duly seconded by Councillor Jones.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) a climate change emergency be agreed by the Environment & Leisure Working Group and declared by the Council;
- (2) should a climate change emergency be declared, Officers investigate the scope of evidence necessary to test the feasibility and viability of achieving higher standards of sustainable design and adopting a zero-carbon target by 2030 where achievable; and
- (3) following consideration of this evidence and testing, Officers to prepare a review of the development management policies in the Local Plan or a Supplementary Planning Document.

The Chairman then drew Members' attention to the next set of recommendations at Minute 13 [Provision of Accommodation Suitable for Older People and People with Disabilities] which she duly proposed. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Jones.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) the proposed guidance for the provision of Accommodation Suitable for Older Persons and People with Disabilities be treated as a guide (i.e. not as a Supplementary Planning Document) to provide a material consideration in respect of the determination of all relevant planning applications; and

(2) the proposed guidance is clearly set out as a starting point to inform development management negotiations, does not impose rigid requirement and is subject to viability.

The Chairman then referred Members to the final recommendation at Minute 16 [Housing Delivery Test] which she duly proposed. This recommendation was then seconded by Councillor Jones.

The Council

RESOLVED

That, subject to any further minor changes made by the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and the Portfolio Holder for Planning, the Action Plan be approved as a technical document for publication on the Council's web site.

Councillor Bower raised a Point of Order in relation to Minute 14 [Open Space Playing Pitches and Built Sports Facilities] and Minute 15 [Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document] which had recommendations for Full Council to consider but for the meeting to be held on 15 January 2020. He felt that this approach was confusing and asked how the recommendations could be considered later when the Minutes would be considered tonight.

The Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer confirmed that the matters at Minutes 14 and 15 would need to be represented to the next meeting of the Planning Policy Sub-Committee on 17 December 2019 so that the recommendations could be debated on 15 January 2020.

297. ELECTORAL REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE - 16 OCTOBER 2019

The Vice-Chairman, Councillor Jones, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Electoral Review Sub-Committee held on 16 October 2019.

Councillor Jones alerted Members to three recommendations at Minute 8 [Review of Polling District, Polling Places and Polling Stations] which he formally proposed. The recommendations were seconded by Councillor Oppler.

The Council

Full Council - 13.11.19

RESOLVED – That

- (1) the location of polling stations/places as set out in Appendix 1 from 2020 onwards be accepted;
- (2) delegated authority be given to the Returning Officer to complete any outstanding work identified in Appendix 1; and
- (3) delegated authority be given to the Returning Officer to make changes to polling stations where these are required urgently.

298. GOVERNANCE WORKING PARTY - 21 OCTOBER 2019

The Chairman, Councillor Oppler, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Governance Working Party held on 21 October 2019.

Councillor Oppler outlined that he wished to take this opportunity to thank the Members of the Working Party for their constructive contribution made to this meeting and to the meeting held on 12 November 2019. It was the Working Party's plan to develop options for Full Council to consider at its next meeting to be held on 15 January 2019. Finally, he thanked the Chief Executive, the Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer and the Group Head of Policy for all their hard work and assistance with this review to date.

299. OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE - 22 OCTOBER 2019

The Chairman, Councillor Coster, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Overview Select Committee held on 22 October 2019.

Councillor Coster made reference to Minute 259 [Leisure Operating Contract – Year Three Report] and the presentation made by Freedom Leisure outlining their performance and activities over the last three years. Some very interesting key points had been highlighted. One had been the plans in place for addressing the issue of obesity in the District. It was Councillor Coster's view that more work needed to take place to address this vital issue.

Councillor Lury stated that he had submitted his apologies yet they had not been recorded and so he asked if the minutes could be amended accordingly.

300. BOGNOR REGIS REGENERATION SUB-COMMITTEE - 28 OCTOBER 2019

The Chairman, Councillor Stanley, in presenting the Minutes from the meeting of the Bognor Regis Sub-Committee held on 28 October 2019 confirmed that a revised set of Minutes had been circulated to the meeting.

Although the agenda confirmed that there were no recommendations for the Council to consider, Councillor Stanley stated that this was not correct. Since the Minutes had been circulated in Bundle 2 on 7 November 2019, a question had been raised about their accuracy as they had not included two proposals put forward at the meeting and voted upon. Councillor Stanley outlined that he had raised this with the Council's Monitoring Officer, and this had identified that the outcome of these proposals had not been clearly minuted as recommendations to come before the Council at this meeting. Having reviewed the notes taken at the meeting, a clerical error had been identified and the minutes subsequently revised and reissued setting out the two recommendations that need to be considered tonight.

Councillor Stanley confirmed that the first recommendation was at Minute 10 [The Arun Public Spaces Protection Order] where the Sub-Committee had been informed of the public consultation exercise underway. At that meeting Members had raised serious concerns about the impact of reducing the Public Spaces Protection Order areas and wished to formally respond to the consultation exercise. The revised minutes confirmed that it was proposed, second and voted upon "That the formal response of the Bognor Regis Sub-Committee was that the areas that had been removed from the existing Public Space Protection Order should be reinstated into the new Order".

Councillor Stanley stated that he was aware that Cabinet would be considering the outcome of this consultation exercise at its meeting to be held on 13 January 2020 and he gave Members of the Sub-Committee his assurance that he would present their formal response and the reasons for this at that meeting. Councillor Stanley therefore proposed this recommendation and it was seconded by Councillor Brooks.

In discussing the recommendation, concern was expressed as to why this recommendation had not been minuted accurately and especially since there had been a lengthy debate on the consultation and the PSPO.

The Monitoring Officer reconfirmed the statement made by Councillor Stanley stating in that there had been no deliberate omission, it had been a misunderstanding from the notes taken at that meeting. As soon as this had been brought to her attention, she had alerted Councillor Stanley of the issue.

Further debate then focused on the PSPO. It was highlighted by the Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing, Councillor Mrs Yeates, that the PSPO had been presented to the Sub-Committee to outline the public consultation process undertaken. The existing PSPO, introduced by the Council in 2017, remained in place until March 2020 and so there was still time for further debate. She was not sure that the wording in the recommendation from the Sub-Committee was completely correct, as nothing had yet, been removed from the PSPO. There had been several responses from the public, but nothing submitted by Members of the Council or Parish Councils. Councillor Mrs Yeates stated that she had asked if Officers could provide a further briefing to Members on this matter and that the Council would be looking at addressing the issues that had been raised by the Traders of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton.

Full Council - 13.11.19

Many Members then provided their viewpoints. They widely supported the need for the areas covered in the PSPO introduced in 2017 to remain. This was because anti-social behaviour was a District wide problem and so it was felt to be dangerous to accept the changes proposed to introduce new areas that would specifically relate to just the Town Centres of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton. There was concern that this would have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring villages as people caught causing anti-social and nuisance behaviour would relocate to nearby rural areas instead. A request was made to have the PSPO fully examined again and to provide Members with the opportunity for this to be fully debated by all Councillors via the decision-making route used back in 2017.

The Chief Executive stated that it had been unfortunate that neither the author of the report or the Committee Manager had not been present at the meeting and so the guidance that should have been given to Members had not taken place. When an issue of accuracy with the minutes published had been identified, Councillor Stanley had re-presented them accurately corrected. The Chief Executive reminded Members that the report had been presented to inform the Sub-Committee of the consultation process undertaken and that any observations made by the Sub-Committee would be fed into the consultation exercise which would ultimately be considered by Cabinet in January 2020. Councillor Stanley had also given his assurance that all comments made by the Sub-Committee would be reported to Cabinet. No decision to determine the PSPO could be made at this meeting.

A lengthy debate then took place about the method of decision making for this item. Councillor Dr Walsh then proposed an amendment to the recommendation which read as follows (additions are shown in **bold**):

“That the formal response of the Bognor Regis Sub-Committee **is forwarded to the Cabinet meeting on 13 January 2020 for consideration** this being that the areas that have been removed from the existing Public Space Protection Order should be reinstated into the new Order”.

This amendment was seconded by Councillor Brooks.

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

The Chairman then referred Members to the substantive recommendation, as amended and on putting this to the vote it was declared LOST.

The Chief Executive confirmed to Members that this decision meant that no formal response would be put to the Cabinet when it considered the outcome of the consultation exercise.

Councillor Stanley then referred Members to the second recommendation at Minute 11 [Bognor Regis Business Improvement District (BID) in which the Sub-Committee had received a verbal update on the work and progress of the BID. Councillor Stanley outlined that he wished to reinforce the Sub-Committee's

congratulations to Mr Paul Wells who had recently stepped down as Chairman in terms of the achievements that he and the BID had made. Congratulations had also been passed to Mr Jason Passingham on his recent appointment as Board Chairman.

Councillor Stanley outlined that debate on this item had seen the Sub-Committee wishing for further investigation to take place into the potential for a longer-term agreement for two-hour free parking in Bognor Regis. The revised minutes set out what was being recommended to Full Council.

Councillor Stanley confirmed that he now wished to withdraw this recommendation as he was now aware that an urgent item on the two-hour disc parking scheme had been presented to the meeting of the Environment & Leisure Working Group on 7 November 2019. The Working Group had made a recommendation to Full Council that the two-hour free parking scheme be extended to 31 December 2022. This recommendation would be submitted to the next meeting of Full Council to be held on 15 January 2020 allowing all Members the opportunity to discuss and debate the item.

Although Members were happy to withdraw the recommendation based on the recommendation coming forward from the Working Group to a future Full Council meeting, it was queried why, as this had been an urgent item to the Working Group, why the minutes from that meeting and the recommendation, had not been placed onto the agenda for tonight's meeting.

The Chief Executive and the Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer explained that as the meeting of the Working Group had been held only last week [7 November 2019], this did not allow enough time to compile the minutes and present them in line with Access to Information Rules set out in the Council's Constitution. If the need to consider the matter tonight had been raised earlier, the Minutes and the recommendation could have been presented at the start of the meeting as an urgent item. A solution was presented which was that authority could be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Technical Services to action the decision of this investigation as a matter of urgency.

This proposal was accepted by Councillor Stanley who then proposed this amendment, and this was then seconded by Councillor Brooks. The amendment is set out below with deletions shown using ~~strike through~~ and additions shown in **bold**.

"That Officers investigate a longer term (more than 1 year) agreement for the 2-hour free parking scheme between the Council and the Bognor Regis Improvement District (BID) **and authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Technical Services to action the outcome decision of this investigation as a matter of urgency.**"

The Chairman then invited debate on this amendment. It was highlighted by Councillor Brooks that in view of the urgency of the Bognor Regis Bid to print the new discs for the 2-hour free parking scheme ahead of the beginning of December [to include confirmation of an extension of the scheme to 31 December 2022] the amendment should be accepted. The recommendation as amended would allow the

Full Council - 13.11.19

Cabinet Member to implement this decision by way of an Individual Cabinet Member Decision.

Following some discussion and on the amendment being put to the vote it was declared CARRIED.

The Chairman then returned to the substantive recommendation and the Council

RESOLVED

That Officers investigate a longer term (more than 1 year) agreement for the 2-hour free parking scheme between the Council and the Bognor Regis Improvement District (BID) and authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Technical Services to action the decision of this investigation as a matter of urgency.

Councillor Charles confirmed that he wished to make a Statement in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.3 in relation Minute 12 [Bognor Regis Regeneration Position Statement in relation to the Old Town and Pier]. Councillor Charles outlined that the full detail of his statement and a question that he had asked had not been detailed in full as part of the minutes, despite him making this request. He had asked Councillor Oppler a question, which he felt needed to be answered, regarding a statement that Councillor Oppler had made at the previous meeting of the Sub-Committee regarding Waterloo Place. It was Councillor Charles' view that the statement made by Councillor Oppler had been incorrect and he wished for this to be withdrawn.

The Chief Executive advised Councillor Charles to put his concerns to Councillor Oppler in writing.

### 301. MOTIONS

The Chairman announced that one Motion had been received in accordance with Council Procedure Rules 14.1 and 14.2, this had been circulated in Bundle 2 on 7 November 2019. The Motion is set out below:

“That this Council supports the aspiration of increasing the proportion of homes which are designed to accommodate a person through all phases of their life, otherwise known as “Lifetime Homes”. In doing so the Council would be acknowledging the diverse and ageing population in our area.

In pursuit of this aspiration and pending a review of relevant Local Plan Policies, the Council requests the developers of all sites to improve the accessibility and inclusiveness of all homes.

Simple changes should be considered for incorporation into designs to enable, not just the occupiers of the property, but their family and friends, to gain access within



their capabilities. As a result, this would create houses that could be visited by all irrespective of their ability.

The Council agrees that after the adoption of its Design Guide. Future design guidance be prepared to implement these aspirations as part of the Council's plan making".

The Chairman invited Councillor Mrs Worne, to propose and present her Motion.

In proposing her Motion, Councillor Mrs Warne highlighted that everyone present in the Council Chamber this evening could, in the future, find themselves in a situation where their personal circumstances changed. Everyone took independence for granted until this was suddenly lost or changed in some way. Councillor Mrs Worne stated that she had reflected upon how she had felt following her attendance at her local Remembrance Sunday service in remembering the soldiers and those who had fought and those who had died fighting for our today's independence. It was her view that we all had an obligation to continue in a passive way to fight for independence out of a sense of duty for all those who had served in this way. Councillor Mrs Worne stated that it was unacceptable that there were people who had suffered an accident or illness and were still in hospital unable to leave as there was no-where suitable for them to live allowing them to cater for their new disability. Sadly, as a result of this, some ultimately ended up having to live in care homes which was costing the Country millions of pounds.

Councillor Mrs Worne stated had everyone had the right to independence and that it was impossible to know when this could be lost, or partly lost, she knew this from personal experience, this could be because of illness, an accident or old age. She felt that everyone should be able to visit a friend for a cup of tea and it was vital to future proof homes to provide security and peace of mind. This could be achieved with some simple adaptations that could save money and help in cases of flooding.

The Motion was then seconded by Councillor Chapman.

The Chairman then invited Members to debate the Motion. All Councillors who spoke supported this cross-party Motion confirming that it was a thoughtful and well-worded proposal that sent an important and clear message out to the wider community, this being that all new homes needed to be future proofed against the ageing process and that if simple adaptations could be made at the design and build stage, the costs of which would be minimal, it was hoped that Arun as a Council could be seen to be leading the way on this important issue.

More debate followed with those speaking praising Councillor Mrs Worne for proposing the Motion as it was such an important subject for all as it was about inclusivity and the mental wellbeing of Arun's community. It was hoped that simple steps such as making doors wider; raising electricity plugs and improving access to buildings would make a real difference. It was felt that these steps needed to become mandatory and it was hoped that Arun could achieve this. A request was made that

Full Council - 13.11.19

assessments be made of the Council's own housing stock in line with this Motion and that a report be presented to Members on progress sometime soon. Mention was made of the need to build bungalows as part of new developments and that pressure should be put onto developers to do this. Too much focus was placed onto "first time Buyers" and not "last time buyers".

On the Motion being put to the vote, it was declared CARRIED.

The Council

#### RESOLVED

That this Council supports the aspiration of increasing the proportion of homes which are designed to accommodate a person through all phases of their life, otherwise known as "Lifetime Homes". In doing so the Council would be acknowledging the diverse and ageing population in our area.

In pursuit of this aspiration and pending a review of relevant Local Plan Policies, the Council requests the developers of all sites to improve the accessibility and inclusiveness of all homes.

Simple changes should be considered for incorporation into designs to enable, not just the occupiers of the property, but their family and friends, to gain access within their capabilities. As a result, this would create houses that could be visited by all irrespective of their ability.

The Council agrees that after the adoption of its Design Guide. Future design guidance be prepared to implement these aspirations as part of the Council's plan making".

#### 302. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

The Chairman confirmed that the Questions from Members along with their responses had been circulated to the meeting and so this would be put without discussion, in line with the Constitution.

The Chairman then invited each questioner to ask a supplementary question.

Some of the questioners asked supplementary questions. These questions and the supplementary responses can be found on the schedule attached to these Minutes.

#### 303. STRATEGIC COUNCIL TARGETS FOR THE PERIOD 2019/2023

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh, presented this report and stated that the Council currently had three main aims; to deliver the best services; to support those that needed help; and to plan in the future. These aims would remain. However, as a result of the new administration the Council needed to be clear what it wanted to

achieve. The strategic targets set out in the report had been worked up with the Council's Senior Management Team.

The report set out the new proposed strategic targets which would take the Council through to 2023. The targets had been set out in the Appendix to the report and had been divided into priority order.

Councillor Dr Walsh stated that by agreeing these additional targets, the Council's Chief Executive would be able to allocate resources to try to achieve them, in an agreed way and within an agreed timetable.

In debating the report varying comments were made.

It was outlined that the six items listed as being of high priority should be considered with caution. This was because when tasks were listed as a high priority and urgent, they were often not achieved – there was the potential for an element of overload in terms of available Officer time and the timescales confirmed, was this achievable?

There were Councillors who were disappointed with the targets and they felt that they showed a lack of ambition. There were no targets looking at the health and well-being of the District; or about the need for residents to be able to own their own home; and nothing about the seafront areas of either side of the District. These Councillors asked how public engagement would be achieved. Some questioned why there was such urgent pressure to change the governance arrangements of the Council as a high priority rather than focusing upon the care of the District's residents. Concern was also expressed over the financial impact of completing some of the targets, especially as some of these were unknown or to be confirmed. Councillors asked for the financial gaps to be filled and wished to know how these areas would be funded. There was concern that this would result in residents having to pay yet another increase in Council Tax next year.

Another point of concern was that the Leader of the Conservative Group, Councillor Chapman, had not been fully involved in the work undertaken in progressing the targets to reach this final stage as suggested by the report. The Chief Executive confirmed that Councillor Chapman had only been initially involved at the start of the process and not at later stages.

Debate then focused on those supporting the targets put forward. The point was made that the Appendix was not a business plan but a confirmed route as to how, if accepted, the targets would be achieved. The aim behind all targets was to improve the lives and quality of lives for Arun's residents - tackling climate change was highlighted as a significant part of this.

As a new administration it had been essential to set out the future direction for the Council. The new targets proposed were in addition to what the Council was already working hard to achieve for its residents. It was accepted that some targets would cost money, however a lot of work was underway to ensure that as far as

Full Council - 13.11.19

possible targets would make the Council financially buoyant, this had been why a Commercial & Acquisition's Manager post be created to allow the Council to make money and to the relieve pressure on council tax payers. It was highlighted that the Council needed to run like a business; tackling the varying wage levels across the District which contributed to the affordable housing problem in Arun.

Councillor Oppler, as proposer of the recommendations, stated that urgent regeneration was needed and that this had to happen now. The Towns of Littlehampton and Bognor Regis were crying out for regeneration and it was essential to look at developing a new planning framework to deliver priorities whilst continuing to deliver the Local Plan whilst improving the quality of life for residents.

As proposer to the recommendations, Councillor Dr Walsh, reminded Councillors that as the strategic targets were developed all Councillors would have the opportunity to debate them as they would all report through the decision-making process of the Council, via a Committee or Sub-Committee in the future. The proposals presented were a list in order of deliverability, not priority, for the Council and set an indication as to what this might cost. He reassured Councillors that they were not being asked to make any financial decisions now as this would come later. These were the priorities of the new administration. These were tough targets, but he believed were deliverable in the life of this Council.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) that the strategic targets, timetable, route to achieve them and 'Lead Member;' as shown in the Appendix to the report be agreed; and

(2) The financial impact of these new targets be noted with the Council seeking to establish financial viability through future Medium-Term Financial Strategies (MTFS).

#### 304. CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EMPLOYEES

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh, presented this report explaining that the Code of Conduct originated from the premise that the public were entitled to expect the highest standard of conduct from all Local Government employees. The Code provided guidance for employees which would help to maintain standards and protect employees from criticism or misunderstanding.

The Code of Conduct attached to the report had been developed based on best practice and existing legislation and was in keeping with the seven principles of public life as stated by the Nolan Committee. Unison had been consulted on the contents which had been agreed at a meeting of the Staff Consultation Panel held on 25 September 2019. That meeting had recommended that the Code be brought to this meeting of Full Council for formal adoption.

Councillor Dr Walsh then formally proposed the recommendations set out within the report and these were seconded by Councillor Oppler.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) The Code of Conduct for employees be approved and formally adopted; and
- (2) The Group Head of Corporate Support be authorised to make any further consequential changes to the Code of Conduct.

305. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

The Council received and noted the following changes in Committee Memberships:

- (1) Councillor Bennett had replaced Councillor Dr Walsh as a Member of the Governance Working Party;
- (2) Councillor Mrs Erskine had replaced Councillor Stanley as a Member of the Governance Working Party;
- (3) Councillor Mrs Gregory had replaced Councillor Purchase as Chairman of the Chief Executive's (CEO) Remuneration Committee;
- (4) Councillor Miss Needs had filled the Liberal Democrat vacancy on the Overview Select Committee;
- (5) Councillor Mrs Worne had filled the Liberal Democrat vacancy on the Standards Committee;
- (6) Councillor Oppler had filled the Liberal Democrat vacancy on the Development Control Site Inspection Panel; and
- (7) Councillors B Blanchard-Cooper, Lury and Tilbrook had filled the three Liberal Democrat vacancies on the Housing Appeals Panel.

306. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES

No changes to representation to Outside Bodies were reported to this meeting.

(The meeting concluded at 9.55 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

# Public Document Pack Agenda Item 9

Subject to approval at the next Development Control Committee meeting

197

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

6 November 2019 at 2.30 pm

Present: Councillors Bennett (Chairman), Ms Thurston (Vice-Chair), B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Charles, Clayden (substituting for Councillor Mrs Stainton), Coster, Edwards, Huntley (substituting for Councillor Mrs Hamilton), Kelly (substituting for Councillor Roberts), Lury, Northeast, Mrs Pendleton, Mrs Yeates and Mrs Worne

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

### 264. CANCELLATION OF NEXT MEETING

The Chairman advised that, due to the General Election that had been called for 12 December 2019, the next meeting of the Committee on 4 December 2019 had been cancelled.

### 265. CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

The Chairman advised the meeting that Planning Application P/58/19/PL would be heard before P/53/19/L as the latter was the Listed Building Consent for the former.

### 266. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mrs Hamilton, Roberts and Mrs Stainton.

### 267. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs Yeates – Planning Application BE/135/18/PL – I previously declared a prejudicial interest when this application was considered in June 2019 when in fact it should have been a personal interest. However, in light of that, I will withdraw from the debate but will exercise my right to speak prior to consideration of the item.

Councillor Huntley – Planning Applications P/58/19/PL & P/53/19/L – I am a member of Pagham Parish Council's Planning Committee and wish to declare an interest in the Inglenook applications. I made recommendations based on the information available at that time. At this meeting, with new facts before me, I may come to a different decision. I made a mirror declaration at Pagham Parish Council.

Councillor Edwards – Planning Application BE/135/18/PL – I wish to make this meeting aware that I may have made public statements by virtue of my role on West Sussex County Council for Bersted Ward and/or in other circumstances that I have concerns about this particular application. These were my views I held at that time,

Development Control Committee - 6.11.19

however, I have an open mind regarding this item and will listen and consider all the relevant issues and interests presented to this Committee and will reach my decision on merit.

268. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2019 were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

269. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED APPLICATION BE/135/18/PL SALT BOX FIELD, LAND OFF ROWAN WAY, BERSTED

*(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Mrs Yeates had declared a personal interest and spoke to the item before leaving the meeting and she took no part in the debate or vote.*

*(Councillor Edwards had declared a personal interest and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)*

BE/135/18/PL – Hybrid Application comprising of Outline application for the principle of employment uses B1-B8. Full application for Class B8 warehouse with fuel-island and car parking (Unit 2), 2 No. Class B1/B8 employment units with associated parking and servicing (Units 6 & 7), Class A1 retail food store with car parking and servicing (Unit 8), 2 No. drive thru units with car parking and servicing (Units 4 & 5), car showroom, workshops (including MOT testing), vehicle storage, external display areas, service areas and parking (Unit 9) together with access roads, associated ground and engineering works, landscaping and ancillary works. This application affects the character and appearance of the Shripney Conservation Area and a Public Right of Way, Salt Box Field, Land off Rowan Way, Bersted

This application had been considered at the meeting on 5 June 2019 and had been deferred as the details of the surface water drainage plans were outstanding and required further assessment.

The Principal Strategic Planner now represented an updated report which detailed the applicant's revised drainage strategy and associated plans and calculations and was able to confirm that, as a result, the Environment Agency had withdrawn its objection. The detail of the revised strategy was included in the update report.

In addition, Members were appraised of the following:-

- Amended Site Masterplan Block Plan (Rev C) and an updated Phasing Plan (Rev C), which ensured that the site layout accorded with the revised drainage strategy. These were listed in Condition 2 in the Full application and in Condition 4 in the Outline application, together with an additional informative.
- Two additional conditions relating to the opening hours at the Foodstore (Unit 8) and the Car Showroom (Unit 9).



- Two letters of representation from local residents regarding traffic congestion and quantum of development, which had been previously addressed at the meeting on 5 June 2019.
- Amendments to conditions as set out in the update report.
- A summary of updated consultee comments, with resultant amended conditions where relevant.
- An officer's report update was circulated at the meeting which detailed amendment to Condition 23 of the Full application, which was considered necessary to enable further discussions to take place on the best route for the footpath connection between the site and Bersted Brooks/Rowan Park.

The Engineering Services Manager was pleased to confirm that, since the last meeting, the drainage matters had moved on significantly and officers were now quite happy with the proposal.

In commencing the debate, Members thanked the Principal Strategic Planner for an excellent report and, although reservations were still expressed with regard to flooding, traffic issues and the impact of the development on the Conservation Area, the Committee accepted the drainage mitigation that had come forward and

#### RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report update.

#### 270. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED APPLICATION EP/179/18/PL GLADWYN, THE STREET, EAST PRESTON, BN16 1HT

EP/179/18/PL – Demolition of existing house & erection of 3 x 3 bedroom houses together with landscaping, car parking and fencing, Gladwyn, The Street, East Preston  
The Committee was reminded that this application had been deferred from the meeting held on 9 October 2019 to enable County Highways to visit the site to provide further information with regard to its assessment of the two adjoining developments on the road network and to ascertain whether the flint wall could be retained.

The Planning Team Leader presented the updated report, together with the officer's written report update circulated at the meeting detailing an amendment to the wording of Condition 10 to replace the first word "Following" with "Prior" to ensure that details regarding the replacement of the boundary wall were agreed with the Council before any demolition took place. He advised on the detail of the amendments to the application and confirmed that the proposed dwellings had been realigned; car parking within the site had been increased from 7 to 9; and the front boundary wall had been resited to increase the visibility splays. County Highways had visited the site and had confirmed no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions. The original officer recommendation for approval of the application was maintained, subject to amended conditions.

Members welcomed the visit to the site from County Highways and that the car parking provision within the site had been increased but still expressed reservations

Development Control Committee - 6.11.19

with regard to the resiting of the flint wall and the safety of the access and egress from the site. Comment was particularly made that moving the northern section of the wall was not necessary.

A detailed discussion was had whereby Members voiced their concerns with regard to the re-building of the flint wall and the need for its demolition in its entirety. It was felt that the wall must be re-built using traditional methods and its curvature retained as an important design feature. It was also felt that there was a need to ensure that it could not be removed in the future due to its importance to the character of the area. The Group Head of Planning advised that the north section of the wall was being retained and suggested that any approval be delegated to the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, subject to:-

- (i) a plan confirming the visibility splays relative to the siting of the proposed flint wall (with retention of the section to the north of the access and re-built section to the south); and
- (ii) amendment to the wording of condition 10 to ensure retention of the re-built wall in perpetuity.

The Committee agreed and

#### RESOLVED

That authority be delegated to the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, to grant planning permission subject to:-

- (i) A plan confirming the visibility splays relative to the siting of the proposed re-built wall (with retention of the section to the north of the access and re-built section to the south); and
- (ii) Amendment to condition 10 to ensure retention of the re-built wall in perpetuity.

271. Y/57/19/PL OLD BILSHAM FARM, BILSHAM LANE, BILSHAM, YAPTON, BN18 0JX

Y/57/19/PL – Conversion of existing single residential dwelling into 3 No. residential units with associated internal & external alterations & refurbishment & detached garage/outbuilding, Old Bilsham Lane, Bilsham, Yapton Having received a report on the matter, together with the officer's written report update detailing a correction to paragraph 2 of the Conclusions section relating to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation areas) Act 1990, the Committee

#### RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report.

272. Y/58/19/L OLD BILSHAM FARM, BILSHAM LANE, BILSHAM, YAPTON, BN18 0JX

Y/58/19/L – Application for Listed Building Consent for conversion of existing single residential dwelling into 3 No. residential units with associated internal & external alterations & refurbishment & detached garage/outbuilding, Old Bilsham Farm, Bilsham Lane, Bilsham, Yapton Having received a report on the matter, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report.

273. P/58/19/PL REAR OF INGLENOOK HOTEL, 253-255 PAGHAM ROAD, PAGHAM, PO21 3QB

P/58/19/PL – Erection of 9 No. dwellings with associated access, parking, cycle & refuse storage & landscape design. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan and may affect the setting of a listed building, Rear of Inglenook Hotel, 253-255 Pagham Road, Pagham

The Planning Team Leader presented this report, together with an officer report update which detailed additional objections received and replacement transport maps which had resulted in an amendment to Condition 2. The Committee was advised that none of the statutory consultees had raised an objection to the proposal; County Highways were happy with the access arrangements; and, although the site was outside the Build Up Area Boundary and conflicted with policy, other material considerations made it acceptable, namely that the location was surrounded by development, the Council at present did not have a 5 year housing land supply and, under National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) guidelines, presumption should be made in favour of sustainable development.

In the course of discussion on the item, serious concerns were raised in respect of the access road to the development, which Members considered to be too narrow to provide safe movement of vehicles and pedestrians, particularly for those using wheelchairs and/or pushchairs.

The Group Head of Planning acknowledged that the access was far from ideal and that highway impact and highway safety was a valid planning consideration. However, he advised that, as this was an existing access, an assessment had to be made on what was currently in use against what was being proposed. County Highways had made that assessment and had determined that the difference between the two was not sufficient to cause a severe impact on highway safety. Improvements to visibility were being made as part of the application and County Highways had demonstrated that there would not be such a severe impact on highway safety and highway users as to warrant a refusal. In the event of any appeal, that was what would be taken account of by the Inspector.

Development Control Committee - 6.11.19

Members still expressed concern and comment was made that the existing use as a car park for the hotel was substantially different from a permanent development with increased traffic movements and pedestrian use by families, children and disabled users. Although the Committee had considered and approved single track access roads in the past, it was felt that this one had too many bends and so there were blind spots – the point was made that if the development was to go ahead, improvements were required to the pinch points and signage should be installed.

The general view of Members was that there were overriding safety issues and, following advice from the Group Head of Planning, it was duly proposed and seconded that the application should be deferred to enable an independent assessment of the proposal to be carried out on the highways impacts for all users, to include safety issues for all users.

The Committee then

RESOLVED

That the application be deferred to enable an independent assessment of the proposal to be carried out on the highways impacts for all users, to include safety issues for all users.

274. P/53/19/L INGLENOOK HOTEL, 253-255 PAGHAM ROAD, PAGHAM, PO21 3QB

P/53/19/L – Listed building consent for the demolition of modern side extension & 2.25m of boundary wall, Inglenook Hotel, 253-255 Pagham Road, Pagham Having received a report on the matter, and in light of the decision on the previous application P58/19/PL, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be deferred.

275. M/42/19/PL 117 ELMER ROAD, ELMER, PO22 6LH

M/42/19/PL – Demolition of existing dwelling & erection of pair of semi-detached chalet dwellings with on-site parking facilities & new vehicular access, 117 Elmer Road, Elmer Having received a report on the matter and following a brief discussion, the Planning Team Leader was able to assure Members that the proposal did safeguard residential amenities and there would be no unwarranted overlooking. The Committee therefore

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report.

276. CM/21/19/PL LAND ADJACENT TO SCYLD, HORSEMERE GREEN LANE, CLIMPING, BN17 5QZ

CM/21/19/PL – Construction of 9 No. dwellings, access, landscaping and associated works, Land adjacent to Scyld, Horsemere Green Lane, Climping Having received a report on the matter, Member comment was made that the proposal did not provide affordable housing which was much needed in the District and that a total of 54 objections had been received which needed to be taken account of. The Planning Lawyer advised that the threshold for such provision was 11 so there was no requirement for affordable housing in this instance. The Group Head of Planning also responded that the number of objections was not necessarily material, rather it was the planning considerations within those objections that would determine the weight that could be afforded to the comments made.

Members generally agreed that the proposal was acceptable and, following satisfactory clarification of questions relating to boundaries and highway safety within the site, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report.

277. BR/120/19/PL THE BANDSTAND, THE PROMENADE, BOGNOR REGIS

*(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Goodheart spoke as a member of Bognor Regis Town Council.)*

BR/120/19/PL – Application under Regulation 3 of the Town & Country Planning (General Regulations)1992 for the reinstatement of missing pieces of ornamental metalwork; redecoration of entire structure; removal of yellow brick plinth and step and reinstatement with red brick; relocation of entrance gate from south elevation to west elevation; infilling of open east and west sides with new railing to match existing; removal of existing lighting and provision of new; fitting of horizontal ceiling; removal of concrete floor finish; laying of new non-slip tiles in geometric pattern; fitting of Perspex sheeting at high level to prevent rainwater penetration, The Bandstand, The Promenade, Bognor Regis

In presenting the detail of this proposal, the Planning Team Leader highlighted condition 3 which required full details of colours/designs/materials for the perspex sheeting, roof structure, bricks and flooring tiles to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to any development taking place.

In commencing the debate, Member comment was made that it was good to see structures such as this being restored but were there any plans to provide access to the interior to enable anyone to access the bandstand? The Planning Team Leader advised that there was nothing included in the application to indicate that.

Development Control Committee - 6.11.19

Further concerns were raised in respect of the wooden boarding which could adversely effect the acoustics and that wind breaks needed to be in place to ensure maximum use of the bandstand.

With regard to the request for disabled access, the Planning Team Leader advised that would require a separate new application in order for the red edge to be increased to enable a suitable ramp to be installed. Alternatively, the provision of a temporary or permanent ramp could be investigated through a separate process.

In the course of further discussion, it was felt that the Perspex screening at the base of the structure needed to be reinstated (had been taken out from the original plans due to the Town Council's objection) so full use could be made of the bandstand.

It was suggested and agreed that, due to the issues raised, the matter should be deferred to enable discussion to be had with the Cabinet Member for Technical Services and that a further report be presented at a future meeting detailing his comments.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be deferred for comment by the Cabinet Member for Technical Services.

278. BR/121/19/L THE BANDSTAND, THE PROMENADE, BOGNOR REGIS

BR/121/19/L – Listed building consent for the reinstatement of missing pieces of ornamental metalwork; redecoration of entire structure; removal of yellow brick plinth and step and reinstatement with red brick; relocation of entrance gate from south elevation to west elevation; infilling of open east and west sides with new railing to match existing; removal of existing lighting and provision of new; fitting of horizontal ceiling; removal of concrete floor finish; laying of new non-slip tiles in geometric pattern; fitting of Perspex sheeting at high level to prevent rainwater penetration Having received a report on the matter and in light of the decision on the previous application BR/120/19/PL, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be deferred.

279. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the appeals that had been received.

(The meeting concluded at 5.32 pm)

# Public Document Pack Agenda Item 10

Subject to approval at the next Environment & Leisure Working Group meeting

1

## ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE WORKING GROUP

7 November 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Mrs Staniforth (Chairman), Brooks (Vice-Chair), Bicknell, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Clayden, Dixon, Edwards (Substitute for Kelly), Gunner, Huntley, Ms Thurston and Mrs Worne

Councillors Mrs Yeates was also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

Apologies: Councillor Kelly

### 7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Dixon declared a personal interest in agenda item number 4 as a member of the Bognor Regis Civic Society.

### 8. MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting held on 4 July 2019 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 9. URGENT ITEM - BOGNOR REGIS DISC PARKING SCHEME

The Members received an urgent report from the Customer & Parking Services Manager in relation to the Bognor Regis Disc Parking Scheme that operated in Hothampton, Lyon Street and Fitzleet car parks. It was explained that the scheme was due to finish on 31 December 2019, but a request had been made from The Bid Board and Bognor Regis Town Council that the scheme continues and a long-term agreement be agreed for the scheme.

A full discussion was had by all Members who were all in full support of the scheme being continued consideration was given to the following points:

- Cost implication to Arun District Council
- Possible Sponsorship options to be suggested to The Bid

The Working Group then,

Agreed to recommend to Full Council the extension of the Bognor Regis Disc Parking Scheme up to the 31 December 2022.

Environment & Leisure Working Group - 7.11.19

#### 10. LITTLEHAMPTON WAVE UPDATE

The Principal Landscape Officer provided the Members with a final update on the completion of the Littlehampton Leisure Centre project. She highlighted that the project objectives that had defined the scope of the project in 2016, had been met and the total project expenditure was on target to be maintained within the allocated budget. She further explained that as well as providing the new leisure centre for the district, the project had also created a range of wider opportunities that had and continued to add extra value for local people during and after its delivery.

All Members of the Working Group expressed their satisfaction with the project and the completed addition of an excellent leisure and sport provision in the District. Key points that were highlighted throughout the discussion were:

- A request for specific feedback from the leisure centres customers to be provided to Members
- Confirmation was sought to ensure that light pollution measures were considered when the lights for the new path were installed and it was confirmed that grey caps had been included in the design to provide downward light.
- Praise was given by Members for working in conjunction with Willmott Dixon that assisted with a careers initiative at HMP Ford
- Attention was drawn to the figures that had been detailed in a report that was presented to the Overview Select Committee on 22 October 2019 showed a significant reduction to the new buildings carbon footprint in comparison to the old building. It was confirmed that the technology was proving to be successful during its first year of use.
- Tree planting on the west and north side of the site had been completed, and it was confirmed that further planting of trees was planned.

The Chairman thanked the Principal Landscape Officer and the Group Head of Community Wellbeing for the update which was then noted by the Working Group.

#### 11. SAFER ARUN PARTNERSHIP ANNUAL REVIEW

The Community Manager introduced Inspector Steve Turner from the Arun Prevention Team at West Sussex Police to the Working Group and explained that there was a statutory requirement for all districts to ensure they tackled and reduced anti-social behaviour and crime in the local area. There continued to be a long-standing partnership with the anti-social behaviour team at Arun District Council and the prevention neighbourhood team who jointly work together to tackle an array of persistent anti-social behaviour and crime issues.

It was explained that the team had recognised and taken action on county line issues and it is known as a significant problem nationally. Littlehampton, Worthing and Brighton are key seaside areas where young and vulnerable individuals had and continue to be targeted. County drug lines can change in circumstances quickly so



safeguarding and enforcement action was vital in the management of these specific circumstances. Arun was the first area in Sussex to obtain a criminal behaviour order against a known perpetrator involved in the sale and distribution of drugs linked to county lines activity; the order proscribes tight conditions restricting the activity of the offender including an exclusion zone that prevents them residing in West Sussex.

Strong emphasis was placed by the Community Manager on the importance of continued partnership working across the board was vital to keeping the community safe.

The Working Group participated in a full discussion and the key points raised were:

- Confirmation was obtained that the Glenlogie night shelter that was operated through Stone Pillow would be running again this year and negotiations to ensure all plans are in place in the event of severe weather conditions are ongoing.
- A query was raised in relation to figures stated at point 8.3 in the report. It was advised that a written response would be provided for this question
- Concern raised over the increase in violent crime reports. It was confirmed that while the figures for this type of crime are high, it does also include targeted violent crime reports and links to drug and county line reports. The recruitment for more PCSO's that had taken place would help significantly with this area.
- Suggestion for the team to work more closely with Parish Councils was made.
- Concern for rural areas across the district was raised as it was understood that a lot of the work that had been completed was focused on Town areas. Reassurance was provided by the Arun Prevention Inspector that rural areas had the focus of the teams working in partnership and that consideration and risk analysis was always be taken in relation to these individuals considering a change in location when targeting behaviour in Towns and that more PCSO's would also assist on a larger more detailed scale.

The Chairman thanked the Community Manager and the Arun Prevention Officer for their detailed update.

The Working Group then

#### RECOMMEND TO CABINET – That

- 1) The work of the Safer Arun Partnership be endorsed and the importance of partnership working in contributing to reducing anti-social behaviour and addressing crime and disorder in Arun be recognised.

Environment & Leisure Working Group - 7.11.19

- 2) Recognition be given to the work of the Safer Arun Partnership in contributing to the delivery of the Councils strategic priority “supporting you if you need help”.

## 12. CLIMATE CHANGE

The Director of Services provided Members with an overview of her report that outlined the current situation on Climate Change and set out Arun District Council corporate response. She stressed the importance of working across all elements of the Council and with the community, partners, contractors and businesses. She advised that declaring a climate emergency was Arun District Council stating that it was taking the issue very seriously. The report was really the start of the first steps to make significant improvements. She suggested that updates on action taken and next steps should be reported to Members every six months to ensure that Member’s would be fully involved all the way through the process.

Members were in full support of the report that had been provided to them and several comments made were:

- Investment needed to be made to fund the post of a Sustainability Manager in order to keep the Council moving forward on the Climate Change issues.
- A request to ensure that the latest scientific information to be kept at the forefront of decision making on this topic
- It was confirmed that Consultancy support would be needed in order to ensure the work was credible. It would be vital to procure the right individual, qualified to speak and make decisions on the Climate Change plan.

Further discussion was had on how everyone could influence change, from moving to paperless meetings right through to the importance of planting more trees across the district.

The Chairman thanked the Director of Service for her report and update and then put the recommendations to a vote en bloc.

The Working Group agreed to recommend to Cabinet and Full Council that:

1. Arun District Council declares a Climate Emergency.
2. The impact and mitigation of climate change is considered and incorporate into all policy and key decision making.
3. Officers work through the Environment & Leisure Working Group to produce an action plan with milestones to make the activities of Arun District Council carbon neutral by 2030.

4. A supplementary estimate be approved for up to £180k to fund the post of Climate Change Manager and Sustainability Manager for three years, including consultancy advice to support the calculation of carbon budgets both within the Council and more widely through its role in community leadership and work with partners and local businesses.

(The meeting concluded at 8.04 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

## LITTLEHAMPTON REGENERATION SUB-COMMITTEE

18 November 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Miss Seex (Chairman), B Blanchard-Cooper (Vice-Chair), Mrs Baker, Mrs Caffyn, Cooper, Gunner, Mrs Haywood, Miss Rhodes and Dr Walsh.

Councillor Bicknell was also present during the meeting.

### 12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of Personal Interest were made:-

- Councillor Miss Seex as a Member of Littlehampton Town Council and also as a Member of the Chichester Business Improvement District [BID]
- Councillor Dr Walsh as a member of Littlehampton Town Council and West Sussex County Council.
- Councillors Mrs Baker, Miss Rhodes and B Blanchard-Cooper as Members of Littlehampton Town Council.

### 13. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2019 were approved as a correct record by the Sub-Committee and signed by the Chairman.

### 14. ARUN PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER - PUBLIC CONSULTATION

The Chairman outlined that in view of the concerns raised at Full Council on 13 November 2019 relating to the role of the Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee in considering this item, she was putting forward her suggestions as to how this matter be handled by the Sub-Committee.

As confirmed at Full Council, Cabinet has been listed in the Forward Plan as the decision taker on a new Order and the date for the decision to be taken would be the meeting of Cabinet on 13 January 2020. As a result of the debate at Full Council, the Community Manager was now reviewing the legislation and what happened when the last Order was made to confirm whether this should remain a Cabinet decision or should form a recommendation going forward to a future meeting of Full Council.

Discussions were ongoing with the Cabinet Member for Community and Wellbeing, Councillor Mrs Yeates, in terms of whether there should be any change to the current timelines for a decision as the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Stanley, who was also the Chairman of the Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee, had agreed to look at this when this had been debated at Full Council.

Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee - 18.11.19

The Chairman suggested that as a Sub-Committee, Members views be listed and compiled to make a formal response to the consultation exercise but that this would not form a recommendation to Full Council. Instead, any special observations would be reflected in the Minutes forming the Sub-Committee's response for feeding into the consultation exercise.

Having received the Sub-Committee's approval to this way forward, the Chairman then invited the Community Manager to present her report.

The Community Manager firstly reminded Members that the current Order did not expire until the end of March 2020. It had been introduced by the Council in April 2017 and this was why there had been the need for it to be reviewed. Legislation required the Council to undertake a period of public consultation to determine whether the Order should be extended, amended or discharged. The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 granted local authorities the opportunity to introduce PSPOs as a way of tackling persistent or on-going nuisance identified in specific locations where it was having a detrimental effect on the quality of life. Public consultation had commenced on 24 September and ended on 24 October 2019. This Sub-Committee was being invited to submit its views which could be added to the feedback received from local businesses and residents in respect of two sections. Section 1 which was tackling and reducing anti-social behaviour (Bognor Regis and Littlehampton) and Section 2 tackling and reducing anti-social behaviour for parks, opens spaces and foreshores.

Members were advised that the new proposed PSPO areas had been significantly reduced compared to the current Order. This change was a result of the difficulty in enforcing the dispersal powers. The new areas specifically related to the Town Centres of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton where there was evidence of constant anti-social and nuisance behaviour. Members were asked to remember that the resources required to enforce all PSPO prohibitions needed to be considered when deciding on the restrictions to be included.

A lengthy debate took place in which various views and concerns were raised. These have been summarised below with the Community Manager ensuring that they would form part of the response to the PSPO consultation when considered by Cabinet early next year.

- It was clear that wide reaching consultation had been undertaken identifying that businesses and residents in both Littlehampton and Bognor Regis were of the view that both of these Town Centres had the same concerns in terms of anti-social and nuisance behaviour. In view of these problems, which were not experienced in the wider District, this was why it was proposed that the new areas covered by the PSPO would specifically relate to these Town Centres. This change was also as a result of the difficulty in enforcing the dispersal powers. By reducing the designated area, it was hoped that people could be moved from the Town Centre if they were caught causing anti-social behaviour.

- It was recognised that there was a drinking and public disorder problem in Littlehampton's Town Centre. This problem needed to be addressed and so there was support for the smaller restricted areas to make the Order effective.
- Concern was expressed by a couple of Members that reducing the proposed PSPO areas would result in anti-social and nuisance behaviour being migrated out to surrounding villages. Rustington was cited as a prime example.
- This was disputed by some Members as it had to be acknowledged that nuisance was caused by people who were on foot, they did not use transport, they were local trouble makers and so needed to be dealt with locally.
- Had Town and Parish Councils been consulted? The Community Manager confirmed that all Members of the Council and all Town and Parish Councils had been invited to take part in the consultation exercise. To date only Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Town Council had responded. No individual Members of the Council had submitted a response.
- Reducing the PSPO areas would allow for more targeted enforcement to take place.
- If the PSPO was approved with reduced areas, could it be reviewed in the future if there was evidence to prove that the significantly reduced areas within the Order were not working. The Community Manager responded stating that there was always the opportunity to review the PSPO and that if there was evidence to back up change, then this could be reviewed.
- The two Town Centres had many areas where anti-social behaviour had an impact for residents and so this was why the restrictions to focus on these areas had to be very carefully considered.
- With Appendix B, what area of Rustington did the restrictions run into? It was explained that this illustrated the proposed alcohol restriction to be applied in Littlehampton in relation to foreshore areas.
- It was felt that this restriction should apply to cycling and the Community Manager undertook to take this on board.
- The Sub-Committee agreed that a Cycling Strategy needed to be compiled and agreed by the Council sometime in the future.

#### 15. VISITOR INFORMATION PROVISION IN LITTLEHAMPTON

The Sub-Committee received a report updating Members on the sources of Visitor Information provision within the Town since the closure of the Look and Sea Centre on 31 August 2018.

Since the Council made the decision to not provide a staffed VIC in the Look & Sea, the Council had been charged to explore alternative ways to provide a physical VIC presence in the Town, in addition to the existing information sources such as the Sussex by the Sea website; social media; the printed visitor guide; and a destination marketing and promotion facility.

Members were updated on work that had been undertaken to date. It had been decided to work with a variety of existing local businesses and organisations in various locations such as the Town Centre; riverside, seafront and West Beach. The Tourism Officer confirmed that nine businesses/organisations had agreed to host information in the form of tourist information leaflets and event posters and that volunteers/staff could also assist with visitor enquiries. These new partner businesses were known as Littlehampton Local Visitor Information Points (LLVIPs) and their locations had been set out within the report. They had already reported the benefit of LLVIPS in terms of experiencing an increased footfall from visitors entering their premises. To date this had been reported as being a positive experience.

Varying questions were raised by the Sub-Committee. Offices were asked to explore providing additional LLVIPS in new locations. Littlehampton Railway Station was seen to be an obvious choice. It was explained that work was ongoing and that there was a space capacity issue to overcome first in terms of where to display leaflets in obvious places like the waiting room area or ticket office and/or refreshment area which were all open at different times. Members asked whether, as part of the ongoing negotiations, if it would be possible to explore providing an electronic screen in the station as this had been successfully trialled last year at Bognor Regis and seemed to be the most efficient and effective way of advertising Town events and Town issues. The Littlehampton Harbour Board, which had plenty of downstairs space was also highlighted as a possible and appropriate LLVIP venue for Officers to explore taking into consideration its prime location on the Riverside Walkway. The Tourism Officer explained that the Harbour Board Office was already included in the nine LLVIP locations. The new Littlehampton Wave was also identified as a 'must have' location.

Discussion then turned to the Sussex by the Sea website and the issues that had been raised at the last meeting of the Sub-Committee in June 2019. There were concerns that visitors might not easily associate this link to finding events and attractions in the District. The Group Head of Economy responded stating that this fact had been recognised and that a review would be taking place as the web site was dated and needed a refresh. Officers were looking at a range of tools as part of this review which would revamp the website completely. In view of the interest from Members on what would form the review, it was agreed that an update would be provided to the Sub-Committee's next meeting.

The Sub-Committee then noted the content of the report and the updates provided at the meeting.



## 16. LITTLEHAMPTON REGENERATION POSITION STATEMENT

In receiving and noting the Position Statement, particular discussion took place on the following main topical projects:-

- **Littlehampton Town Centre Public Realm Scheme** – Further information was provided by the Town Centre Regeneration Officer confirming that over the Summer a funding bid had been submitted to the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership Local Growth Fund in the sum of £1.38m to fund delivery of the next phase of public realm improvements. With the agreement of the Leader of the Council, a further bid had been submitted bringing the final total up to £2.3m to deliver Phase 3 of the programme. A grant of £564k had been awarded for Phase 3, however, this fell short of the full amount needed to deliver the scheme [£900k]. In liaison and conjunction with Littlehampton Town Council, Arun and LTC were topping up the outstanding money so the full scheme could be delivered to include the Beach Road element. The next step was for Officers to meet with the scheme’s designers, LDA Designs, who would be working up more detailed design specifications by February 2020. The Group Head of Economy outlined that it would benefit Members if she could organise a “walk through” of the scheme to highlight how it would work using maps and drawings so that the Sub-Committee could see and understand exactly what was being proposed. Over the Summer months Officers had liaised with traders to gain their understanding and views on some of the issues that would need to be taken into consideration for the next phase. The issue of vehicles using the High Street for deliveries had been the main concern and so Officers were gathering more data on this. In response, Members commented that it was vital to sort out the mixed paving for this aspect of the scheme as it was felt that a flat plaza could lead to dangerous confusion between pedestrians and vehicles. It was Members’ wish that this viewpoint be forwarded onto the designers. It was felt vital that the Arcade needed to be included as part of this phase to show that it was an integral and welcoming part of the High Street. It was hoped that lighting would be fully updated in line with the rest of the High Street. Further points made were:
  - Would the ‘walk through’ be for information purposes or would Members have an opportunity to make comments that would be taken into consideration?
  - Concern was expressed over accessibility and paving surfaces. It was outlined that there was the need to ensure that those with disabilities would be able to access all new paving areas and that these would be appropriate.
  - The placement of trees was important
  - Precise timeframes for the project were requested.
  - How were traders’ views being formulated and incorporated?
  - Members asked to see the survey results so that they had the opportunity to comment
  - The Group Head of Economy outlined that it had taken a huge Officer resource to get the project to this point. The views of

Members would form part of the next stage of work. The intention was to ensure that Members were fully consulted on each stage of the project and not excluded from the decision making process. Communication with traders and stakeholders would also continue to take place. Now that the bids had been submitted the Officer team could focus on the next stages of work.

- A request was made to see the measures of success.
- Information was requested on traffic flows around the railway station seen as key information.
- The Chairman thanked Officers for their work undertaken in securing the money and she reassured Members that this work had taken place in consultation with Members. The next steps were cost evaluation looking at every part of the scheme and affordability. Engineering, construction and work on traffic regulation orders then needed to take place. This was a huge piece of work and Members needed to appreciate the lead in time for this and as this involved a lot of background work first before any physical advantage would be seen.
- It was outlined that it was hoped to be able to put on a display in one of the empty shops, if possible, to set out the next stages. The key stages of the next part of the project were then outlined by the Group Head of Economy. It was hoped that some work would commence during Summer 2020. Traders would be given notice of any works starting.
- **Town Centre Safety** – Detailed discussion took place on a number of issues: -
  - An update was provided following the launch of the Littlehampton Traders' Partnership DISC scheme, which was supported by the Police and was working well, this was being led by the traders themselves who had been issuing banning orders for their own shops.
  - Littlehampton Shopwatch – this had merged with the DISC scheme.
- **Town Traders Partnership** – during the Summer WSCC had introduced a new charging regime whereby tables and chairs situated on the highway would incur a cost. The Partnership was strongly against this proposal and conducted a 'sit-in'. The Highways Manager had since confirmed that this decision was being reviewed and that options would be presented to the Cabinet Member for Highways at WSCC soon.  
A Traders Breakfast meeting would be taking place on 3 December 2019 and the new PSCO would be in attendance.
- **Markets & Events** – the festive lights switch-on had been moved to this Friday, 22 November 2019. A request was made that the footfall for this event be recorded as this would provide useful information. It was explained that WSCC had terminated funding for this mechanism. Questions were asked about how the Council used Twitter to promote its own and other events as the light switch on could not be found on social media. It was agreed that this would be looked at. The Friday market date had also been changed as a result of the switch-on and concern was expressed that there was no mention of this on social media. Discussion then focused on the

market and its range and quality of stalls. It was explained that this was under review and that a full update would be provided to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee. The Chairman asked if a survey of the business could be undertaken to assess if there were footfall increases on market days. She wanted to know if the market was beneficial and if there were historical records that could be used as additional information gathering tool. This led to discussion that there was the need to look at using the Greens on the seafront more to promote bigger events that would bring visitors to the Town. Mention was made of organising a Sussex Food Festival as an example.

- **New Café and Watersports Venue** – The Group Head of Economy confirmed that having spoken to the operator, this project was now moving forward and that foundation work would be starting soon.
- **Shopfront Grants** – The Business Development Manager explained in more detail the shopfront grant scheme and the latest round of awards that had been made. She outlined that there was still an opportunity for businesses to apply which was important for those wanting to upgrade their shopfronts. A further bid for retail training and shopfront enhancement was imminent - this was being put together by Chichester District Council. More details would be provided to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee. As there was concern expressed about the poor quality of many shopfront facias in the Town, the question was asked if bidding could include making improvements to floors above a shop premises. This was confirmed as being possible, as long as an application had been submitted to include the shopfront area. Members asked if this could be publicised and made clear in the guidance document. Further discussion saw Members asking if Section 215 letters could be issued to landlords to motivate further applications to this scheme. Officers were also asked to design and distribute to the Town a one-off leaflet to circulate ahead of the next round of bids which would take place in the Spring. It was outlined that this was all possible, but funding was quite limited and so it was not ideal to raise hopes until it was known if the further funding bid was successful
- **Littlehampton Town Centre Management** – An update was provided on the Littlehampton railway where it was explained that a decision was still awaited on the outcome of the £50k allocation to the station from the GTR Passenger Fund for priority improvements to waiting room and toilet. Nothing had been confirmed about how this money would be allocated. One Member expressed concern as questions about this had been raised at the last meeting in June and still no progress had been made. It was agreed that further pressure would be put onto the Southcoast Line Group to push for a conclusion.
- **North of Littlehampton Public Art Project** – There was nothing further to add.
- **Gigabit West Sussex** – progress was moving forward in a positive way and the next phase which was the second roll-out of connections with City Fibre was explained.
- **Fitzalan Link** – there were nothing further to add.

- **Look & Sea** – there was nothing further to add as this had been discussed as part of an earlier agenda item.
- **Visitor Information Points** - again, this had been discussed in full as part of an earlier agenda item.
- **Media Coverage/Marketing** - work was continuing with the Communications Team in pulling together a series of short videos promoting independent businesses in the Town. A video had been made about one business in the Arcade and one on Beach Road, future videos were planned for a business in East Street and Manor Parade. Feedback received to date was positive and it was outlined that a survey would be undertaken with all those who had taken part to assess the worth of this exercise. Some Members stated that they were not aware of these videos and that these could not be found on Twitter or Sussex by the Sea.
  - The Chairman raised the issue of the Littlehampton Health Centre as the NHS had confirmed that it no longer wished to own property. She stated that she wished to progress this matter and had met with the Council's Chief Executive to look at possible solutions.

(The meeting concluded at 7.47 pm)

# Public Document Pack Agenda Item 16

Subject to approval at the next Governance Working Party meeting

1

## GOVERNANCE WORKING PARTY

12 November 2019 at 6.30 pm

Present: Councillors Oppler (Chairman), Ms Thurston (Vice-Chairman), Bennett, Bower, Charles, Coster (Substituting for Councillor Dixon), Mrs Daniells, Mrs Erskine, Mrs Gregory, Gunner and Mrs Pendleton.

[Note: The following Councillors were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters discussed in the following Minutes:- Councillor Mrs Erskine – Minute 11 to Minute 15 (Part)]; and Councillors Mrs Pendleton Minute 16 (Part)].

Councillor Dr Walsh was also in attendance for part of the meeting.

### 11. WELCOME

Members and Officers were welcomed to the second meeting of the Governance Working Party.

### 12. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An Apology for Absence had been received from Councillor Dixon.

### 13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

### 14. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Governance Working Party held on 21 October 2019 were approved by the Working Party as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

### 15. FEEDBACK FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

The Chairman outlined that the results obtained from those Councillors who had responded to the questionnaire provided some interesting reading. These also included comments from the Council's Senior Management Team (SMT).

The Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer reported on the information obtained. The key messages from the responses received were outlined to the meeting.

Governance Working Party - 12.11.19

- 30 Councillors and 5 members of (SMT) had responded.
- Question 1 – What worked well and what worked badly under the current system?
  - 17 Councillors agreed that the Cabinet system allowed for quicker decision making – 5 of SMT echoed these comments.
  - Some comments had been made about the specialised role of the Cabinet Member in terms of knowledge and that the Cabinet system allowed for clearer accountability given that it was clear who was responsible for a decision, rather than it being diluted by having been made by a Committee. Three Councillors and 3 Officers commented on the quality of decision making under the Cabinet system. Others felt that a small number of Councillors had too much influence and all from one party.
  - 20 Councillors felt that there was a lack of engagement, 3 Officers supported this view. It was felt that a Committee system would allow more Councillors to be involved in decision making. Currently backbenchers were largely excluded from decision making with their contributions being neither invited or valued.
  - 3 Councillors felt that there was a lack of transparency in the process. Committees allowed issues to be discussed hearing a range of views resulting in a more-rounded decision.
- Question 2 – What change would you make?
  - 15 Councillors supported the opportunity to change the governance structure to a Committee system.
  - No Officers supported change
  - One Officer supported the idea of exploring a hybrid structure
- Question 3 – Do you feel involved in the Council's decision-making process?
  - Most Councillors who responded stated that they did not feel involved stating that backbenchers were largely excluded
  - 5 Councillors felt that they were fully involved
- Question 4 – Can we improve public engagement in the way decisions are made? If so, how?
  - Some Members of the Working Party felt that the public engagement issue was not relevant to this review.
  - Public Question Time was suggested for all meetings as well as the need to webcast more. Expanding Public Question Time was accepted as a good idea.
  - 7 Councillors felt that changes to public engagement were beyond the scope of the review agreed by Full Council.
  - Other suggestions made were to hold meetings in other parts of the District
  - Conducting surveys to gain the public's views
  - Introducing electronic voting and better use of social media
  - One Councillor and one Officer response had been submitted late and not included as part of this feedback. –

Before inviting questions, the Chairman asked the Chief Executive to provide his summary of the questionnaire responses. He outlined that it had allowed for full consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the current system to be evaluated. The main messages emerging focused on the lack of Member engagement and the exclusion of back benchers. The Chief Executive reminded Members that whatever system they might decide to proceed with, they needed to firstly think about what they wanted to gain from any amended governance arrangements. If this was to involve Members more in moving forward, then the Working Party needed to think about what structure best met those principles.

In discussing the responses received, observations were made on:

- The involvement of back benchers
- The need to have a key role for Councillors
- That decision making needed to be timely
- Why was the issue of public engagement being considered when this had not been part of the remit of the review approved by Full Council in September 2019?
- The lack of experience from some who had responded – there was concern that they did not fully understand how the current Cabinet system worked – this could cloud their judgement and views.
- The need to have time to explore what other local authorities had done looking at what worked well and why some had reverted to their old decision-making system after a period of adoption
- What would be the additional cost of running a Committee system if there were additional meetings/staff costs etc. The likely costs of other structures circulated also needed to be known as well as any hybrid option.
- Was there time to conduct a thorough review in the timescales given, now that a General Election had been called?
- Were there ways of altering the Cabinet system – Committee Chairmen could have similar roles to Cabinet Members
- Would a slower decision-making process cause issues when having to make urgent financial decisions?
- What about Call-In – how would this work under a new structure
- Councillors should consider the Officer arguments for wanting to keep the current structure
- This was such an important decision – it should not be rushed and Members should have time to explore all options in full detail – there was concern that the wrong decision could be made for the Council

The Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer reminded Members that the questions used had been based on Crawley Borough Council's proposals which had been based on the Centre for Public Scrutiny's questionnaire. At its last meeting, the Working Party had agreed that in agreeing the questions to be included in the questionnaire, consultation be undertaken with Group Leaders as well as the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Working Party. This consultation had agreed the questions asked.

Governance Working Party - 12.11.19

The Chairman stated that in order to undertake a full and thorough review, the Working Party needed to know the views Councillors held about the current system in terms of what worked well and what didn't. He thought that the questionnaire had achieved this aim and had been a useful and important exercise in providing the evidence needed for change. The responses would assist in moving forward proposals for change.

Discussion again focused on Question 4 and why this had been included. The Chairman outlined that if Members felt that strongly that this element of the review should not be investigated further, then it could be decided to 'park' it and not include it as part of further consideration for this review. The Working Party agreed this.

In concluding debate, the Chairman outlined that no decision would be made on a structure now. The Working Party had been tasked to allow the Council the opportunity to either debate an option or options or to choose to stay as it was - a status quo. The Working Party needed to consider the key message from the questionnaire and needed to present possible solutions by way of structure options which would be discussed as the next item on the agenda.

#### 16. SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

Suggested proposals were circulated to the meeting from all four political groups as well as a proposal from the Council's Senior Management Team (SMT).

The Chairman suggested that the proposal from the SMT be considered first as this had been pulled together by Officers who were uniquely placed within the Council and were responsible for the delivery of its services on a day to day basis. This structure was not massively dissimilar to the suggestions submitted by some political groups.

The Chairman outlined the purpose for this meeting. This was to review the options submitted and provide a steer to Officers on which draft structure should be explored in more detail. Any requests made by the Members could then be taken away and developed for further discussion at the Working Party's next meeting – this would be taking place on 3 December 2019.

The Chief Executive provided an overview of the proposal submitted by SMT and explained that this had been created following an SMT Officer Away Day which had involved input from 9 Group Heads and the three members of the Corporate Management Team (CMT). This draft proposed a structure containing 6 Committees and the service areas reporting into each Committee had been set out to include the Council areas that the Committee would lead on the and SMT leads for each meeting. It was highlighted that this structure mirrored something similar to the existing officer structure operating now. He emphasised that any great change made to the existing structure would result in the need to radically change the Council's management structure and would require a wider review of the Council's Constitution. This needed



to be considered in light of the timescales in place for concluding and putting into place any new structure.

The SMT draft structure aimed to even out the workload of the SMT leads and grouped related service areas together. It proposed that the current regulatory Committees – Audit & Governance, Development Control, Licensing and Standards be kept as stand-alone Committees.

The titles of each of the 6 Committees and their areas of responsibility had been chosen to reflect the current Job Descriptions of SMT and CMT Officers. The name of each Committee had been selected so that the public could understand what the work of that Committee might involve. The Chief Executive asked the Working Party for its views and whether it wished to provide any suggestions that could be worked upon for further discussion at the next meeting.

There was discussion around corporate performance and whether this should be a responsibility for each Committee to review rather than just one. This was because Councillors needed to keep on top of the performance of the Council and it was felt that this needed to be thought through further for the next meeting.

Other observations made by the Working Party were:

- This structure was not dissimilar to those submitted by other Groups. The 6 Service Committees would allow for greater Councillor involvement and attendance. What needed to be looked at further was the size of each Committee, should they have a membership of 11, 13 or 15 Members.
- It was the overarching structure of the Service Committees that needed to be roughly agreed. In terms of what service that sat under each Committee could be adjusted in various ways – this was not a decision for tonight.
- Some comment was made over the placement of some of the service areas. Concern was expressed about having Planning Policy and CIL items reporting into Development Control [as per the Liberal Democrat option]. It was felt that only planning applications should form the remit of Development Control. This did not, however, prevent Members from sitting on both the Development Control Committee and the Planning Policy Committee.
- It was agreed to focus on the SMT structure as a starting point.
- A suggestion was made to move Economic into Planning Policy as the two overlapped and involved the same Officers. The Chief Executive stated that he did not disagree but the future workloads of the Committees and the Officers supporting them had to be fully thought through.
- Questions were asked about the future of Scrutiny and if and how this should fit into the SMT structure.
- The workload of Officers supporting the Committees needed to be considered.

- How would some of the existing Outside Bodies report into the new structure such as the Health and Adult Social Care Committee which reported into OSC. It was outlined that this would need to be considered as individual Members could not be given the same level of responsibility that Cabinet Members currently had. The review of the Constitution would have to look at defining how decision making would take place.
- Comments were made about the proposed Residential Services and Wellbeing Committee – as other draft structures submitted proposed to split these areas. What were the implications for SMT in joining them together? It was explained that this was the best example where two Group Heads worked very closely together and where their areas of responsibility very often overlapped. To split the two would cause a problem – this was an example of where practicality had to be applied.
- Concern was expressed that combining the two functions would create too much responsibility for one Committee. The Chief Executive responded stating that any structure could be reviewed and adjusted, however, any change would have a constitutional impact – it was about applying the correct balance in terms of how areas would work together.
- Questions were asked about a hybrid option and what if any work had been undertaken to look at examples that might suit Arun.
- It was pointed out that the cost of a revised Members Allowances needed to be considered in looking at draft structures.
- There were strengths and drawbacks that could be applied to all options submitted and the best way forward needed to be achieved. One strength of the existing structure was that there was a clear vehicle with 7 people being experts having an excellent overview of what was going on in other areas of the Council. The danger of moving over to a Committee system, the opposite could become the case.
- Alternative methods of scrutiny were explained – the opportunity for Full Council to refer back any decision made by a Committee. Work Programme for all Committees could be fed into Full Council for approval to avoid overlap and to confirm the core priorities for each Committee.
- The old Policy & Resources Committee should form part of any new Committee structure. The Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer outlined that elements of what would have been reported into this Committee would sit between Corporate Support and the Corporate Policy and Performance Committee.
- There was interest in investigating what a hybrid structure might look like and how this could work. The Chief Executive outlined that in looking at minimising costs, a hybrid structure would cost more in terms of Members Allowances. He also pointed out that the more structures that Members wished to investigate presented an issue in term of the tight timescales that were being worked to.
- Should there be a dedicated Committee to address climate change rather than this sitting under Corporate Policy and Performance? The Chief Executive outlined that if agreed at Full Council this would become a Corporate Target for the Council and there would be the need to a Council

Policy to address this. Once there was an approved Policy in place it would be reported to different Committees to deliver this.

- Would the public understand titles such as Wellbeing? Should the Residential and Wellbeing Services Committee be retitled to read People and Housing?
- Performance Management should report into all Committees.
- A hybrid option should be worked up for 3 December 2019.
- Members should conduct their own research to assist Officers in view of time constraints.
- The Tunbridge hybrid option explained by the Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer should be explored in terms of how this could be adapted to suit Arun. Officers were asked to make contact so that options could be considered.
- More concern was expressed over the timescales in place – in view of the work to be undertaken – could this be achieved in time for a decision to be made for January and for implementation in May 2020?

Having received the views of Members the Chairman stated that a way forward needed to be agreed. The purpose of this meeting had been to listen to views made so that Officers could work on any instruction given by the Working Party for its next meeting on 3 December 2019. It would be that meeting that would consider a draft structure to approve. This draft would be taken to a Special Meeting of the Audit & Governance Committee that would be held on 19 December 2019. The views of that meeting would then be fed back to the Working Party at a meeting to be held on 6 January 2020 so that recommendations could be considered at Full Council on 15 January 2020.

Following discussion, the Working Party agreed that it would be impossible to debate and scrutinise the submissions received from each political group. The SMT proposal represented an appropriate blend of options presented by all the different groups. It was agreed that Officers should take away the comments highlighted on the SMT proposal so that a worked-up draft could be considered further at the next meeting.

The Chairman encouraged all Political Groups to continue to have internal discussions so that their Members could be appraised of the outcomes of this meeting. Although Members were mindful of the update provided on researching other Councils, the Chief Executive was requested to contact Tunbridge Council to see if they could provide information to bring to 3 December meeting. This approach was agreed by the Working Party.

Governance Working Party - 12.11.19

17. NEXT STEPS IN THE REVIEW

The timescales in place and the dates for future meetings had been agreed as part of the discussion on Item – Suggested Alternative Governance Structures.

(The meeting concluded at 8.33 pm)

# Public Document Pack

Subject to approval at the next Governance Working Party meeting

1

## GOVERNANCE WORKING PARTY

3 December 2019 at 6.30 pm

Present: Councillors Oppler (Chairman), Ms Thurston (Vice-Chairman), Bennett, Bower, Charles, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Mrs Erskine, Gunner, Mrs Pendleton.

Councillor B Blanchard-Cooper was also in at the meeting.

### 18. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An Apology for Absence had been received from Councillor Mrs Gregory.

### 19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

### 20. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Working Party held on 12 November 2019 were approved by the Working Party as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman, subject to the attendance of Councillors Mrs Daniells and Gunner being added to the list of those present.

### 21. ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS - DRAFT COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

The Chairman outlined that as agreed at the last meeting of the Working Party held on 12 November 2019, a report had been compiled providing a revised committee structure based upon the example provided by the Senior Management Team (SMT). The Working Party had decided that it wished to explore the SMT option further and had requested Officers to bring it back with revisions based upon the views that had been raised at the last meeting.

This latest draft set out a structure based on six service committees and four regulatory committees. The updates made were:

- To the committee name of 'Neighbourhood and Technical Services' to read 'Environment and Technical Services' to link in with Group Head job titles.
- Emphasising that the Corporate Policy and Performance Committee would deal with the Climate Change Action Plan acting as the strategic lead with the relevant service committee being involved in the operational delivery of the action plan
- Setting out how performance would be dealt with

Governance Working Party - 3.12.19

- That the delivery of the Digital Agenda would sit with the Corporate Support Committee
- That Audit & Governance would be responsible for reviewing reports on both internal audit matters together with considering the annual and ongoing reports from the Council's external auditors.

The Chairman outlined that the Working Party needed to decide tonight if it wished to support this structure with the changes presented or if Members wished to make alternative recommendations for taking the review forward.

The observations made by the Working Party have been summarised below: -

- The changes in terms of how performance would be dealt with were agreed. However, it was felt that the Development Control Committee needed to consider its own service performance as this was reported to the Committee annually.
- Many comments were made about potential cost implications and the need to be clear about what these would be for each of the options being discussed. There was concern that it was impossible for Members to be able to come to a firm view on each of the options without a full breakdown of costs. Hidden costs could come to light after the decision to adopt a structure had been made. It was explained that the report had outlined a cost in the region of £40k to fund additional consultancy support and increased Officer resource. There was discussion about the level of Officer resource that would be needed for both options. Further information was requested for the next meeting on 6 January 2020.
- It was felt that more areas linked to the climate change remit needed to be added to the Environmental & Neighbourhood Services Committee. The Chief Executive explained this was too much detail at this time.
- Based on the recently agreed strategic targets, it was requested that public engagement should be added to the structure. It was agreed to add this to the responsibilities of the Corporate Policy and Performance Committee.
- It was confirmed that the detail confirming the Terms of Reference and Responsibility for Functions for all Committees would form the final stages of the review in terms of Constitutional changes that would be reported to the Special Council on 22 April 2020 for approval.
- Costs could increase once the Independent Remuneration Panel had concluded its review on the structure to be adopted – some Members stated that all costs needed to be known before they felt a decision could be made.
- What should the Development Control Committee be called in the future? It was confirmed that this sort of detail could be decided upon later once the body of any new structure had been approved

- How would options be presented to Full Council in January 2020 – there was concern that there was a lot of detail for Members to absorb and understand in deciding what option out of a possible three should be adopted.

The Chairman explained that the Working Party would need to decide if it would be recommending three options for the Audit & Governance Committee to consider and debate at its Special meeting to be held on 19 December 2019. If so, these would be:

- No change, the status quo
- To change to a Committee structure, based on the SMT proposal,
- To change to a Hybrid structure – looking at the options forming the next agenda item

The Audit & Governance Committee would then feedback its views to the next meeting of the Working Party on 6 January 2020 as to whether it had clear support for any one of the three options. The result of the Working Party's determination of these views would be what would be presented to Full Council on 15 January 2020. It was acknowledged that this would need to be very carefully presented to Members to allow them to make a clear decision.

## 22. ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS - HYBRID OPTION

The Chairman outlined that this report explored how a hybrid option could work. It had been compiled following research conducted by the Chief Executive and Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer following discussions held with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council who operated a hybrid option of Cabinet Advisory Boards. The report set out the pros and cons of this approach for the Working Party's consideration.

Prior to inviting debate, the Chairman stated that the results of this work showed how quickly the Council could move to a hybrid option, if this ended up being the Council's preferred approach. It provided greater flexibility in that it could be implemented at any time – it did not need to be introduced at an Annual Council Meeting and could be reviewed when needed.

The Chairman also confirmed that the research undertaken had revealed that this option would cost much less than originally anticipated.

The observations made by the Working Party were:

- This structure was not dissimilar to how the Council currently used its Working Groups.
- It was interesting to note that one of the aims of Tunbridge in moving to a hybrid option had been to increase the involvement of back benchers in decision making.

Governance Working Party - 3.12.19

- Members liked the fact that this option provided for greater participation and greater ownership of Council decisions.
- The flexibility this option provided was a significant advantage in terms of how the Council could reorganise and change the structure when needed and outside the timings of an Annual Council meeting.
- Although this option was a good compromise, there were some negatives. One was that it would provide a convoluted decision-making process. There could be more meetings held in closed session so it could be less transparent
- Would it change the culture of the Council which was vital in making any new structure successful?
- There was concern that some Members could be basing their decision on what structure to propose based upon their experience with the previous administration – this could cloud judgement with this option. Although there would still be a Cabinet – it would be essential to emphasise the greater involvement of back benchers in the development of Cabinet decisions via the Advisory Boards.
- Would this option overcome disengagement and attendance issues – this was a problem that needed to be solved – would any of the proposals result in positive change? Councillors needed responsibility to make them want to be involved in decision making – would this option introduce this?
- Membership to the Advisory Boards would be crucial in making the structure work – involvement had to be encouraged.
- An inclusivity programme would need to be considered and appropriate training provided
- What would be needed in terms of Officer resource?

In summing up the discussion held, the Chairman stated that the Working Party now needed to come to decide what it wished to submit to the Audit & Governance Committee, this was the next agenda item.

### 23. CONSULTATION WITH AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Having debated fully the options put forward, the Chairman outlined that the Working Party now needed to agree what proposals it wished to put forward to the Special Meeting of the Audit & Governance Committee on 19 December 2019.

Comments had been made that it was vital to find the best governance arrangements for the Council, whether this turned out to be more or less expensive than the current structure. Based on the discussion held he was of the view that the Audit & Governance Committee be invited to submit its views on three options as he had highlighted earlier – these being: -

- No change, the status quo
- To change to a Committee structure, based on the SMT proposal,
- To change to a Hybrid structure –



The Working Party would then debate the conclusions of the Audit & Governance Committee on 6 January 2020.

The Working Party stated that if time was available it would assist Members if a Members' Seminar could be held in early January 2020 – ahead of Full Council on 15 January 2020. It was explained that the Working Party had been presented with this option as its first meeting in October 2019, but this had not been agreed at that time.

Following discussion, the Working Party

**RESOLVED**

That the Audit & Governance Committee be invited to feedback its views to the Governance Working Party on whether it supported the proposal for three options for a governance structure being presented to Full Council on 15 January 2020, namely:

- No change, the status quo
- To change to a Committee structure, based on the SMT proposal,
- To change to a Hybrid structure, based on the Tunbridge Wells Borough Council model of three Cabinet Advisory Boards.

(The meeting concluded at 8.24 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

## ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

### REPORT TO AND DECISION OF FULL COUNCIL ON 15 JANUARY 2020

**SUBJECT: Adoption (making) of the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan Review  
2018-2031**

**REPORT AUTHOR:** Donna Moles (Senior Planning Officer)  
**DATE:** 3 December 2019  
**EXTN:** 37697  
**PORTFOLIO AREA:** Planning Policy

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

On 19 November 2019, there was a referendum held on the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan Review 2018-2031. More than 50% of those voting on the day, voted 'yes', which triggers the requirement for the Local Planning Authority under section 61E(4) of the 1990 Act, to 'make' (adopt) the Plan. This adoption will give the Plan legal force and it will form part of the statutory Development Plan for Arundel. Consequently, decisions on planning applications in Arundel neighbourhood area will need to be made in accordance with the Neighbourhood Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

##### **It is recommended to Full Council that:**

- 1) It 'makes' the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan Review 2018-2031 and it becomes part of the Development Plan for Arun District Council.

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

1.1 The Localism Act, which received Royal Assent on November 15 2011, introduced new rights and powers to allow local communities to shape new development by coming together to prepare Neighbourhood Plans and Orders. Neighbourhood forums and Parish Councils can use new Neighbourhood Planning powers to establish general planning policies for the development and use of land in a neighbourhood. These are described legally as 'Neighbourhood Development Plans'. They have to meet a number of conditions before they can be put to a community referendum and legally come into force. These conditions are to ensure plans are legally compliant and take account of wider policy considerations (e.g. national policy).

- 1.2 Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), the Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans and Orders and to take Plans through a process of examination and referendum. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.
- 1.3 The Arundel Neighbourhood Development Plan relates to the area that was designated by Arun District Council and South Downs National Park Authority as a neighbourhood area on 29th November 2012 and 14th March 2013 respectively. This area is coterminous with the Arundel Town Council boundary that lies partially within both the Arun District Council and South Downs National Park local planning authority areas.
- 1.4 The Arundel Neighbourhood Development Plan was examined by Mr Andrew Ashcroft, who passed the Plan and recommended Arun District Council should, subject to the modifications in the Examination report, proceed to referendum. Following this, the Examiner's modifications were agreed by Arundel Town Council, Arun District Council and South Downs National Park and a Post Examination Plan incorporating the changes, was published on 10 October 2019.
- 1.5 On 10 October 2019, the Decision Statement, which is a report that outlines all the Examiner's modifications and confirms acceptance by all parties, was signed by the Group Head of Planning and published on the Arun District Council website.

## 2. PROPOSAL(S):

- 2.1 Proposed Neighbourhood Development Plans need to gain the approval of a majority of voters in the neighbourhood area in a referendum, in order to come into force. If a Plan passes the referendum, the Local Planning Authority is under a legal duty to bring it into force. Neighbourhood Development Plans do not take effect unless there is a majority of support in a referendum.
- 2.2 On 19 November 2019, Arundel Neighbourhood Development Plan successfully passed its referendum with 80.29% of the votes agreeing that the Neighbourhood Development Plan be used in Development Management decision making.

The results of the referendum are set out in Table 1 below:

**Table 1: Declaration of Result of Poll**

Polling Station	Votes recorded	Percentage
Number cast in favour of a <b>'Yes'</b>	790	80.29%
Number cast in favour of a <b>'No'</b>	193	19.61%
<b>Turnout</b>		<b>35.03%</b>

<b>3. OPTIONS:</b>		
1. To 'make' the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan Review 2018-2031 to become part of the Development Plan for Arun District Council.		
Or		
2. To not 'make' the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan Review 2018-2031 which would not become part of the Development Plan for Arun District Council.		
<b>4. CONSULTATION:</b>		
Various rounds of consultation have been undertaken as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process.		
Has consultation been undertaken with:	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Relevant Town/Parish Council	yes	
Relevant District Ward Councillors	yes	
Other groups/persons (please specify) The community, Statutory bodies and relevant stakeholders as per the regulations	yes	
<b>5. ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS IN RELATION TO THE FOLLOWING COUNCIL POLICIES: (Explain in more detail at 6 below)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Financial		no
Legal		no
Human Rights/Equality Impact Assessment		no
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime & Disorder Act		no
Sustainability		no
Asset Management/Property/Land		no
Technology		no
Other (please explain)		no
<b>6. IMPLICATIONS:</b>		
Once 'made', the Arundel NDP will become part of the Development Plan for the District and will be used by the Council when determining planning applications for this area.		

<b>7. REASON FOR THE DECISION:</b>
Arun District Council as the Local Planning Authority under section 61E(4) of the 1990 Act, needs to bring a Neighbourhood Development Plan into force where more than 50% of voters have voted yes for the Plan at referendum.

## **8. BACKGROUND PAPERS:**

The various web links provide the full information for the Plan, background of the Plan and the complete results.

[Arundel NPR post examination Plan 2019.pdf \[pdf\] 2MB](#)

[Arundel NPR Declaration of Result.pdf \[pdf\] 197KB](#)

<https://www.arun.gov.uk/arundel-neighbourhood-development-plan-2>