



Public Document Pack

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

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

e-mail: committees@arun.gov.uk

**Members are reminded to bring their Agendas from the Cabinet Meetings held on 7 October 2019 with them to the meeting.
NOTE: This meeting will be webcast live**

30 October 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 13 November 2019** at **6.30 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 - 14)

Since the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 18 September 2019 were agreed as a correct record at the Special Meeting of the Council held on 10 October 2019, a clerical error has 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 can also be Cabinet Members to be increased from 2 to 4. The decision is not reflected in Resolution (1). Therefore, the Council is asked to agree that the final sentence of Resolution (1) at Minute 221 should read “ and increase this figure from 2 to 4” so this will read:

Having voted on the amendment, it was declared CARRIED.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) the following section of the Council’s Constitution – Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions – Paragraph 4.2 – Development Control Committee be changed in terms of its stipulation that no more than 2 Members can also be Cabinet Members and increase this figure from 2 to 4”; and

(2) this will enable Cabinet Member Substitutes to replace a relevant Group Member on the Development Control Committee should they not be able to attend. It will also ensure that this vitally important Committee has full representation at each meeting, which will help deliver the best possible service to the community of Arun District.

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Special Council Meeting held on 10 October 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. Housing & Customer Services Working Group - 19 September 2019 (Pages 15 - 20)

The Chairman, Councillor Bennett, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Housing & Customer Services Working Group held on 19 September 2019. There is a recommendation at:

- Minute 8 [Work Programme – 2019/20] – to view the Work Programme, please click on this link: [Work Programme](#)

10. Licensing Committee - 20 September 2019 (Pages 21 - 22)

The Chairman, Councillor B Blanchard-Cooper, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 20 September 2019. There are two recommendations at:

- Minute 230 [Statement of Licensing Policy] – to view the Officer's report and Appendices, please click on this link - [Report](#) and [Appendix](#)

11. Cabinet - 7 October 2019 (Pages 23 - 34)

The Chairman, Councillor Dr Walsh, will present the Minutes from the meeting of Cabinet held on 7 October 2019. There are no recommendations.

12. Development Control Committee - 9 October 2019 (Pages 35 - 46)

The Chairman, Councillor Bennett, will present the Minutes from the Development Control Committee held on 9 October 2019. There are no recommendations.

13. Planning Policy Sub-Committee - 15 October 2019 (Pages 47 - 54)

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Yeates, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Planning Policy Sub-Committee held on 15 October 2019. There are recommendations at:

- Minute 12 [Planning Policy and Climate Change Emergency] – to view the Officer's report – please click on this link – [Report and Appendix](#)
- Minute 13 [Provision of Accommodation Suitable for Older People and People with Disabilities] – to view the Officer's report – please click on this link – [Report](#)

- Minute 16 – [Housing Delivery Test – Action Plan] – to view the Officer’s report and Appendix, please click on this link - [Report](#) and [Appendix](#)

14. **Electoral Review Sub-Committee - 16 October 2019** (Pages 55 - 56)

The Vice-Chairman, Councillor Jones, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Electoral Review Sub-Committee held on 16 October 2019. There are three recommendations at:

- Minute 8 [Review of Polling District, Polling Places and Polling Stations] – to view the Officer’s report and three Appendices, please click on these links: [Report](#) and [Appendix 1](#); [Appendix 2](#); and [Appendix 3](#)

15. **Governance Working Party - 21 October 2019** (Pages 57 - 62)

The Chairman, Councillor Oppler, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Governance Working Party held on 21 October 2019. There are no recommendations.

16. **Overview Select Committee - 22 October 2019** (Pages 63 - 68)

The Chairman, Councillor Coster, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Overview Select Committee held on 22 October 2019. There are no recommendations.

17. **Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee - 28 October 2019**

The Chairman, Councillor Stanley, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee held on 28 October 2019.

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

18. **Motions**

To consider any Motions submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14.

19. **Questions from Members**

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

OFFICER REPORTS

20. **Strategic Council Targets for the Period 2019/2023** (Pages 69 - 80)

Following the May 2019 elections, the formation of a new Council and a new administration, this report requests agreement for the Council’s main strategic targets to try to achieve between 2019 and 2023.

21. **Code of Conduct for Employees** (Pages 81 - 98)

A revised Code of Conduct was approved at the formal Unison/Employer Consultation meeting on 25 September 2019. The Code of Conduct needs formal approval by Full Council before it can be adopted.

22. **Committee Memberships**

The following changes to Committee Memberships need to be noted by the Council as set out below:

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

23. **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.

The Council is also asked to note the report back itemised below in respect of the Council's membership of Greater Brighton Economic Board:

(1) Membership of Greater Brighton Economic Board

On 15 October 2019, it was confirmed that Arun District Council would formally join the Greater Brighton Economic Board. Arun joins six other local authorities, two universities, Gatwick Airport and the South Downs National Park as part of a powerful partnership aimed at increasing investment in the region, bringing in funding for major projects and helping to create jobs and prosperity.

- 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](#)

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 6

Subject to approval at the next Full Council meeting

191

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE ARUN CIVIC CENTRE ON 10 OCTOBER 2019 AT 5.45 PM

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

[Note: The following Councillors were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters detailed in the Minutes indicated:- Councillors Elkins and Mrs Hamilton – Minute 257 to Minute 260 (Part); Councillor English – Minute 257 to Minute 264 (Part – during the debate on Recommendation 1); Councillors Brooks and Goodheart – Minute 264 (Part – they left during the debate on Recommendation (1) and did not take part in any of the voting); Councillor Mrs Madeley – Minute 264 (Part – she left after the recorded vote had been taken on the Magenta Route Option); Councillors Mrs Worne and Mrs Staniforth – Minute 264 (Part – they left during the Recorded Vote on Recommendation (4) (a) to (f)].

257. WELCOME

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

258. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Batley, C Blanchard-Cooper, Buckland, Miss Needs, Purchase, Roberts, Smith and Stanley and from all of the Council's Honorary Aldermen.

259. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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 Agenda Item 8 – A27 Trunk Road – Improvements at Arundel. This table is set out below:

Full Council - 10.10.19

Name	Town or Parish Council or West Sussex County Council [WSSC]
Councillor Jamie Bennett	Rustington
Councillor Paul Bicknell	Angmering
Councillor Billy Blanchard-Cooper	Littlehampton
Councillor Jim Brooks	Bognor Regis
Councillor Mike Clayden	Rustington
Councillor Alison Cooper	Rustington
Councillor Sandra Daniells	Bognor Regis
Councillor David Edwards	WSSC
Councillor Roger Elkins	Ferring and WSSC
Councillor Paul English	Felpham
Councillor Steve Goodheart	Bognor Regis
Councillor Pauline Gregory	Rustington
Councillor June Hamilton	Pagham
Councillor Shirley Haywood	Middleton-on-Sea
Councillor David Huntley	Pagham
Councillor Martin Lury	Bersted
Councillor Francis Oppler	WSSC
Councillor Jacky Pendleton	Middleton-on-Sea and WSSC
Councillor Vicky Rhodes	Littlehampton
Councillor Emily Seex	Littlehampton
Councillor Samantha Staniforth	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

260. 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 six questions had been received and that all questions were for the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh to respond to. All of these questions related to Agenda Item 8 – A27 Trunk Road – Improvements at Arundel.

Question One outlined concern about the viability of the route options throughout the consultation and referred to an email that Highways England (HE) had sent to a Member of Arun District Council confirming that it had “not yet formulated any conclusions on the planning likelihood of any route” and that “it was too early and

inappropriate for HE to conclude the ‘consentability’ of any route”. The questioner asked if the Council had been made aware of this guidance and if it would be taken into account when the route options were ranked against the Council’s stated objective of improving the social and environmental wellbeing of Arundel and Walberton, Storrington and surrounding communities.

Councillor Dr Walsh responded confirming that he was not aware of the email referred to. However, he stated that there was a subtle difference between viability and consentability. The Council’s Officers had worked on the basis that the six options were viable and would not have been put forward by HE if this was not the case.

Members of the Council tonight would debate the issues and would be invited to vote for or against or abstain on each of the six options. The options would not be ranked, however, a ranking could be discernable once the votes had been cast for all six of the options.

Question Two outlined that the Magenta option would result in Walberton and Slindon Parishioners facing the sum of all fears with the monstrous multi-directional motorway interchange that would cover at least the size of the Crossbush junction. Great concern was expressed over the increase in traffic for surrounding areas and the threat that ‘rat runs’ would be created too. The Magenta route would sever two parts of the area permanently and so the Council was asked it could please oppose options that achieved one Arundel by creating two Walbertons.

Councillor Dr Walsh responded stating that the reason why this Special Council meeting had been called was to debate the very important issue of a proposed by-pass of Arundel and so to provide a basis upon which HE could be provided with the Council’s corporate response to its consultation. As part of the debate, Councillors would have regard for the likely effects on local routes and for junction arrangements. Councillor Dr Walsh confirmed that he was confident that severance would be in Members’ mind when casting their votes for/against each of the options.

Question Three outlined that the Crimson route was now said to be ‘viable’ by HE and would cause the least damage to any residential properties by taking a route through the South Downs National Park (SDNP) which was only slightly longer than the online options. In light of environmental concerns surrounding Crimson and the fact that it had the second-best benefit to cost ratio and was the cheapest of all routes, the Council was asked why it could not consider Crimson instead of Magenta?

Councillor Dr Walsh outlined that all six route options were viable. A substantial portion of the Crimson route was within an area classified as “replanted ancient woodland”. He re-emphasised that Councillors would consider all of the six options and that each option would be voted on.

Question Four remarked upon the fact that local residents had initially been persuaded by HE not to support the Crimson route as this would pass through ancient soil and so there would be associated environmental offsetting costs. HE had since confirmed that all routes were viable and had admitted that Crimson was the shortest,

Full Council - 10.10.19

cheapest offline route. As halfway between Arundel and Walberton a covered Crimson would be the ideal solution and would unite all communities. Taking this into account the questioner asked the Council to please support Crimson.

Councillor Dr Walsh stated that he could not comment on the assertion of HE persuading local residents towards or away from any particular route option. He reconfirmed that Members would consider all of the six options and that they would be voting for or against or abstaining on all of the six options.

Question Five focused on the cost of all of the route options and the questioner asked that in light of the Climate Emergency, could these vast sums of money be spent on public transport in the Arun District instead which would achieve reduced congestion; less air pollution and reduced CO2 emissions.

Councillor Dr Walsh stated that he understood the questioner's concerns in terms of the environment and that the Council was addressing the matter of climate change in a number of ways. He reminded those present that the reason why this Special Council meeting had been convened was to debate the very important issue of a proposed bypass for Arundel and to be able to provide HE with the Council's corporate response to its consultation.

Question Six outlined the questioner's viewpoint that all six route options had their advantages and disadvantages but that the Magenta option was the least worst option due to varying points of view, it would effectively deal with traffic problems on the A27 and would create the significant benefit of reducing the amount of east-west traffic using the current A27 through the SDNP. The downside of this option was that it, along with four of the other options, would have a negative impact on both local people and their houses. The questioner outlined why he felt that the Crimson route was not a practical runner and he set out the reasons for this. He urged the Council to make a decision to support one of the six HE options and preferably that this be the Magenta option which was the best route for this essential and long-awaited A27 bypass of Arundel.

Councillor Dr Walsh in responding stated that the format of the officer recommendations had been changed to enable Councillors to cast a vote for or against (or to abstain from voting) on each of the six route options. It was felt that this presented the most transparent way of reaching a position that could be relayed to HE as the Council's corporate response to its consultation.

As no supplementary questions were asked, the Chairman then drew Public Question Time to a close.

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

261. MINUTES

The Minutes of the last Full Council Meeting held on 18 September 2019 were approved by the Council as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

262. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman alerted Members to the list of engagements and events that had been attended since the last Full Council meeting held on 18 September 2019 – these had been emailed to Councillors recently.

The Chairman then invited Councillor Dixon to make a statement.

Councillor Dixon outlined that it had recently been brought to his attention that at the last Full Council meeting he had failed to sit when the Chairman of the Council had stood to regain order within the Council Chamber. Councillor Dixon confirmed that he had been unaware, at that time, of his actions and that he had not, at any time, intended to show any form of disrespect to the Chairman. Councillor Dixon gave his unreserved and sincere apologies to the Chairman in this respect and confirmed that his actions had not in any way been intentional.

The Chairman confirmed that she accepted Councillor Dixon's apology.

263. URGENT MATTERS

There were no items for this meeting.

264. A27 TRUNK ROAD - IMPROVEMENTS AT ARUNDEL

The Chairman invited the Chief Executive to make a statement.

The Chief Executive outlined that all Members of the Council were sent an email on 8 October 2019 advising them that the recommendations in the Officer's report issued with the agenda were being withdrawn and were being replaced with revised recommendations which had been provided and published to the Council's website that same day.

The decision had been made to take this action based on concerns raised with him by the Council's Group Leaders about the wording of the recommendations in the Officer's report. The Chief Executive believed that the revised recommendations allowed greater transparency and would allow for a more democratic debate to take place on all the options put forward by Highways England (HE) for the A27 improvements at Arundel. A copy of the Chief Executive's statement issued including the revised recommendations had been circulated to the meeting.

The Chief Executive then explained the process that would be followed for the meeting. He confirmed that:

Full Council - 10.10.19

- It was in order for an Officer recommendation to be revised and withdrawn right up to the time it was due to be considered by Members. This was because at a Council meeting, an officer recommendation only became the subject of debate once it had been proposed and seconded by two separate Members.
- In terms of the officer recommendations now before Members, if proposed and seconded, the Chairman intended to request that each recommendation be debate and voted on individually. This meant that:
 - If the Council supported Recommendations (1) and (2) then there would be no further discussion on the options put forward by HE.
 - If recommendation (1) was not supported, then the Council would debate all the options in the consultation document as set out in Recommendation (3) then allowing all Members to have the opportunity to vote on each option. The vote on each option would be recorded.
 - If there was support by a majority for one of the options, then Recommendation (4) sought approval to this option being presented as the Council's response to HE. It was explained that if there was not an overall majority for one option, then the Council would be able to consider ranking the options.
 - Members would then consider Recommendation (5).
- Throughout the debate, Members would have the opportunity to propose further amendments in line with Council Procedure Rule 16.7.

The Chief Executive confirmed that to support and inform debate, all Councillors had been provided with the Officer report setting out the technical assessment of the options; the opportunity to participate in a briefing provided by HE on 24 September 2019 or to attend one of the community-based exhibitions; and a copy of the full consultation documents from HE.

Finally, the Chief Executive alerted Councillors to an error on Page 29 of the Officer report at Paragraph 1.1.4 in which the option 4/5AV2 (Magenta) should read (Amber) and the 'emerging Local Plan' had been referred to in the Officer's report, as the Local Plan was now adopted the word 'emerging' should be deleted from each occurrence.

The Chairman then invited the Leader of the Council to present the item.

Councillor Dr Walsh outlined that this was a 'once in a lifetime' opportunity for the Council to make and that it could not afford to not arrive at a corporate preference or opinion to be related to HE as part of the current consultation, especially in light of the fact that enhancements to the A27 at Chichester and Worthing had not come to fruition. For over 27 years Arun's residents had been crying out for the right improvements to be made as well as commuters; businesses and tourists. This was because this was not just a local road but because it was the strength of the south coast. The A27 was vital to the economy for this part of the country. Its lack of improvement had led to less inward investment into the Arun District over many years. Completing much needed

enhancements would unlock this potential allowing employment and businesses to thrive. Councillor Dr Walsh urged Councillors to unite and support one option which could be confirmed as this Council's solid recommended route option to HE.

Councillor Dr Walsh outlined that there were six options to consider and that there were many factors to think about in assessing each of these including environmental; financial; deliverability and effects on communities as a starting point. Firstly, he stated that as a Council, Councillors were being asked to vote to support the principle of a bypass for Arundel and then if this succeeded Members would then have opportunity to drill down further looking into the merits surrounding each option that was available to the Council.

Councillor Dr Walsh highlighted some background to previous studies and proposals around improvements to the A27 at Arundel. Following a consultation in 2017, the Council revised its preferred solution to Option 5A with a suggestion for a slight amendment – this was the equivalent of the current Amber option. Councillor Dr Walsh's view was that this was the Option that should be supported. There had recently been a lot of emphasis made on social media in terms of the Crimson route as this ran through an area of designated ancient woodland. If chosen as an option, the South Downs National Park would strongly reject it. The Magenta route provided greater flexibility and would have a less direct impact on the South Downs National Park area, minimising the environmental impact. Local feedback had shown massive support for a road junction at Ford, to avoid 'rat running' south of the River Arun. Due to expanding housing and industrial parks this was seen to be a vital need. Although this was not promised by HE, it had been included in its consultation document and would be looked at once a route had been chosen. Turning to other details, the Magenta route would mean that only 29 properties within 50 metres of the scheme footprint would be affected. In terms of the SDNP only 0.75 km of land would be taken from the National Park. Government was offering £300 m of investment into the District via this bypass, as a Council could we afford to reject this opportunity?

Councillor Oppler then seconded the revised recommendations circulated.

The Chairman firstly invited debate on Recommendation (1) which was whether the Council agreed that it should make a response to HE to not support any of the options put forward in their latest consultation on the A27 Arundel Bypass.

This commenced with two Councillors speaking in support of the Council to vote for not supporting any of the six options presented. This was because they felt that many residents could see the damaging effect all the six options would have on the local community and on the environment. It was quoted that 'nobody wanted a 70 mile per hour road near to their home'. The Magenta option threatened to be the most devastating for Arundel residents as well as those residing in the villages of Binsted and Walberton. The Six Villages area had also expressed its dismay at the idea of 3 offline routes passing nearby. A Walberton Village campaign group had compiled a leaflet that stated that a bypass would be catastrophic for the village and that residents in Arundel would also be divided as many recognised the environmental damage that would be inflicted onto their neighbouring countryside, spoiling panoramic views and walks for

Full Council - 10.10.19

ever. It was felt that the Council had a duty to support and protect all residents and their surrounding environment.

The Council was reminded that its adopted Local Plan promised to protect the unique qualities of the District and look after its beautiful landscape and special habitats. The well-rehearsed arguments for Arundel needing a bypass were well known, however, it was felt that it was more important to bring to the attention of Councillors the sound environmental reasons why a bypass should not happen. It was accepted that there was congestion at Arundel as there was on many other roads, but there were important reasons that the Council could not afford to ignore. There were many rare and protected species of birds and bats that would become endangered. Destroying them would be too high a price to pay in order to save drivers eleven minutes travelling time during rush hour. There was concern that the proposals would only shift traffic from Arundel to Fontwell and then Chichester and would create 'rat running' on other more minor roads resulting in higher emissions and pollution. It was suggested that instead the funds available should be invested in public transport to free up roads and to develop new transport plans with WSCC whilst at the same time providing a more reliable and affordable public transport infrastructure.

Varying Councillors then spoke against supporting Recommendation (1). This was because they very strongly believed that the time had come to make a decision that would provide an improved A27 at Arundel. The congestion issues on the A27 affected the economy in the Arun District as well as areas further afield. To support one of the six options put forward by HE would mean that something would be done about the situation in Arundel and areas to the east and west. Arundel was a bottleneck that held up traffic costing commuters, businesses, communities and visitors valuable time and money.

This viewpoint was widely supported by other Members who referred to the fact that the Council had a corporate responsibility for the entire District of Arun, not just the villages that would be affected by any A27 improvements. Examples were cited. The A27 at Arundel was recognised as one of the worst traffic hold up spots in the whole of South East England and this would only get worse, unless action was taken now. The need to consider alternative forms of transport were accepted as important but it had to be recognised that the A27 was the only major east-west trunk road south of the M25 linking many of the towns and cities along the south coast, this made it a national situation. The smooth running of the road played a key part in the region's success. Congestion in Arundel resulted in drivers seeking alternative routes which were not suited to higher traffic volumes. This was why National Government had come forward with the funding to deal with this situation. The whole of the Arun District was reliant on the provision of this bypass. Its importance could not be underestimated in view of other A27 schemes that had either been paused or were no longer part of HE's schemes.

Other Councillors referred to previous debates where it had been stated that the housing crisis in Arun could not be improved without the essential infrastructure in place. The opportunity for a bypass was that essential infrastructure and all residents, businesses and tourists knew that a bypass was needed. It was argued that there was nothing 'green' about hundreds of people sitting in traffic jams and polluting the environment.

During this part of the debate, Councillor Elkins outlined that West Sussex County Council's Select Committee had not yet debated this topic. He therefore felt that in his position as West Sussex County Council's Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport he did not wish to prejudice his position and so asked for advice on whether he should declare an interest and remain in the meeting and vote on the item or whether he should leave the meeting at this point. Having received advice, Councillor Elkins decided that he would leave the meeting and not participate any further in the debate and votes.

As proposer to the recommendation, Councillor Dr Walsh urged Councillors to vote in support of making a response to HE. In responding to biodiversity and environmental concerns raised from those not wishing to submit an option response, he outlined that any option put forward would aim to minimise environmental impacts and would seek to protect and enhance the quality of the surrounding areas through high quality design. He referred to the consultation document that confirmed that green bridges could be implemented to protect wildlife by constructing culverts to facilitate safer animal crossings of the A27. He outlined the real problem of 'rat running' as drivers were often left with no alternative other than to use less suitable routes [notably Storrington] to avoid severe congestion around Arundel. Finally, Councillor Dr Walsh referred to poor transport connectivity, it was hoped that the Arundel Chord linking the south coast mainline to the Arun Valley train route could be explored as part of this process.

The Chairman announced that a recorded vote would now take place on Recommendation (1).

Those voting for Recommendation (1) were Councillors Mrs Catterson and Ms Thurston (2). Those voting against were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (34). Councillors Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

Recommendation (1) was therefore LOST.

As Recommendation (1) had not been supported, Recommendation (2) was withdrawn and so the Chairman invited debate on Recommendation (3) which was for the Council to agree which option it would support to be submitted as its response to Highways England. There were six options, these being:

Full Council - 10.10.19

- Cyan (Option 1V5)
- Beige (Option 1V9)
- Crimson (Option 3V1)
- Magenta (Option 4/5AV1)
- Amber (Option 4/5AV2)
- Grey (Option 5BV1)

Councillors were reminded that they now had the opportunity to debate each of the six options listed above before a recorded vote would be taken on each option.

The following arguments were put forward in respect of the following route options:

Cyan, Beige and Amber

Would divide Arundel and not solve congestion issues and would have the worst impact on the villages of Binsted and Walberton. Amber could be the safest route.

Crimson

There were many arguments put forward to support this route as it would improve the safety of travellers; would reduce congestion; and would provide a substantial carbon footprint saving. It would reduce the impact of noise and would reduce the impact on the villages of Binsted and Walberton. The woodland to be lost was a conifer plantation which happened to be located on ancient woodland. Conifer plantations could contaminate soil and would need to be harvested at some point in the future. This route provided the best available balance between providing the much-needed bypass with the least impact on the local community. The Council had a duty to protect resident's homes.

Crimson was not a bad route, just not the best route. It would destroy 21 hectares of ancient woodland. There were concerns expressed that this would not be the safest option for travellers.

Magenta

This route provided the most pragmatic balance by having the least impact on residents and the least loss of land. The following points were made:

- Magenta might look like the least damaging option, but it did cut through land that was the home for many rare species such as bats and owls – there were environmental issues to consider.
- Traffic in the area had increased and would continue to do so. A new bypass would take the pressure off the A259.
- This was the best option to deliver and improve inward investment
- Had the smallest impact on the South Downs National Park.

- A Ford Junction should be included as part of this option
- This is the most environmentally friendly route and least detrimental on homes

Councillor Dr Walsh, as proposer of the recommendations, highlighted his observations from the debate that had taken place. Firstly, he congratulated Councillors for executing a well conducted discussion on this vital issue. He stated that all arguments had been well presented and he thanked everyone for their contribution. The discussion held so far had highlighted the impact congestion was having with travellers taking alternative routes from the A27 to other minor roads not suitable for such volumes of traffic. Responding to concerns about environmental impact, the Magenta route had less of an environmental impact than the Crimson route. Back in 2017, the Council had shown general support for Option 5A but there had been caveats attached to this. HE has listened and had now moved one of the option routes westwards and this was the Magenta route. For that reason, the Council should support Magenta. All of the arguments for not supporting the Crimson route had been well itemised in Question Six asked at Public Question Time. Whatever option chosen, Councillor Dr Walsh stated that it was important for the Council to also put across points of vital importance. These were to ensure that the impact on residents and the environment be reduced as far as possible; that viaducts and bridges be built to the highest architectural standard; to encourage a Ford Junction; to consider using the port of Littlehampton and the River Arun to barge materials to the construction site; and to encourage the creation of a cycleway between the South Downs to the coast alongside the River Arun, forming an alternative form of local transport.

The Chief Executive confirmed that a recorded vote would now take place on each of the six options.

For Option (1V5) Cyan, no Councillors voted for this Option. Those who voted against it were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (37). Councillors Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (1V5) Cyan HAD NOT BEEN SUPPORTED.

A recorded vote then took place on **Option (1V9) Beige**. No Councillors voted for this Option. Those who voted against it were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (37). Councillors Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

Full Council - 10.10.19

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (1V9) Beige HAD NOT BEEN SUPPORTED.

A recorded vote then took place on **Option (3V1) Crimson**. Those voting for this Option were Councillors Coster, Dixon, Mrs Hamilton, Huntley, Northeast (5). Those voting against were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (31). Councillors Mrs Daniells, Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (3V1) Crimson HAD NOT BEEN SUPPORTED.

A recorded vote took place on **Option (4/5AV1) Magenta**. Those voting for it were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Mrs Daniells, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (31). Those voting against were Councillor Mrs Catterson, Coster, Dixon, Mrs Hamilton and Ms Thurston (5). Councillors Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (4/5AV1) Magenta WAS SUPPORTED.

A recorded vote took place on **Option (4/5AV2) Amber**. No Councillors voted for this Option. Those voting against it were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (36). Councillors Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (4/5AV2) Amber WAS NOT SUPPORTED.

A recorded vote then took place on **Option (5BV1) Grey**. No Councillors voted for this Option. Those voting against it were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Mrs Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Chapman, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dixon, Edwards, English, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Kelly, Lury, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Miss Seex, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates (36). Councillors Mrs Warr and Mrs Worne abstained from voting.

The Chairman then announced the outcome of this recorded vote which confirmed that Option (5BV1) Grey WAS NOT SUPPORTED.

The Chairman confirmed that Option (4/5AV1) Magenta had received the majority of the Council's votes.

The Council

RESOLVED

That Option (4/5AV1) Magenta be submitted to Highways England as this Council's supported option for the A27 Trunk Road, Improvements at Arundel.

The Chief Executive advised Members that now it had resolved that Option (4/5AV1) Magenta was this Council's supported option, it now had to agree the comments set out in Recommendation (4) (a) to (f). A request was made that the voting on these elements of Recommendation (4) be taken on block and without a recorded vote. This was agreed by the Council.

Having undertaken the voting on Recommendation (4) (a) to (f) via a show of hands the Chairman announced that 32 Councillors had voted for the recommendations and three had abstained from voting. There were no votes against.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

As Option (4/5AV1) Magenta had been confirmed as the Council's supported Option the following comments be made to Highways England:

- (a) The Council urges Highways England to consider all potential opportunities on any preferred route corridor, which would further reduce the impact on residents and the environment;
- (b) The Council encourages Highways England to construct any bypass and consequential embankment, viaducts and bridges to the highest possible architectural standards and to take appropriate account of any potential flooding issues;
- (c) The Council would encourage Highways England to consider amending any 'off-line' preferred route to provide a junction between the proposed A27 Bypass and Ford Road to improve accessibility to and from communities (existing and proposed) south of the South Coast Mainline Railway and the residential amenity of residents in Ford Road, Arundel;
- (d) The Council would welcome further investigation into the routing of Footpath 2207 at Crossbush, with the potential for an on-line footbridge rather than a diversion that is routed close to the Arun Valley Railway;

Full Council - 10.10.19

- (e) The Council would encourage Highways England to consider using the port of Littlehampton and the River Arun to barge aggregate and other construction materials to the construction site; and
- (f) The Council would encourage Highways England to support, through their 'Designated Funds', the creation of a cycleway between the South Downs National Park via Arundel to the coast, along the River Arun and improved parking for commuters, tourists and residents at Ford Railway Station.

Councillor Dr Walsh then formally proposed Recommendation (5) which sought the Council's approval to delegate authority to the Director of Place to commission and submit any Local Impact Statement required as part of a formal Development Consent Order process working collaboratively with West Sussex County Council, Arundel Town Council, Walberton Parish Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. This recommendation was then seconded by Councillor Oppler.

The Chairman invited Councillor Mrs Catterson to speak as she had confirmed that she wished to propose an amendment to this recommendation. She proposed adding the words "**Lyminster and Crossbush Parish Council**" after the words Walberton Parish Council in view of the impact of the proposals on this Parish area. Councillor Ms Thurston seconded this amendment.

As there was no debate on this amendment, Councillors Oppler, as seconder to the recommendation, and Dr Walsh, as proposer to the recommendation were asked if they were willing to accept this amendment. They both confirmed that they were happy for this amendment to be incorporated into what they had originally proposed at Recommendation (5).

The voting on this amendment declared it as being CARRIED.

The Council

RESOLVED

Delegated authority be granted to the Director of Place to commission and submit any Local Impact Statement required as part of a formal Development Consent Order process working collaboratively with West Sussex County Council, Arundel Town Council, Walberton Parish Council, Lyminster and Crossbush Parish Council and the South Downs National Park Authority.

(The meeting concluded at 8.00 pm)

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 9

Subject to approval at the next Housing & Customer Services Working Group meeting

1

HOUSING & CUSTOMER SERVICES WORKING GROUP

19 September 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Bennett (Chairman), Coster (Vice-Chair), Bicknell, Charles, Mrs Cooper, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Mrs Pendleton and Ms Thurston (Substitute for Mrs Catterson)

[Note: The following Councillor was absent from the meeting during the following items of business – Councillors Mrs Pendleton and Ms Thurston Minute 1 to Minute 4 (Part).]

Apologies: Councillors C Blanchard-Cooper and Chapman

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2019 were approved as a correct record by the Working Group and signed by the Chairman.

3. MEETING START TIMES

The Working Group

RESOLVED

That the start times of meetings for the remainder of 2019/20 be 6.00 p.m.

4. RE PROCUREMENT OF RESPONSIVE REPAIRS CONTRACT UPDATE

The Group Head of Residential Services presented her update report outlining the current Contract for repairs and maintenance and associated works and services for Council Housing Stock with Mears Limited was due to expire in June 2020.

She explained that earlier in 2019 the Council appointed Faithorn Farrell Timms LLP (FFT) as its consultants to assist with the procurement of a new contract. There were now four candidates who had been invited on 16 August 2019 to tender for the new Contract, with a view to secure a contract term based on 5 years with the option to extend for a further 3 years and a further 2 years thereafter.

Members were advised that a future report would be taken to Cabinet to request the award of the new Contract when appropriate.

Housing & Customer Services Working Group - 19.09.19

A number of questions were asked by Members of the Working Group, the key points raised were:

- If an end of contract report from Mears Limited would be provided to evaluate their performance over the last three years of the contract
- Confirmation was sought about the void process and if residents would be required to pay for the work undertaken. Members were advised that charges only applied if deliberate damage had been caused. In this scenario residents would be recharged the cost of fixing the damage.

The Chairman thanked the Group Head of Residential Services for her update and the Working Group noted the report.

5. STRATEGIC DIRECTION OF CUSTOMER SERVICES

The Group Head of Neighbourhood Services and The Customer and Parking Services Manager presented their report and outlined that the new draft strategy contained within his report reflected the Council's 2020 Vision and suggested a new Customer Service Vision that would put the Customer at the heart of everything the Council does. This is summarised as follows:

- The report briefly reviewed progress since the implementation of the 2013-17 Strategy
- It introduces a new draft strategy and sets out a process of implementation. This includes consultation and workshops with elected members and staff
- The draft Customer Access Strategy (2020-25) reflects the Council's 2020 Vision and suggests a new Customer Services Vision which aims to place the customer at the heart of everything that the Council does.
- It sets out how a new strategy will be embedded into the organisation together with a proposed timescale.

Some key areas of progress that had been made were highlighted:

- Training had been provided to multi-skill staff across the Customer Service teams
- Website redesign although there was further work to be completed on this item, it had seen significant progress made and was now providing a much better service for the customer e.g. smartphone access, improved self-service options from reporting missed bin collections online to making online payments.
- Social Media, regular updates across all social media channels allow the Council to respond directly with Customers as well as using these platforms to keep our customers informed of updates.

- From the Customer Satisfaction Survey (2019) the results showed that the largest percentage of our customers (44%) said that their preference was to make contact with the Council via the website.
- Implementation of a new vision across the organisation would be vital to ensure success of the new strategy and it would require everyone across the Council to be putting the customer first in everything they do in order for this culture change to be successful.

Members to part in a full debate, the key points raised were:

- Suggestions to make improvement to the telephone Interactive Voice Response (IVR) as these can be difficult and frustrating to use
- Support for customers who want to use the website but don't have a computer or access to the internet
- A suggestion to investigate Repeat Contact reasons was made as this had not be detailed in the report provided.
- How contact is logged at the Council, and the ease of locating all the customers information was discussed and a suggestion of logging contact to a case number was made.

It was confirmed that the aim of the new strategy was to ensure that customers had options to contact the Council to suit their needs. Whilst there had been a focus on boosting the number of customers who use the website to serve themselves, it was acknowledged that this does not suit everyone.

For those customers who may find using the internet difficult, there had been computers available in the reception areas along with staff to support anyone who wanted help accessing the website. A suggestion of working with Libraries and local community groups in a bid to help support and educate specific target groups of customers was made. Further confirmation was given by the Customer & Parking Services Manager that work was being completed to identify why customers contact the Council which included investigation into customers who would be classed as repeat contact.

Further discussion took place as to how the Council would manage such a big culture change in order to see the new vision be successful, Members felt that it would require a lot of work. Officers were in agreement with Members, this was a big task, however work had already started under the existing Strategy, working with key managers across the business implementing improvements to processes. Workshops for staff to attend would be taking place as part of the implementation of the Strategy, and there was consideration to employing a consultant as required.

The Chairman advised that he had spent time in the Contact Centre last week and wanted to express his thanks to the team for the great work they do. This was echoed by the rest of the Working Group who all appreciated what a demanding role they have. He then thanked the Group Head of Neighbourhood Services and the Customer and Parking Services Manager for their update and the Working Group noted the report.

Housing & Customer Services Working Group - 19.09.19

6. ASBESTOS MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Group Head of Residential Services presented her update report and outlined that the Council as a Landlord of social housing has responsibility for managing the maintenance and repairs of its housing stock, including managing asbestos in each property.

She advised that the Control of Asbestos Regulations had come into effect from April 2012, with the aim to protect workers and other people from the potential dangers of asbestos. Explaining that duty holders must take reasonable steps to find materials in premises likely to contain asbestos and check their condition, make and maintain a record of location and condition of asbestos, assess the likelihood of anyone being exposed to asbestos and manage that risk accordingly.

In summing up she explained that Members would receive a fully updated Asbestos Policy and Management Plan at the December meeting of this Working Group.

Members had a full discussion on the update provided, the key points raised were:

- Members sought clarification on the categorisation for different risk levels for the different forms of asbestos and it was confirmed that it would be clearly defined in the next update.
- Thanks, was given to The Group Head of Residential Services in particular the work and change that she had driven since joining the Council was expressed as amazing and this was evidenced by the great results that had been achieved by her team.
- A request to understand how near the Council was to be being compliant in respect of asbestos was made. It was confirmed that this information would be shared at the next meeting as part of the Health & Safety update report.

The Chairman thanked the Group Head of Residential Services for her report and the Working Group noted the report update.

7. REPORT BACK FROM CABINET/FULL COUNCIL

No queries or questions on recommendations that had been forwarded from the Working Group to Full Council on 7 February 2019 were raised.

8. WORK PROGRAMME 2019/2020

The Group Head of Neighbourhood Services presented the Work Programme for 2019/20 to members.

Members put forward a number of suggestions to be considered, these are listed below:

- Council Housing Stock update to be provided in December in particular confirming the Council being fully compliant across all Health & Safety areas by November 2019.
- Invitation to have Stone Pillow and Turning Tides attend one of these meetings to provide an update, as there is concern that when the West Sussex County Council (WSCC) cuts are implemented in November that these will impact the District significantly.
- An update on the number of Empty Homes within the district was requested as members were aware that the figure reported at 7 February 2019 meeting of 416 had now increased to 600. It was confirmed an update on this report is due to be presented to the Working Group in February 2020.
- Members were keen to confirm if the Working Group would have the opportunity to influence the Allocations Review Policy before it was presented at the February 2020 meeting. The Group Head of Residential Services confirmed that a briefing session could be arranged for members to attend.
- The Energy Efficiency and Fuel Poverty report also due in February 2020 would Carbon Emissions be addressed within this report.

Following consideration, the Working Group

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL

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

(The meeting concluded at 7.00 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 10

Subject to approval at the next Licensing Committee meeting

171

LICENSING COMMITTEE

20 September 2019 at 9.30 am

Present: Councillors B Blanchard-Cooper (Chairman), Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Coster (substituting for Councillor Goodheart), Kelly, Lury, Oliver-Redgate and Mrs Worne.

Councillor Mrs Madeley was also in attendance at the meeting.

226. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Bennett, C. Blanchard-Cooper, Mrs Catterson and Goodheart.

227. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made.

228. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2019 were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

229. START TIMES

Following consideration, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the start times of meetings be 9.30 a.m. for the remainder of 2019/20.

230. STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY - REVISION

The Group Head of Technical Services introduced this item and advised that, in the absence of the Licensing Manager, the Licensing Officer would present the detail of the revised Statement of Licensing Policy and answer any questions Members might have. Since publication of the agenda, a couple of presentational issues had been identified and he was therefore seeking Members' agreement to an additional recommendation to read "Authority be delegated to the Group Head of Technical Services to make minor changes to the policy, in consultation with the Chairman".

The Licensing Officer informed the Committee that the revisions to the Statement of Licensing Policy centred on additions to sections 3, 5, 6, 15, 20, 22 and 24 and he provided a brief summary of those additions. He also advised that, as a result of the

Licensing Committee - 20.09.19

public consultation that had been undertaken, Public Health had provided information that was considered to be useful for inclusion in the policy.

In discussing the matter, clarification was sought that the Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO) would dovetail in with the Licensing Act regime and the Group Head of Technical Services was able to provide that clarification. Following further questions, which were responded to at the meeting, Members commented that this was an excellent report that was understandable and easy to read.

It was suggested and agreed that, following amendment to the policy as discussed, a draft final version would be circulated to Members for comment and proof reading.

The Committee then

RESOLVED

That the Public Health data provided be inserted into section 7 of the policy; and

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL - That

- (1) the Statement of Licensing Policy be approved for adoption to take effect from 01 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.

(The meeting concluded at 10.00 am)

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 11

Subject to approval at the next Cabinet meeting

173

CABINET

7 October 2019 at 5.00 pm

Present: Councillors Dr Walsh (Chairman), Oppler (Vice-Chair), Mrs Gregory, Lury, Purchase and Mrs Yeates.

Councillors Brooks, Buckland, Coster, Goodheart, Mrs Hamilton and Huntley were also in attendance for the meeting.

231. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Members, members of the public and press and Officers to the meeting.

232. APOLOGIES

An Apology for Absence had been received from the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Stanley.

233. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

234. QUESTION TIME

The Chairman confirmed that two Public Questions had been submitted in line with the Council's Constitution. Both questions were from the same questioner and were for him as Leader of the Council to respond to.

The first question asked when and how the Council would be responding to the proposed Littlehampton Harbour Revision Order. The questioner also asked if the Council would consider municipalisation as an option to secure the public interest recognising the importance of Littlehampton Harbour to the economic wellbeing of the Town going forward.

Councillor Dr Walsh confirmed that the Council would respond to any proposed Harbour Revision Order when it was published for consultation. It was anticipated that this would be towards the end of this month with the Council intending to take a report to its next Cabinet meeting in December 2019. Regarding the municipalisation of the Harbour, Councillor Dr Walsh stated that he had concerns about this and that now was not the time to explore this as an outcome. Firstly, it would be necessary to understand the impact of any changes brought about the Harbour Revision Order before considering such a course of action.

Cabinet - 7.10.19

The second question related to the Exempt item on the agenda for the meeting [Disposal of Freehold Land on the West Bank of the River Arun] with the questioner asking the Council if it could ensure that as much information as possible be made available to the public.

Councillor Dr Walsh responded stating that the principle of openness in decision making was important to the Council and it was aware of the need to balance this with preserving the Council's commercial interests. The Council owned the freehold of the area west of the footbridge known as Littlehampton Marina and land running alongside the River Arun to the north of the A259. Councillor Dr Walsh confirmed that this item would be confirmed as being withdrawn for consideration at this meeting to allow further investigation and due diligence to take place.

Councillor Dr Walsh then invited the questioner to ask supplementary questions.

A supplementary question was asked in relation to the first question with the questioner referring to a recent Littlehampton Harbour stakeholder meeting in which it had been stated by the Board's legal representative that in order for the Harbour Board to even consider the Council taking over the running of it as an option, one of the Councillors would have to express an interest in this happening. Could an update be provided?

Councillor Dr Walsh outlined that he would take this on board.

235. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 2 September 2019 were approved by the Cabinet as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

236. BUDGET VARIATION REPORTS

There were no matters discussed.

237. PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENT AGREEMENT - PUBLIC HEALTH WELLBEING PROGRAMME

The Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing, Councillor Mrs Yeates, introduced this item stating that Arun had enjoyed a Partnership Agreement with Public Health since 2011. The agreement allowed the Council to identify the key issues facing its residents and to agree a range of interventions to help improve the health and wellbeing needs of the community. Councillor Mrs Yeates stated that she was extremely supportive of this arrangement as it allowed the Council the opportunity to work with Public Health to consider the local picture rather than requiring a 'one size fits all' approach to the prevention agenda.

Councillor Mrs Yeates then invited the Group Head of Community Wellbeing to highlight the key sections of the report.

Members were advised that the main point to emphasise was that this was a long-term partnership with Public Health who commissioned Arun to provide a preventative service to its residents. This service focused on issues that were particular to Arun. An example provided was life expectancy differentials between the most and least affluent areas which were as much as nine years for men and eight for women. This had improved over the last nine years when the gap had been well over eleven years for men.

Members' attention was drawn to the Arun Wellbeing Business Plan attached to the report at Appendix 1 identifying all the activities of the team which had previously been agreed with Public Health, who very closely monitored the service outcomes. This conveyed that this partnership delivered services that improved and transformed lives and so it was hoped that Members would agree to entering into a new three-year agreement.

The Chairman thanked the Group Head of Community Wellbeing for his report and outlined that as a retired doctor he endorsed the Plan entirely and applauded the work of the Wellbeing Team in demonstrably improving health outcomes. There were large issues to continue to tackle such as childhood obesity and he outlined that it was partnership agreements such as this that assisted in tackling such long-term problems.

Other Cabinet Members agreed with this point of view and commended the work undertaken by the Arun Wellbeing Team. The varying life expectancy ages were of concern and it was hoped that by continuing with the partnership the differentials could be reduced further.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED – That

- (1) Agreement be given to enter into the Partnership Agreement Relating to the Public Health Wellbeing Programme for the period 2019 to 2022 with West Sussex County Council; and
- (2) The financial contribution of £323,360 from West Sussex County Council for the financial year 2019/20 and that subsequent contributions would be subject to the ratification of the Budget by West Sussex County Council was noted.

The Cabinet supported the recommendations in the report and then confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/017/071019, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

(During the course of the discussion on this item, Councillors Oppler, Purchase and Dr Walsh all declared their Personal Interests as Members of West Sussex County Council).

Cabinet - 7.10.19

238. INNOVATING OUR HIGH STREETS - TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION APPROACHES

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh, introduced this item and stated that everyone was aware of the devastating effect that the internet was having on High Streets. Although it was unlikely that High Streets could be brought back to how they once were, there were some moves that the Council could make to help the situation.

The Chairman invited the Chief Executive to present his report which outlined what could be done to kickstart the High Street economy following a study tour he had attended with the District Council Network.

The Chief Executive explained that his report focused on the work of an acknowledged expert in the retail market and the outcomes of a study tour of Roeselare in Belgium which he had attended on behalf of the Leader of the Council to explore the key findings of the work and schemes that had been undertaken to see if there were any initiatives that could be explored at Arun. The key findings from attending the tour were then highlighted. A short video clip was shown to the meeting highlighting what the shopping experience could be like for the next generation.

The report recommended the development of Town Centre Plans with Town Councils and other partners that would look at event suggestions put forward by the public and the community. Officers would also investigate setting up a Business Rate Fund for new start-up businesses to help reduce business costs in the early stages of promoting a new business. If approved, Officers would report back with their findings at some point in the future.

Although Cabinet very much welcomed the report and ways in which the High Street could be innovated, it was felt that this could present other problems to resolve. There would be socialisation aspects to consider. For some people to remove the social side of the shopping experience could cause isolation in addition to unemployment. It was explained that the idea of community cafes, allowing exhibitions and art/craft events to take place whilst offering free wi-fi, was what was attracting people to towns now. Members agreed the merits of charity shops which not only acted as amazing recycling centres places but also ticked the sustainability box that was a high priority for young people in particular. With advances in technology, it was accepted that a cash free world would eventually happen.

It was agreed that for the District's Towns, it was now a top priority to think of new and fresh ideas. In looking at working with other partners, the University of Chichester and business school and church groups were suggested as there could be young people that had entrepreneurial ideas and vision that could work. The Chief Executive confirmed that dialogue was ongoing with the Bognor Regis Town Council, the Bognor Regis Improvement District (BID) and Littlehampton Town Council.

Councillors Coster, Brooks and Goodheart had indicated that they wished to speak and this was agreed by the Cabinet. The points that they highlighted were that:

- the provision of adequate free car parking spaces was key to attracting visitors to shopping areas.
- New events needed more support and more volunteers to make them successful. The increasing cost of health and safety was a problem and threatened the future of events.
- The Council needed to make maximum use of its website and web pages such as 'Sussex by the Sea' as a portal to promote people to the existing web site.
- The District's three Towns needed to work together looking at lessons learnt and new incentives.

In response it was agreed that events were key to success and that it was an essential aim to focus on providing new and fresh projects that would attract people into the District's Town Centres. Digital support and access to free wi-fi were vital to the future of Towns.

In summing up the discussion held, the Chairman stated that it was vital for Arun to commence some form of dialogue with similar seaside towns such as Lowestoft, Hunstanton and Margate as they had made huge progress from putting on free festival type events that had generated opportunities for their nearby communities. It was felt that in the short-term the suggestions put forward in the report would be a good starting point for the Council.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED – That

- (1) the principle of supporting our three Towns in Arun to improve their shopping experiences be agreed;
- (2) Officers be requested to investigate ways to develop Town Centre Plans with Town Councils and other partners;
- (3) Officers be requested to consider a £60k budget within the 2020/21 Budget considerations; and
- (4) Officers be requested to investigate setting up a Business Rate fund for new start-up businesses (in a defined Town Centre area) to help reduce business costs (possibly through the West Sussex Business Rate Pool).

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/018/071019, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

239. ITEMS PUT FORWARD BY THE OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUPS

There were no items to consider.

Subject to approval at the next Cabinet meeting

178

Cabinet - 7.10.19

240. DISPOSAL OF FREEHOLD INTEREST IN LAND ON WEST BANK OF THE RIVER ARUN, INCLUDING LITTLEHAMPTON MARINA

The Chairman reconfirmed that this item had been withdrawn.

(The meeting concluded at 5.52 pm)

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

**DECISION NOTICES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON
MONDAY 7 OCTOBER 2019**

REF NO.	DECISION
C/017/071019	Partnership Arrangements Agreement – Public Health Wellbeing Programme
C/018/071019	Innovating our High Streets – Town Centre Regeneration Approaches

PLEASE NOTE THAT THESE DECISIONS WILL COME INTO EFFECT FROM 10.00 A.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2019 UNLESS THE CALL-IN PROCESS IS APPLIED

REFERENCE NO:
C/017/071019

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENT AGREEMENT - PUBLIC HEALTH WELLBEING PROGRAMME	
OFFICER CONTACT: Robin Wickham – Group Head of Community Wellbeing	
EXTN: 01903 737931	
PORTFOLIO AREA: Community Wellbeing	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The West Sussex Wellbeing Programme is commissioned by West Sussex County Council's Public Health Department. Since 2011, Arun District Council has delivered a prevention and wellbeing service under this agreement which provides a wellbeing service that focuses addressing local health inequalities. This report seeks authority to enter into a new three year funding and partnership agreement with West Sussex County Council to enable the contribution of the Wellbeing Programme in Arun.

DECISION:

The Cabinet

RESOLVED – That

- (1) Agreement be given to enter into the Partnership Agreement relating to the Public Health Wellbeing Programme for the period 2019 to 2022 with West Sussex County Council; and
- (2) It be noted that the financial contribution of £323,360 from West Sussex County Council for the financial year 2019/20 and that subsequent contributions will be subject to the ratification of the budget by West Sussex County Council.

REASON FOR THE DECISION: To enable the continuation of the Wellbeing programme in Arun and support the delivery of Arun District Council's corporate policy of 'Supporting you if you need help'.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED:

- (1) Not to agree to enter into the Partnership Arrangement Agreement Relating to the Public Health Wellbeing Programme for the period 2019 to 2022 with West Sussex County Council; or
- (2) Not to note the financial contribution of £323,360 for the financial year 2019/20 and that subsequent contributions will be subject to the ratification of the budget by West Sussex County Council.

CABINET MEMBER(S):

DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:

Councillors Oppler, Purchase and Dr Walsh all declared their Personal Interests in this item as Members of West Sussex County Council.

Yes

DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :

None

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER CONSULTED IN RESPECT OF THIS DECISION: None

REFERENCE NO:
C/018/071019

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: INNOVATING OUR HIGH STREETS - TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION APPROACHES	
OFFICER CONTACT: Nigel Lynn, Chief Executive EXT: 01903 737600 PORTFOLIO AREA: Economy	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The report provides background to a Local Government Association/District Council Network study tour, plus recent expert views on how to innovate and regenerate our Town Centres.

The report proposes that Cabinet are minded to support budget provision of £60k in the 2020/21 budget for Town Centre event in partnership with other organisations.

DECISION:

The Cabinet

RESOLVED – That

- (1) The principle of supporting our three Towns in Arun to improve their shopping experiences be supported;
- (2) Officers be requested to investigate ways to develop Town Centre plans with Town Councils and other partners;
- (3) Officers be requested to consider a £60k budget within the 2020/21 Budget considerations; and
- (4) Officers be requested to investigate setting up a Business Rate Fund for new start-up business (in a defined Town Centre area) to help reduce business costs (possibly through the West Sussex Business Rate Pool).

REASON FOR THE DECISION: To provide a practical and financial framework to enable Town Centre regeneration in Arundel, Bognor Regis and Littlehampton.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED:

To reject the proposals or to identify alternative or additional proposals.

CABINET MEMBER(S):

DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:

None

DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :

None

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER CONSULTED IN RESPECT OF THIS DECISION: None

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 12

Subject to approval at the next Development Control Committee meeting

179

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

9 October 2019 at 2.30 pm

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

Councillors Mrs Haywood and Huntley were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

241. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mrs Pendleton and Mrs Stainton.

242. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Edwards Planning Application BE/69/19/OUT - I wish to make this meeting aware that I did make an objection to the previous application on this site. This was my view at that time and I have not made any comment on this latest application. I have an open mind regarding this item and I will listen, and consider all the relevant issues and interests presented to this Committee today and I confirm that I will reach my decision on merit.

Councillor Coster AW/134/19/HH – I wish to make this meeting aware that I may have made public statements as part of my election campaign and or in other circumstances that I have concerns about this particular application. These were my views that I held at that time. However, I have an open mind regarding this item and I will listen and consider all the relevant issues and interests presented to this Committee today and I confirm that I will reach my decision on merit.

Councillor Mrs Hamilton P/134/16/OUT – I wish to make this meeting aware that I may have made public statements as part of my election campaign that I have concerns about some of the proposed development in the Parish of Pagham. Those were views I held at the time, however, I have an open mind regarding such development, mostly on the question of flood risk, and I will listen and consider all the relevant issues, presented to the Committee today and I confirm that I will reach my decision on merit.

Mrs Yeates - Planning Application BE/69/19/OUT – I wish to make this meeting aware that I was involved with Bersted Parish Council's deliberations on the previous application on this site. I held views at that time on the previous application, however, I have not made any comment on the latest application. I have an open mind regarding

Development Control Committee - 9.10.19

this item and I will listen, and consider all the relevant issues and interests presented to this Committee today and I confirm that I will reach my decision on merit.

Mrs Yeates – Planning Application BE/47/19/PL – I wish to make this meeting aware that I was involved with Bersted Parish Council’s deliberations on the application on this site. I held views at that time on the application, however, I have not made any further comment and I understand it has been amended. I have an open mind regarding this item and I will listen and consider all the relevant issues and interests presented to this Committee today and I confirm that I will reach my decision on merit.

243. PERSONAL APOLOGY

Councillor Bower made a personal apology to the Chairman for a comment he had made at the last meeting, which had been made in the heat of the moment. The Chairman appreciated his apology.

244. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2019 were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

245. POST COMMITTEE SITE INSPECTION 33 BALLIOL CLOSE, ALDWICK, PO21 5QE

(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Coster had declared a personal interest and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)

AW/134/19/HH – Single storey side and rear extension with habitable roofspace and conversion of existing roofspace to habitable use, together with porch removal and replacement windows, 33 Balliol Close, Aldwick

This application had been deferred from the meeting held on 4 September 2019 to enable it to be readvertised following receipt of amended plans. The officer report update circulated at the meeting summarised the responses received to the readvertisement and concluded that none of the points raised altered the officer recommendation to approve.

The Planning Team Leader reminded the Committee that the amended plans had reduced the size of the proposed extension and dormer. He also advised that, as the consultation date would end on 10 October 2019, the decision would need to be taken under delegated powers by the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

In discussing the matter, comment was made that the amendments made to the original proposal were welcomed and, whilst some Members expressed concerns, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and the officer report update and the decision be delegated to the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

246. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED APPLICATION Y/103/18/PL 10 ACRE FIELD, NORTH OF GREVATTS LANE, YAPTON

Previously deferred Application Y/103/18/PL – Single Chapel Crematorium with car parking, landscape works, surface water drainage features & associated highway improvements. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan, 10 Acre Field, North of Grevatts Lane, Yapton

This application had been deferred from the meeting held on 7 August 2019 to enable an independent Road Safety Audit (RSA) to be undertaken, the results of which were outlined in the agenda item. An officer report update was also circulated at the meeting which detailed:

- the applicant's response to the RSA
- West Sussex County Council's confirmation that the access arrangements had been tracked for a hearse, fire tender, refuse vehicle and articulated HGV
- An additional representation from Sustrans
- Advice that the S106 legal agreement had not been signed/completed and any approval would need to be delegated to the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, and subject to completion of the S106 Agreement and the recommended conditions

In entering into debate on the matter, Members were still extremely concerned with regard to road safety issues, particularly the junction onto the A259, and were not convinced that the introduction of signage would be sufficient to prevent accidents along the A259 as a result of traffic slowing down to turn sharply into Grevatts Lane West to access the proposed crematorium. It was felt that there was a need for a deceleration lane.

The County Highways Officer in attendance confirmed that a deceleration lane had not been considered at any point; the visibility to be provided was in line with standards; and the signage suggested by the second RSA would be installed and dealt with at the detailed design stage.

The Group Head of Planning advised Members that the application had been in the system for a considerable time and that it would not be appropriate to have a further deferral for further consultation with County Council Members, as had been suggested in the course of discussion because, had they wished to, they could have made comments through that consultation period. He confirmed that the geometry of the junction was generous to enable vehicles to turn in and two RSAs had been undertaken to provide evidence that the highway issues would be addressed. If Members did not agree with the RSAs they needed to come forward with evidence to the contrary as it was not sufficient to just say they did not like what had been presented. In the absence

Development Control Committee - 9.10.19

of such evidence, the advice from the Group Head of Planning was that a refusal of permission on those grounds would not be robust, was unlikely to be able to be defended and could potentially open the Council up to costs at a future appeal.

In turning to the vote, the Committee did not agree with the officer recommendation to approve and there was further discussion around a reason for refusal. The Committee then

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

1. In the absence of a left turn deceleration lane and the potential for rear end shunts on the west bound A259, the proposals would result in severe harm to pedestrians, cyclists and motorists using the A259 in conflict with TSP1 of the Arun Local Plan and paragraphs 108 - 110 of the NPPF.
2. The proposed access from Grevatts Lane West, with the inclusion of a right turn going eastbound onto the A259, would be unsafe and would result in severe harm to pedestrians, cyclists and motorists using the A259 in conflict with TSP1 of the Arun Local Plan and paragraphs 108 - 110 of the NPPF.

247. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEM P/134/16/OUT LAND NORTH OF SEFTER ROAD & 80 ROSE GREEN ROAD, PAGHAM

(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Huntley spoke as the Ward Member.

Councillor Mrs Hamilton had declared a personal interest and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)

Determination of Planning Application P/134/16/OUT

The Committee received a comprehensive report from the Group Head of Planning which addressed the 3 reasons that had resulted in the application being deferred at the meeting held on 4 September 2019. Members were being requested to grant planning permission under delegated authority once the content of the report had been considered.

The Group Head of Planning gave a brief presentation which summarised the content of his report. It was highlighted that an amended planning condition had been accepted by the applicant with regard to the WW2 Infantry Section Post and that the details of a statement of how it would be retained on site and integrated as part of the proposals would be considered by the Committee at a future date.

Members welcomed the retention of the Infantry Section Post.

In the course of debate, a view was expressed that as a decision notice had not been issued against the application, it was permissible to consider new information relating to highways issues. West Sussex County Council had issued a document in April 2013 which stated that there would be an inability to put forward a mitigation scheme to alleviate highways issues in Pagham and that should be considered as new information since the application had been approved in November 2018. In addition, there was felt to be a conflict with the policies in the Local Plan and therefore it should now be refused. However, the Group Head of Planning reminded the Committee that the application had been considered in accordance with all the relevant policies and had been found to be acceptable and those policies had not changed since the decision in November 2018. With regard to the highways issues referred to by the Member, this was an interpretation of what had been published and it was reiterated that there was no new information, surveys or data to be considered, a fact that had already been confirmed by the County Council. In addition, the document being referred to was a consultation response on a different application.

Following further comments from Members, the Committee

RESOLVED

That delegated authority be granted to the Group Head of Planning for the completion of the Section 106 Agreement, substantially in accordance with the Heads of Terms previously approved by the Committee on 13 November 2018 and to grant planning; and to grant planning permission subject to the S106 Agreement and Conditions and Informatives, as set out in the report of 4 September 2019.

248. AW/28/19/PL REAR OF 276 ALDWICK ROAD, ALDWICK PO21 3QH

AW/28/19/PL – Erection of 1 No. dwelling & associated works, Rear of 276 Aldwick Road, Aldwick Having received a report on the matter, together with the officer's written report update detailing that the Section 106 Agreement to secure the Pagham Harbour contribution of £871 had been completed, which had resulted in a change to the recommendation to read "Approve conditionally with Section 106 Agreement", the Committee participated in some discussion on the merits of the proposal.

Some Members expressed reservations with regard to the application as it was felt it would have a negative impact on the special character of the area due to its close proximity to the duck pond. Concerns were also voiced in respect of the loss of trees and the loss of parking for the public visiting the duck pond but, following responses from the Principal Planning Officer, the Committee

RESOLVED

Development Control Committee - 9.10.19

That the application be approved conditionally with Section 106 Agreement and as detailed in the officer report and officer report update.

249. A/62/19/PL OLD BLACKSMITH'S YARD, WATER LANE, ANGMERING BN16 4EP

A/62/19/PL – Erection of 2 No. semi-detached dwellings with associated access, car parking & landscaping. This application may affect the setting of a listed building, Old Blacksmith's Yard, Water Lane, Angmering Having received a report on the matter, a concern was raised with regard to the potential for flooding – the Planning Team Leader advised that the Council's Engineers had requested conditions which would address the issue of surface water drainage to prevent any adverse impact from the development itself. The Committee then

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and that delegated authority be granted to the Group Head of Planning to issue the decision following expiry of the advertising period on 10 October 2019.

250. BE/47/19/PL 38 CHALCRAFT LANE, BERSTED PO21 5TX

(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Mrs Yeates had declared a personal interest and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)

BE/47/19/PL – Addition of first floor to existing bungalow to allow conversion to 2 x 1 bedroom flats and a studio flat, 38 Chalcraft Lane, Bersted Having received a report on the matter, the Committee voiced concerns that this was a cramped form of overdevelopment that was out of character with the street scene. The parking provision of 4 spaces was also of concern as Members were not persuaded that there was sufficient space for that number of vehicles. The Committee therefore did not accept the officer recommendation to approve and

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The proposed development represents a cramped overdevelopment of the site with unsuitable parking causing harm to the character of the area contrary to Policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

251. BE/69/19/OUT THE COTTAGE, SHRIPNEY ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS PO22 9PA

(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Edwards and Mrs Yeates had declared a personal interest and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)

BE/69/19/OUT – Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for up to 31 No. houses and flats with car parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure & access off Shripney Road (A29), all following the demolition of the existing dwelling & outbuildings. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan, The Cottage, Shripney Road, Bognor Regis Having received a report on the matter, the Committee also received the officer's written report update, which was circulated that the meeting, detailing:-

- Change to the description to state “up to 31 dwellings”, which would provide the Local Planning Authority with greater flexibility in the future when a reserved matters application was submitted.
- The red edge of the application had been amended and conditions 1 and 8 had been amended accordingly.
- A new condition 21 had been added to secure the proposed pedestrian footways on Shripney Road.
- As the S106 Agreement had not yet been signed, delegated authority was sought for the Group Head of Planning to approve planning permission once the legal agreement had been signed, should Members recommend approval.

In opening up the debate, comment was made that a previous approval for 20 houses and flats was acceptable but that an increase to 31 was not as this part of Shripney Road would not be included in the A29 realignment, so there would still be substantial traffic movements along this stretch of road, which would create problems for access and egress to and from the site.

The Group Head of Planning reminded the Committee that this was an outline application and the illustrated plans were indicative only – the figure was for up to 31 dwellings and Members were not being asked to approve the final number at this stage. However, following further discussion, Members were still concerned with regard to the proposal and did not accept the officer recommendation to approve..

The Chairman called a 10 minute adjournment to enable officers to formulate a reason for refusal based on Members' comments.

On the meeting being reconvened, the Group Head of Planning provided advice to Members that they needed to take account of as to whether the additional impact of up to 31 houses would result in overdevelopment. Further Member comment was made around the lack of amenity space; the fact that flats were now being included; and the density of parking spaces.

Development Control Committee - 9.10.19

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:

As a result of the number of units proposed, the development would result in an overdevelopment of the site by virtue of lack of amenity space, inappropriate density and insufficient car parking contrary to policies D SP1, D DM1 and T SP1 of the Arun Local Plan, policy HDQ8 of the Bersted Neighbourhood Plan and policies within the NPPF.

252. BR/129/19/PL 75 HIGHFIELD ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS PO22 8PD

BR/129/19/PL – Conversion of single dwelling to 4 No. flats including rear projection and 1 parking space (resubmission of BR/215/18/PL), 75 Highfield Road, Bognor Regis Having received a report on the matter, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report.

253. EP/179/18/PL GLADWYN, THE STREET, EAST PRESTON BN16 1HTR

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 Having received a report on the matter, the Committee also received an officer report update which was circulated at the meeting and detailed the following:-

- The proposal had been the subject of a Pre Site Inspection Panel visit
- A Parish Council representation regarding the height of the building and the roof pitch and resultant Condition 9 restricting Permitted Development with regard to the creation of dormers.
- An amended block plan had been received, as detailed in the update.
- Correction to the description of the application, as detailed in the update.
- Consultation response from County Highways of no objection, subject to the imposition of a condition.
- Visibility splays and relevant condition.
- Car parking spaces
- Consultee comment from East Preston Parish Council objecting due to the lack of practical on-street parking close to the development.
- Officer comment.

The Panning Team Leader was able to confirm that parking provision at the site had been increased from 4 to 7; the roof height had been reduced; and that the use of dormers would be controlled by Condition 9.

In discussing the proposal, it was acknowledged that this site was in need of development. However, the provision of three houses and resultant traffic movements to and from the site would cause unacceptable disruption, with visitors having to park on the road away from the site.

The Chairman of the Pre Committee Site Inspection Panel advised that the visit to the site had been informative for those Members in attendance as it highlighted the highways issues in the locality. The adjoining roads were narrow and, as they formed part of the bus route, problems were experienced with the on street parking already taking place, which would inevitably be exacerbated by this proposal. A further cause for concern was the fact that the visibility splays would need to be widened, which would cause the loss of the flint wall to the front of the property – it was felt that this would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

The Planning Team Leader reiterated that the 7 parking spaces designed into the scheme were in line with the County Council's parking calculator.

In turning to the vote, the Committee did not accept the officer recommendation to approve. The options to refuse or defer were then considered, following which it was formally proposed and duly seconded that the application be deferred to enable officers to seek assurance from County Highways that they had included in their assessment of this proposal the planning permission on the adjoining site due to the serious concerns expressed with regard to road safety in the area and what the cumulative effect of the two adjoining developments would have on the road network. It was also agreed that the applicant would be asked to ascertain what visibility could be achieved if the flint wall was retained and whether County Highways would find that acceptable. It was further agreed to ask County Highways to visit the site and attend the Planning Briefing Panel to listen to the concerns of Members.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be deferred to enable County Highways 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.

254. FG/74/19/PL HIGHDOWN INDUSTRIAL PARK, LITTLEHAMPTON ROAD, FERRING BN12 6PG

FG/74/19/PL – 2 No. commercial B1/B8 use buildings with associated car parking, access & refuse storage. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan, Highdown Industrial Park, Littlehampton Road, Ferring Having received a report on the matter, together with the officer's written report update which detailed an additional condition requiring precise details of the materials to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration and a consultation response from

Development Control Committee - 9.10.19

County Highways of no objection, the Committee participated in some discussion on the proposal.

In opening up the debate, Member comment was made that the designated gap between Angmering and Worthing must be protected and that the encroachment over the years into this particular area must be stopped in order to protect the views from Highdown Hill.

It was acknowledged that the site had existing industrial uses and that it would be difficult to refuse a proposal that would be improving what was already there into a better form.

However, when voting on the matter, the Committee did not accept the officer recommendation to approve and therefore

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The proposed development would compromise the open nature of the gap between settlements contrary to policy SD SP3 of the Arun Local Plan and, due to the proximity to the South downs National Park, the proposal would also have a detrimental effect on the setting of Highdown Hill and be contrary to policy LAN DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

255. K/19/19/HH LITTLETANGLEY, MIDDLEWAY, KINGSTON GORSE, EAST PRESTON BN16 1SB

K/19/19/HH – Two storey rear extension with a small canopy projecting the footprint to the front. Demolition of existing living room and additional first floor for habitable use with alterations to fenestration, Little Tangley, Middle Way, Kingston Gorse, East Preston Having received a report on the matter, Members expressed concern that the extension was certainly not subservient to the host building and was in conflict with the policies in the Local Plan.

The Committee did not accept the officer recommendation to approve and the Group Head of Planning provided advice on reasons for refusal as he was of the view that the height and size of the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact and there were no issues around residential amenity.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The proposal by virtue of its height, scale and site coverage will have an unneighbourly impact on neighbouring residential occupiers in conflict with policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and policy KPNP7 of the Kingston Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

256. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the appeals that had been received.

(The meeting concluded at 7.06 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack **Agenda Item 13**

Subject to approval at the next Planning Policy Sub-Committee meeting

8

PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE

15 October 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Mrs Yeates (Chairman), Jones (Vice-Chair), Bower, Chapman (substituting for Councillor Elkins), Dixon, Huntley, Lury, Mrs Pendleton, Ms Thurston and Mrs Worne

9. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for Absence had been received from Councillors Mrs Daniells, Elkins, Northeast and Oppler.

10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations made.

11. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2019 were approved by the Subcommittee and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

12. PLANNING POLICY & CLIMATE CHANGE EMERGENCY

At the meeting of Full Council on 17 July 2019, the following Motion was agreed which the Planning Policy Subcommittee was requested to consider:-

“This Council supports the principle of developing supplementary planning guidance to improve the level of sustainability of all developments in comparison to the current position.

Officers are asked to prepare a report for the consideration of the Planning Policy Sub Committee on how this might be achieved including reference to the following, and the likely costs and benefits thereof.

- 1) Guidance on renewable energy (both passive & active) for individual homes.
- 2) Improved standards for insulation, heat recovery and water usage.
- 3) Guidance for community renewable energy schemes.
- 4) Guidance on designs for waste/recycling storage facilities.
- 5) Guidance on the planting of woodland which can be both a mitigating and resilience action in terms of carbon sequestration and reducing the rate of surface water run - off and thereby reducing the flooding impact of severe rainfall.
- 6) Improved and more rigorous standards for the prevention of flooding.

The Sub Committee is also asked to make recommendations as to whether Arun DC should look at declaring a Climate Change Emergency and the implications of creating a framework for moving towards a Carbon Neutral District and whether the Council should consider engaging the services of an energy agency to provide community retrofit advice and support and explore the potential retrofitting of solar panels on all appropriate Council assets.”

In presenting the report, the Planning Policy Team Leader advised that the Director of Services would also be presenting a complementary report to the Environment & Leisure Working Group at its meeting on 7 November 2019 which would

- Scope out the feasibility of, and make recommendation on, setting an appropriate zero-carbon target for Arun District by 2030; and
- Identify the corporate service and other joint stakeholder initiatives and actions needed outside of but complementary to the planning system supported by a consultancy budget.

The Subcommittee participated in a comprehensive debate on the matter which, in summary, encompassed the following issues: -

- Policy E CC SP2 Energy and Climate Change Mitigation – a question was asked with regard to what was decentralised energy and a response was given by the Planning Policy Team Leader that it was, in essence, stand alone schemes, e.g. a factory powered independently of the national electricity grid or could be powered by private wire from a biomass scheme generating energy. It was suggested that other options to be looked at could be combined heat and power plants and centralised energy. In addition, energy sources near to where people lived should not be overlooked.
- The Planning Policy Team Leader advised that through the Future Homes Standards, the Government had already launched a better energy performance target and the building regulations regime was being changed. The building industry needed to be pushed forward collectively. However, the downside of Government intervention was that it would restrict the ability of local authorities to set their own standards.
- Concern was expressed that the construction industry’s reaction to the changes in standards could have a negative and detrimental impact on the District’s housing targets which had been set and must be delivered. A Member response was made that it was important to work with developers as it was felt that they were keen to do the right thing as everyone wanted to get climate change under control.
- It was acknowledged that there were ethical developers working within the industry who were working on greater resilience housing and that, in due course, would become the norm. It was suggested and agreed by Members that a good start could be with the Council taking the lead when building up their own stock of new Council houses in the future (Members were reminded that that was in fact outside the purview of the Subcommittee).
- Comment was made around the viability of development in the future to ensure it was environmentally friendly as it was recognised that there was a fine balance

Planning Policy Sub-Committee - 15.10.19

because houses were needed in the District. In addition, developments had to be viable to ensure that infrastructure could be provided.

In the course of the debate it was acknowledged that this was a good report, but a concern was expressed that a number of other authorities were doing the same work and so a strategic approach should be taken to undertake studies and research to share costs. It was suggested that the Coastal West Sussex Strategic Planning Board should be involved as, in the past, that had provided cost effective and better quality responses to issues at a sub-regional level.

There was a general view from Members that time was of the essence and that there was a need to act urgently so, yes, a climate emergency should be declared.

The Group Head of Planning cautioned Members that what was before them was, at this stage, a scoping report and a route would have to be followed to implement changes.

Following debate, the Subcommittee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL ON 13 NOVEMBER 2019 – That

- (1) A climate emergency be agreed by the Environment & Leisure Working Group and declared by the Council;
- (2) Should a climate emergency be declared, officers to 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.

13. PROVISION OF ACCOMMODATION SUITABLE FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

The Planning Policy Team Leader presented this report which considered the representations made following a four week consultation on the Council's proposed draft guidance for the provision of Accommodation for Older People and People with Disability. Recommendations were proposed to enable adoption of the guidance as a material consideration for Development Management purposes and an amended recommendation was circulated at the meeting to recommend to Full Council for approval at its meeting on 13 November 2019.

The Subcommittee was directed to Section 1 of the report which summarised and addressed the issues raised by Barton Wilmore and the Home Builders Federation. A clear need for this guidance had been included in the Local Plan evidence base and

there was also a recognition that there had been a policy change at national level – National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) had changed and that was a material consideration. The proposed guidance should clarify its status as guidance but not a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It would be used as a starting point to negotiate with developers, subject to viability, the types of housing and accessibility levels (based on the Optional Technical Standards) that should be considered to meet the needs of the elderly population, just as the mix and tenure of housing (e.g. adopted Policy H DM1 Housing Mix) would be negotiated on a case by case basis at application stage, taking into account viability.

Members supported the need for the guidance, and it was suggested that it be included in the Local Plan review in the future for consideration as a Supplementary Planning Document (SDP).

In the course of general discussion on the matter, Members supported the principle of the guidance and saw it as a starting point and, whilst mindful of the viability and feasibility issues, felt that there should be built in better design standards for wheelchair accessibility. There needed to be liaison on the Design Guide to ensure that best practice for provision for wheelchair use was addressed for smaller schemes (below 11 units). It was suggested that putting electrical sockets at wheelchair accessible height could actually save costs and dovetail with measures to increase flood resilience. This was just one example of good practice which could actually assist with viability. Comment was also made that bungalows should be supported for larger schemes.

Members were advised that the Design Guide would be considered in detail at a future meeting of the Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL ON 13 NOVEMBER 2019 – That

- (1) The proposed guidance for the provision of Accommodation Suitable for Older Persons and People with Disabilities is treated as a guide (i.e. not as 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 requirements and is subject to viability.

14. OPEN SPACE PLAYING PITCHES AND BUILT SPORTS FACILITIES SPD

The Subcommittee received a report from the Planning Policy Team Leader which informed Members of representations made and proposed responses following a four week consultation on a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Open Space, Playing Pitches and Built Sports Facilities. A recommendation to Full Council

Planning Policy Sub-Committee - 15.10.19

on 15 January 2020 sought adoption of the SPD as a material consideration for Development Management purposes.

In presenting the report, the Planning Policy Team Leader highlighted paragraph 1.10 and confirmed that it was proposed that the SPD should be adopted but that clarification would need to be added regarding the Fields In Trust (FIT) standard quanta and ancillary facilities within the Sport England calculator which would be maintained as a material consideration but, subject to viability and feasibility. This was due to the untested additional cost implication which had not been specifically viability tested or examined through the Local Plan.

Following Member comment relating to the Butlins LDO (Local Development Order) and S106 contributions, the Subcommittee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL ON 15 JANUARY 2020

That, following publication of the Supplementary Planning Document for 4 weeks, together with the statement of representations and Arun's proposed response, and subject to the proposed changes detailed in the report and any further minor changes made by the Group Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman and Portfolio Holder for Planning, the Open Space, Playing Pitches and Built Sports Facilities SPD be adopted.

15. PARKING STANDARDS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

The Subcommittee received a report from the Planning Policy Team Leader which informed Members of representations made and proposed responses following a four week consultation on a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Parking Standards. A recommendation to Full Council on 15 January 2020 sought adoption of the SPD as a material consideration for Development Management purposes.

In presenting the report, the Planning Policy Team Leader highlighted that this SPD was broadly consistent with West Sussex County Council's published "Guidance on Parking at New Developments 2019" but that it did make several departures to reflect the Arun position, local circumstances, e.g. incorporating electrical vehicle charging points in line with Arun's evidence based approach (i.e. Arun Electrical Vehicle Infrastructure Study November 2017), and to increase the usability of the document.

In discussing the matter, the Group Head of Planning gave advice on the definition of a parking space as a query was raised as to how a garage would only count at 0.5 of a space compared to 1.0 space for a car port or parking space. It was explained that that was meant to apply to larger schemes and to only count as 0.5 in such instances against the parking standard required by proposed overall dwelling numbers – that would ensure adequate provision was provided for parking, via either additional driveway or parking spaces or on street parking (and was necessary because of the tendency for garages to be used for storage/domestic purposes). For individual dwellings a common sense approach would be applied.

A further query was raised with regard to the operation of the escalator for electrical charging points and would it not be better to increase the percentage annually rather than every 5 years. The Group Head of Planning explained the 5 yearly increment would provide Development Management and developers with more certainty, which would make implementation easier.

Following further comment, the Subcommittee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL ON 15 JANUARY 2020

That, following publication of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for 4 weeks, together with the statement of representations and Arun's proposed response, and subject to the proposed changes detailed in the report and any further minor changes made by the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Portfolio Holder for Planning, the Parking Standards SPD be adopted.

16. HOUSING DELIVERY TEST - ACTION PLAN

In February 2019 the Government published the November 2018 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) result for Arun which was 91%. This meant that the Council should prepare an Action Plan aimed at boosting housing delivery. By way of this report, the Planning Policy Team Leader presented a draft Action Plan for Members' consideration which, if approved, would be required to be published on the Council's website.

The Action Plan set out the HDT methodology and the context for Arun's performance at 91%, including some of the barriers to delivery and included perceived solutions. It also set out the risks arising from further under-delivery in terms of the 5 years housing land supply and the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out at paragraph 11.d of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Whilst being broadly in favour of the Action Plan, Members concentrated much of their debate around paragraph 1.7 of the report which proposed investigation into whether the Council should invite applications from landowners/developers on 'deliverable' HELAA (Housing Employment Land Availability Assessment) sites in order to help boost housing delivery. Serious concerns were expressed that the sites that might come forward would be unsuitable e.g. outside the built-up area boundary and that the sustainability assessment had not yet been completed with regard to HELAA sites within climate change flood contours. The Group Head of Planning advised the Subcommittee that, although sites might come forward, they still had to go through the planning process and would not be automatically approved. Work was currently being undertaken to update the HELAA and it was due to be presented to the December meeting.

Further Member comments were made around sustainability; low carbon developments; impacts on the Local Plan; need to address the current 5-year shortfall; government housing requirements. The Group Head of Planning explained that there

Planning Policy Sub-Committee - 15.10.19

was already a shortfall on the 5 year housing supply which triggered the presumption in favour of development. There was concern about what infrastructure delays were hampering development – these appeared to be big schemes such as the A29 and, also, Southern Water applying for licensing restrictions. The impact of delays to the housing trajectory and developing HELAA sites to compensate would mean that some delayed schemes would be pushed beyond the current plan period and would then be a matter for the next plan review.

As it was proposed and duly seconded that the “question be now put” the Subcommittee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL ON 13 NOVEMBER 2019

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.

(The meeting concluded at 8.30 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 14

Subject to approval at the next Electoral Review Sub-Committee meeting

1

ELECTORAL REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE

16 October 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Jones (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Mrs Cooper, Goodheart, Gunner, Lury and Oppler

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

Apologies: Councillors Purchase and Mrs Baker

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In view of the nature of the issues to be discussed in Minute number 7 [Review of Polling District, Polling Places and Polling Stations], it was recognised that all Members' of the Sub-Committee had a Personal Interest in their capacity as having been candidates and electors during both Town/Parish Elections 2 May 2019 and European Parliamentary Election 23 May 2019.

7. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2019 were approved by the Sub-Committee as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

8. REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICT, POLLING PLACES AND POLLING STATIONS

Nigel Lynn, Electoral Registration Officer introduced the report to Members and the Group Head of Policy provided an overview of the findings from the review. She explained that the Sub-Committee were being asked to approve three recommendations going to Full Council on 13 November 2019.

Key points highlighted were:

- 91 Polling Districts currently, increasing to 96 under the current proposal that was recommended to be used from 2020 onwards.
- If a 'snap' General Election was to be called over the next few weeks, it was planned that the Council would use the existing polling stations where they were available.
- 171 comments had been received from the online survey completed, no comments were received for 62 out of the 91 polling districts and that was viewed to be positive.
- Availability of polling places and stations was raised as a manageable risk, but for Members to be aware that just because a venue is suitable, it does not mean it would be available to use.

Electoral Review Sub-Committee - 16.10.19

Members participated in a full debate on areas that it was recommended now required a change of polling district as set out in point 2.7 of the report and appendix 3.

Members were supportive of the recommendations they were being asked to approve, but they were also very keen that the Council continues to review all polling stations whenever feedback is received.

The Sub-Committee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL – That

- a) the Committee recommends acceptance of the location of polling stations/places as set out in Appendix 1 from 2020 onwards.
- b) delegated authority be given to the Returning Officer to complete any outstanding work identified in Appendix 1.
- c) delegated authority be given to the Returning Officer to make changes to polling stations where these are required urgently.

9. CANVASS REFORM 2020

The Group Head of Policy made Members aware of the Government's intention to simplify the process and reduce the need for resources. She advised that a detailed briefing had been given at the Electoral Review Sub-Committee on 12/02/19 and that this would be circulated to Members.

Feedback was that if the legislative timetable was to be met for the data matching part of the process, we understand that it would need to be laid before parliament in the middle of October.

The elections focus in the Queens Speech was for voters to provide photo ID with no mention of canvass reform. The Council don't know at this point if it means that the canvass reform is further along than we thought, or if the Government is not committing fully at this point given their wider agenda.

The key issue was that the national data matching needs legislation in place. If the data matching in January could not be completed, there would be a question about canvass reform for next year given that the District have the PCC election in May 2020. A snap general election would of course have a serious impact on the timetable.

The Sub-Committee noted the update.

(The meeting concluded at 6.38 pm)

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 15

Subject to approval at the next Governance Working Party meeting

1

GOVERNANCE WORKING PARTY

21 October 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Bennett, Bower, Charles, Dixon, Mrs Erskine, Mrs Gregory, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton and Ms Thurston

[Note: Councillor Dixon was absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters considered from Minute 1 to Minute 5 (Part)].

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

The Working Party

RESOLVED

That Councillor Oppler be appointed Chairman of the Working Party.

The Working Party

RESOLVED

That Councillor Ms Thurston be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Working Party.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for Absence had been received from Councillor Mrs Daniells and Gunner.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

4. START TIMES

The Working Party

RESOLVED

That its start times for meetings for the remainder of 2019/20 be 6.30 pm.

5. APPROACHING A REVIEW OF GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

Prior to inviting the Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer to present her report, the Chairman outlined that since the introduction of the Cabinet system concerns had been expressed that many Councillors felt excluded from the decision-making process making him believe that the existing Executive model did not work well for Arun. His view was that it also proved to be more remote to residents and so this was why an investigation to reintroduce a Committee system should proceed. The Chairman stated that the Working Party needed to consider the advantages and disadvantages of the existing system and any proposed alternative. He felt that many Members cited a Committee system as being more democratic with more Councillors being directly involved in making decisions and that the Opposition had more input. The timetable in place for this review aimed to have any proposed alternative structure in place so that consultation could take place with the Audit & Governance Committee before recommendations for change would be considered by Full Council on 15 January 2020. A Special Council meeting would then be held on 22 April 2020 to consider and agree the required constitutional changes and a revised Members' Allowances Scheme. In view of this tight deadline, it would be vital for the Working Party to be focused and to have realistic expectations of what could be achieved. It was acknowledged that the Officer team allocated to work on this review also had to continue in meeting the commitments of their day to day job.

The Chairman outlined that the Liberal Democrat Group had already undertaken some work on this review. He believed that this was a one-off opportunity to create a new structure that would work for all Members, irrespective of party affiliation. In looking at how all Councillors could be engaged and consulted on all steps of the process, it was suggested this be undertaken through the Political Group structure. The main aim of this evening's meeting was for the Working Party to be able to define the purpose of the review and why change was needed; and how change could be planned.

The Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer outlined that the report had been written based on the Working Party's Terms of Reference as agreed by Full Council on 18 September 2019. It outlined that the review of governance arrangements needed to work within the provisions of the Localism Act 2011 confirming that as a Local Authority, Arun had to operate one of the three permitted forms of governance covered in the report. This did not, however, prevent the Working Party from looking at other options. The Council had agreed that the review would work to the guidance produced by the Local Government Association (LGA) and Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS). This guidance had been attached to the report and proposed a four step process to concluding the review and a fifth evaluation step should the Council decide to change its governance arrangements.

What was important to consider, as the Chairman had already highlighted, was how consultation would be undertaken and how the views of wider Councillors and key Officers could be obtained.

In discussing the report, the initial observations made were:

- It would be difficult for Members to compare 'like with like' – much had changed since the Cabinet system had replaced the Committee system – the Council had also substantially changed during this time having a much 'leaner' structure
- There was no adverse objection to change but it was outlined that all options needed to be fully considered – including any potential hybrid systems
- All Political Groups should have the opportunity to submit proposals
- The cost of change needed to be considered
- Could the Council service any new structure within existing resources?
- Concern was expressed over the timescale for the review against the amount of work required – was this realistic and achievable?
- There would be a big onus on Members to be involved in some of this work and to keep the review on track
- Should Scrutiny remain as part of any new structure
- What did prescribed arrangements entail?

The Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer responded to some of the comments made.

- The timescale would be challenging to achieve to meet implementation by the next Annual Council Meeting in May 2020. If this target was not met, implementation would have to be delayed to the next Annual Meeting of the Council
- If the review was kept simple, not changing current decision making levels between Members and Officers then change could be achievable by May 2020. There could then be the opportunity to review any concerns about the Officer Scheme of Delegation at a later date
- It needed to be recognised that there was limited Officer resource to dedicate to this review;
- It needed to be recognised that in the event of a General Election being called, this would inflict severe pressure onto the small Officer team allocated to the review

The Chairman outlined that he had the expectation that all Groups and all Councillors should start thinking about ideas for a new structure and should work up ideas to pass to Officers for discussion ahead of the Working Party's next meeting.

Governance Working Party - 21.10.19

The Group Head of Council Advice & Monitoring Officer asked Members to firstly consider what they wished to achieve from this review. She suggested that Members could be surveyed for their views so that the Council could understand what worked well under the current system and what ideas Members might have for improvement or change. This would also engage all Members in the review process and would inform the judgement that the Council would need to take if a proposal for change was recommended.

In response, the following comments were made:

- Not many Councillors had experience of working with the old Committee system, however, reading the guidance supplied assisted in understanding how such a structure could work and what the important issues to consider were.
- It would be important to understand why some Councils having conducted a review had chosen to not change their existing arrangements – learning from others would be key. It was explained that the Council was seeking assistance from the LGA on these points
- The financial implications needed to be known. The Chief Executive outlined that his report on strategic Council Targets which would be considered at the next Full Council meeting on 13 November 2019 provided some information on estimated additional staffing costs. To provide an answer on precise costs, the full detail of any proposed structure would need to be known first.

The Chairman then alerted Members to the four-step process that should be applied in conducting this review, as set out in the report. Members needed to think about what worked well within the existing structure; what improvements could be made; whether Members felt involved and sufficiently engaged; and what was the public's views were on current arrangements. He referred to the review undertaken by Crawley Borough Council and their survey which embraced the points he had just outlined.

The Working Party agreed that a survey based on these areas should be sent out to all Members of the Council and the Council's Senior Management Team as soon as possible. This would then fulfil what the guidance urged Members to consider in planning for a review. The Working Party agreed not to engage any other stakeholders.

The Working Party agreed that the survey should provide Members with the opportunity to confirm how long they had been a Councillor and what positions they had held. The Working Party also requested that a draft of the questionnaire and the covering email be approved by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Working Party and the four Group Leaders. This approach was approved by the Working Party.

The Working Party then worked through three elements of the process to be followed for the review – these were:

- Planning the review – defining the purpose of the review and agreeing the scope
- Designing principles for the new arrangements
- Meeting objectives and putting a plan in place

The Chairman repeated his purpose for a review mentioned earlier. The Working Party agreed with his statement made.

In looking at how to engage and consult, it was agreed that the survey to be sent to all Councillors and Officers would achieve this.

The Chief Executive urged Members to also consider the disadvantages of any new structure. Although positives had been cited in respect of a Committee system, negatives also needed to be investigated. This was because the Committee system was often criticised for being slow to make decisions.

The Chairman stated that moving forward, the survey would urge all Councillors in all political groups to have their say and would allow groups to organise their own internal discussions and to plan in pushing some ideas forward for the Working Party to consider at its next meeting.

It was agreed that the Working Party would be sent the current Cabinet Portfolios and the service areas that sat under these to assist Members in understand and thinking about how a new structure could be formed.

Following further discussion, the Working Party agreed that each political group should submit its suggestions for a new structure to the Chief Executive by 8 November 2019 in time for the next meeting of the Working Party to be held on 12 November 2019.

The Working Party

RESOLVED – That

(1) A questionnaire approved by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Working Party and all four Political Group Leaders be sent to all Members of the Council and the Senior Management Team by the end of the week seeking views on the existing system of Leader and Cabinet; what improvements could be made to that system; asking how involved Members felt in the decision making process; what other comments Members might wish to make and how long Members had served on the Council;

(2) The next meeting of the Working Party be held on 12 November 2019;

Subject to approval at the next Governance Working Party meeting

6

Governance Working Party - 21.10.19

- (3) The results of the questionnaire be reviewed at that meeting; and
- (4) All Political Groups submit their ideas for a new structure or other alternatives to the Chief Executive by 8 November 2019.

(The meeting concluded at 8.00 pm)

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 16

Subject to approval at the next Overview Select Committee meeting

191

OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE

22 October 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Coster (Chairman), Clayden (Vice-Chair), Bennett, Bicknell, Dendle, Elkins, Huntley, Miss Needs, Miss Seex, Tilbrook and Mrs Worne

Councillors Mrs Gregory, Oppler, Purchase, Dr Walsh and Mrs Yeates were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

Apologies: Councillors B Blanchard-Cooper, Mrs Catterson, English and Miss Rhodes

257. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Committee were in agreement that they all had a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 5 [Leisure Operating Contract – Year Three Report] in view of their membership at the Littlehampton Wave a request was made that this be included in the minutes.

258. MINUTES

The minutes of the Overview Select meeting held on 3 September 2019, as previously circulated, were approved by the Committee as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

259. LEISURE OPERATING CONTRACT - YEAR THREE REPORT

The Chairman invited the Group Head of Community Wellbeing to present his report to Members, in doing so he welcomed Ivan Horsfall-Turner – Chief Executive, Matt Hunt – Operations Director, Darrell Keech – Area Manager, Paul Douglas-Smith – Contract Manager, Lee Tiller and Charlotte Simpson – Active Communities Officers from Freedom Leisure to the meeting.

The Group Head of Community Wellbeing advised Members that he was satisfied with the performance delivered by Freedom Leisure during 2018/19. The Freedom Leisure Team then gave a thorough presentation on their performance and activities over the last year. Their key points are highlighted below:

- 20,000 more customer visits at the centres compared to 2017/18
- Number of people taking part in adult or junior courses, swimming lessons, fitness classes and holiday activities, up by 4.5% compared to the previous year.
- Number of people taking part in referral programmes, up by 29%, this included GP referrals and Phase 4 Cardiac Rehabilitation
- Increased activity levels of fairly active and active adults at the Littlehampton Wave and Arun Leisure Centre – these activity levels are

monitored by Freedom Leisure using the Sport England criteria of the number of adults doing less than 30 mins of exercise, those completing 31-149 mins and those completing 150+ mins per week. Compared against 2017/18 the results for Arun were:

- Inactive -5.78%
- fairly active +6.26%
- active -0.48%
- A total of 26.7% increase in Gym Memberships over 2018/19
- Both Arun Leisure Centre and the Active Communities teams hold a Quest accreditation. Littlehampton Wave will be applying for accreditation in 2019/20
- External Auditors, Leisure Client conducted an audit in August 2018, Littlehampton scored 84.61 putting it in the 'Good' category, Arun Leisure Centre scored 89.16 putting it in the 'Very Good' category
- A Community development programme had been established through the Active Communities Framework
- Freedom Leisure gained the Investors in People accreditation
- Achieved the target of opening the Littlehampton Wave before 1 April 2019
- Since the Littlehampton Wave opened the carbon emissions have halved, giving the community a far more environmentally friendly building

There were four main projects that Freedom Leisure had focused on over the last year with the overall aim to provide activities that were as inclusive for as many people to take part in as possible. Some highlights of these were:

- Starting well & living well for families and younger people
 - Junior Summer Fitness challenge
 - Xplorer days for families in local parks
 - Supported the "This Girl Can" campaign
 - Delivered school holiday activity programmes at both centres
- Making the facilities more affordable and accessible?
 - Provided swim only memberships
 - Subsidised memberships for those on weight loss programmes
 - 50% reduction in charges for core activities with junior membership
 - Discounted swimming for those supported by Coastal West Sussex Mind
- Aging well
 - Provided free health walks for over 2,500 walkers
 - Supported 35 volunteer walk leaders all over the age of 60
 - Provided unlimited free swimming and a half price coffee for those over the age of 75

- Developed a health referral membership for those living with long term health conditions
- For those with additional needs
 - The Arun Active Communities organised the parallel youth games held at K2 where these children represented their schools
 - Provided discounted activities for those with a Compass Card, working with the Amaze Charity
 - Provided free activity session for disabled children and their families working with Albion in the community

The following questions/points were asked and raised by Members:

- Were there any plans to set up indoor Tennis facilities? The Group Head of Community Wellbeing explained that there were no plans, but this could be considered in the future.
- A number of questions were raised regarding the condition of the building and the equipment at the Arun Leisure Centre. It was confirmed that all the equipment was relatively new after the gym refurbishment, if there were issues with the equipment these would need to be reported to Freedom Leisure who would investigate and arrange any repair work to be undertaken. It was also confirmed that work to improve the condition of the wet changing area would be investigated to ensure that these facilities matched the quality of the rest of the Centre.
- A request was put to the Freedom Leisure team, to consider running courses for adults with disabilities across all the centres. Freedom Leisure confirmed that this would be looked into for 2020.

The Chairman thanked Freedom Leisure for their presentation and Members were all in agreement that the work Freedom Leisure had accomplished over the last year has been very impressive and was something to be proud of.

260. FEEDBACK FROM MEETINGS OF THE HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE HELD ON 26 SEPTEMBER 2019

The Committee received and noted the feedback report received from Councillor Bennett, as this Council's nominated representative, following his attendance at the meeting of the West Sussex County Councils Health and Adult Social Care Committee (HASC) held on 26 September 2019.

Councillor Bennett drew the Members attention to three key points from his feedback report that were:

- The update on West Sussex Suicide Prevention Strategy 2017-2020 that showed that the Suicide rates had reduced since 2013.

Overview Select Committee - 22.10.19

- West Sussex Health Protection Report was presented and showed that West Sussex had a great rate for children aged 1 receiving the MMR vaccination but that the rate for children aged 3, due to have the second vaccination, showed a significant drop.
- Substance Misuse Services also reported that more people were coming forward for support to get off drugs or drink with 1537 people currently being supported by the service.

The Leader of the Council was invited to speak by the Chairman regarding the low uptake of the second MMR vaccination for children aged 3. Dr Walsh advised Members that everyone had a responsibility to ensure that MMR vaccination was vital to ensure these diseases do not come back as it could lead to an epidemic. He stated that the current vaccination levels are at 70% and needed to be 90%.

A full debate took place and suggestions for West Sussex County Council to look into the way the second vaccination is promoted to the public, including reminder letters, notices place at children's nurseries and a campaign using graphic images showing the result of being exposed to Mumps, Measles and Rubella.

261. FEEDBACK FROM MEETINGS OF THE SUSSEX POLICE AND CRIME PANEL HELD ON 27 SEPTEMBER 2019

The Committee received and noted the feedback report from Councillor Mrs Yeates following her attendance at the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel on 27 September 2019.

Councillor Mrs Yeates drew Members attention to the following points within her report:

- The South East Regional Integration Partnership agreement
- 101-telephone service and the integration of a Queue Buster service on this line to help with the volume of calls received
- Chichester Custody Suite

She also advised that she had received a presentation from the Early Intervention Youth Fund team regarding the REBOOT programme in relation to young people who have the potential to end up turning to Crime. The presentation specifically looks at changing behaviours to avoid these circumstances.

A summary of the discussion that took place has been detailed below:

- Feedback for the 101-telephone service was still felt to be poor and further questions should be put to the Panel to continue to investigate and implement solutions to this service
- Further questions were raised regarding the Chichester Custody Suite update, with concerns being aired for the time being used to transport

people from Chichester to Worthing and then back again and the issue that the suite at Chichester is being paid for and not used

Councillor Mrs Yeates agreed that she would provide an update on the concerns raised after the next meeting of the Panel.

262. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS AND UPDATES

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh, provided Members with an update on Arun District Council's formal commitment to joining the Greater Brighton Economic Board. He advised that the board were pleased to have the Council on board, and he had received a presentation on the investment that the District could expect to gain as well as what the District had to offer. He also advised that on Monday 21 October 2019, West Sussex County Council's Environment, Committee and Fire Select Committee had also supported the Magenta bypass option, that showed they were in support with the decision that Arun District Council made at the Special Full Council Meeting on 10 October 2019.

Councillor Dendle asked Dr Walsh, if he would push forward his request for the Arundel Chord as he felt that it would provide resilience to the Brighton area. Dr Walsh confirmed that at the first meeting he did raise this and there was general support for the Arundel Chord amongst the group.

263. WORK PROGRAMME 2019/2020

The Group Head of Policy updated Members on the following Work Programme updates:

- CCG have accepted the invite from the Chairman to attend the 10 December 2019 meeting of the Committee. She made a request that any Members who had any detailed questions for the CCG ensured that these were provided to her and the Chairman no later than 8 November 2019.
- The Overpaid Housing Benefit Item that was due to be reported to the Committee on 28 January 2020, required moving to October 2020 due to a change in legislation and a required bedding in period that was needed.

Two further requests were made by Members to invite Network Rail to attend a meeting of the Committee to discuss the Arundel Chord and an invite to Southern Water to discuss options to ensure that Arun's residents would be much better-informed during 'no water' incidents, this request was based on the feedback from the outage that happened in September 2019.

The Group Head of Policy reminded Members that they had a limited number of meetings left in this Civic year and that some of the items suggested would need to be considered to fit onto next years (2020-2021) work programme.

Subject to approval at the next Overview Select Committee meeting

196

Overview Select Committee - 22.10.19

The Committee RESOLVED

That the updated work programme be agreed.

(The meeting concluded at 20:05pm)

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO FULL COUNCIL – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

SUBJECT: Strategic Council Targets for the period 2019-2023

REPORT AUTHOR: Nigel Lynn, Chief Executive

DATE: 24 October 2019

EXTN: 37601

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Following the May 2019 elections, the formation of a new Council and a new administration, this report requests agreement for the Council's main strategic targets to try to achieve between 2019 and 2023.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. Council agree the strategic targets, timetable, route to achieve them and 'Lead Member' as shown in the Appendix of the report.
2. Council note the financial impact of these new targets and seek to establish financial viability through future Medium Term Financial Strategies (MTFS).

1. BACKGROUND:

1.1 The Council's main aims currently are:



The Council Priorities and the Vision

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|
|  | Your services | “Providing the best services |
|  | Supporting you | we can afford to help you |
|  | Your future | improve your life” |

We will continue to deliver our priorities without it costing you more by:

- Offering an improved customer experience
- Building better relationships with other organisations and the community
- Providing more digital opportunities to make dealing with us easier
- Becoming smaller but more effective

1.2 In practice, this has meant that the strategic targets for the Council's Corporate Management Team to try to achieve were to:

- Ensure a balanced budget for 2019/20 and beyond
- Complete and open the Littlehampton Wave (and the demolition of the old pool)
- Develop the Council's housing strategy
- Establish a new park in Bognor Regis (formerly Pavilion Park)
- Progress major regeneration projects
- Work toward increasing recycling rates and prepare for retendering the current contract (by 2023)

1.3 Following the May 2019 District elections, a new Council has been formed with a new administration in a No Overall Control Council (NOC).

1.4 Corporate Management Team have been working with the four Group Leaders to understand the proposed additional targets of the new Council and to propose a way forward to enable their success.

1.5 By agreeing these additional targets, the Council's Chief Executive will be able to allocate resources to try to achieve them, in an agreed way and within an agreed timetable. The Council has a positive history of succeeding with a wide range of projects delivered such as Hotham Park café, London Road Bognor Regis, Eastbank river wall (Littlehampton) and the Littlehampton Wave. Officers desire to succeed under the new administration remains firmly in place. However, it is important to recognise that:

- Council culture must remain firmly based on working together with honesty, integrity and respect for one another (both Councillors and officers). Historically, the excellent Member/Officer relations has been invaluable to ensure success for the Council and this must continue.
- The capacity of the organisation has reduced, resulting in a reduction of staff. As a result, on occasion, consultants will be utilised as a short-term response to staffing pressures. Some of these costs are identified within the Appendix. Overall, this maintains an efficient and cost effective Council.
- The Council is not financially buoyant and anticipates substantial financial reductions from 2021 onwards. Hence, these additional targets will only be achievable through a continued viable Medium Term Financial Strategy.

1.6 Progress

The Council wishes to progress the following strategic targets (through to 2023):

High Priority:

- The following two targets run through all the Council's approaches and will be a 'High' priority for the Council to develop in parallel:
 - Prepare Arun's response to the Environment and Climate Emergency
 - Refresh the Council's Equality and Diversity Policy

- To continue to deliver the Local Plan whilst developing a new planning framework to deliver the Council's priorities by:
 - Improving the level of sustainability and infrastructure in new developments and the Council's response to Environment and Climate Change. The Council will introduce additional and updated Supplementary Planning Documents and revised Development Management Policies as part of commencing a Local Plan review to reflect the change in Council priorities.
- To establish new town centre retail plans for Arundel, Bognor Regis and Littlehampton
- To actively promote a change in governance from an Executive (Cabinet) system to a Committee system at the earliest opportunity
- Maintain a prudent Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)

Medium Priority:

- Maximise the social houses/units we provide
- Engage better with the public by creating a public engagement strategy

Lower priority:

- To consider how best to utilise Bognor Regis Town Hall for the community
- To assist in improving the average wage of people working in Arun by exploring all potential options

1.8 The Council should also consider a 'Lead Member' for each of the targets, as a Member first point of contact for officers to discuss issues with. These Members are proposed in the Appendix.

1.9 Shown as an Appendix to the report are:

- The target
- The route through Council to be achieved
- A rough timescale and cost
- Proposed Lead Member

1.10 The Strategic Targets are not intended to be exhaustive and the only areas that the Council wishes to move forward on; they are more the initial focus for work to be undertaken by Officers. Other areas of importance include an Economic Strategy, a Sea Front Strategy, and a Tourism and Events Strategy, as well as investigating the viability of restoring a sandy beach to Bognor Regis.

2. PROPOSAL(S):

2.1 Council agree the strategic targets, timetable, route to achieve them and 'Lead Member' as shown in the Appendix of the report.

2.2 Council note the financial impact of these new targets and seek to establish financial viability through future Medium Term Financial Strategies (MTFS).

3. OPTIONS:

2.2 The Council agrees to the new targets, timetable, route to achieve them and 'Lead Member', as shown in the Appendix A of the report.

2.2 The Council does not agree to the new targets, timetable and route to achieve them, as shown in the Appendix A of the report.

4. IMPLICATIONS:

4.1 The May 2019 elections saw 37 Councils move to No Overall Control (NOC). Arun District Council is one of them. Of the 248 Councils where elections took place, 73 are now NOC.

4.2 This report focuses on collaboration across the Council. Members from all political parties need to have balanced discussions if they wish to achieve things during this next political (four year) term.

4.3 Working with our communities, the Council needs to lead and facilitate activity that helps to achieve the demands of Climate Change by 2030, which is an increasing challenge for all Councils.

4.4 It is, however, important that Members agree only what is realistically deliverable within the envelope of staff capacity and is financially viable (MTFS) for the Council.

4.5 Collaborative working will require Members to address "the bigger picture" and build consensus with one another across political divides by focusing on solutions and outcomes that they want to achieve for the Arun community. Senior officers, in turn, will work cross-party and in a cross-organisation way, providing sound staff leadership, to enable the Council's agreed targets to be met, within our tight budgets. This will all be in line with Part 8 of the Constitution, paragraph 2. 'General Conduct', specifically:

2.1.5. Listening to the interests of all parties, including relevant advice from statutory and other professional officers, taking all relevant information into consideration, remaining objective and making decisions on merit.

4.6 However, a more collaborative cross-party approach often slows momentum and it is, therefore, essential that the Council focuses on fewer, achievable, targets being delivered well, rather than more targets less well. By having a shared understanding and common targets between officers and Members, achievements could be significant.

5. REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Whilst the Council remains in a position of No Overall Control, there is a high probability that political divisions could hamper progress for the good of the Arun community. Therefore, having agreed targets, in priority order, should improve the opportunity for success, for the community, Members and officers.

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

None

Appendix A – Strategic Council Targets

Target	Decision making route	Rough timescale	Estimate of cost	Lead Member
Overarching Targets that support all the Council's other targets				
<p>1. Environment and Climate Change</p> <p><u>To prepare Arun's response to the Environment and Climate Emergency:-</u></p> <p>by formulating a high-level report that sets out a proposed way forward, to include reference to a strategy and action plan to help mitigation. To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing • Transport • Air pollution • Community leadership • Planning policies • Sustainability 	<p>Environment and Leisure Working Group 7 November 2019, then Cabinet 13 December 2019, then Full Council 15 January 2020</p>	<p>Initial report November 2019</p> <p>Action Plan 2020</p>	<p>Additional staff/resources at £60k p.a for 3 years (Climate Change Manager). Implementation costs unknown at present time.</p>	<p>Councillor Purchase</p>

Appendix A – Strategic Council Targets

Target	Decision making route	Rough timescale	Estimate of cost	Lead Member
Overarching Targets that support all the Council's other targets				
<p>2. Equality and Diversity</p> <p><u>Refresh the Council's Equality and Diversity Policy:-</u> by implementing its recommendations the Council will ensure equality and diversity is the heart of its services to the community</p>	<p>Overview Select Committee then Full Council</p>	<p>OSC on 10 March 2020</p> <p>Full Council on in June/July 2020 (when date set)</p>	<p>Likely to include ongoing regular training commitment as a minimum – £10k p.a</p>	<p>Councillor Francis Oppler</p>

Appendix A – Strategic Council Targets

Target	Decision making route	Rough timescale	Estimate of cost	Lead Member
High Priority				
<p>Local Plan</p> <p><u>To continue to deliver the Local Plan whilst developing a new planning framework to deliver the Council's priorities:-</u></p> <p>This includes:</p> <p>Improving the level of sustainability and infrastructure in new developments and the Council's response to Environment and Climate Change. The Council will introduce additional and updated Supplementary Planning Documents and Revised Development Management Policies as part of commencing a Local Plan review to reflect the change in Council priorities.</p>	<p>Planning Policy Sub Committee. Full Council decision.</p>	<p>A minimum of 36 months from inception</p>	<p>Cost is informed by the breadth and depth of the work that has to be commissioned.</p> <p>A full review could cost approximately £1m over the lifetime of the review. Year 1 costs would be much lower</p>	<p>Councillor Martin Lury</p>
<p>3. Regeneration</p> <p><u>To establish new town centre retail plans for Arundel, Bognor Regis and Littlehampton:-</u></p> <p>by developing a shortlist of projects to be delivered.</p>	<p>Littlehampton Town Council, Bognor Regis Town Council and Arundel Town Council Liaison meetings followed by appropriate Committees for each organisation</p>	<p>24-36 months</p>	<p>£60k p.a</p>	<p>Councillor Dr James Walsh</p>

Appendix A – Strategic Council Targets

Target	Decision making route	Rough timescale	Estimate of cost	Lead Member
High Priority				
<p>4. Governance</p> <p><u>To actively promote a change in governance from an Executive (Cabinet) system to a Committee system at the earliest opportunity to:-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ consider improved openness and transparency of Council procedures. ○ and improving decision making by involving all Councillors in a more democratic way. <p>[The Council also wants to explore East and West Development Control Committees at a later date, to be agreed].</p>	<p>Several stages including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Working Party – October 2019 • Audit and Governance Committee • Full Council decision 20 May 2020 	<p>From October 2019 to May 2020</p>	<p>LGA consultancy to support (£10k?)</p> <p>Potential growth in Committee Services £30k p.a? Lead Officer growth also?</p> <p>£40k total</p>	<p>Councillor Francis Oppler</p>

Appendix A – Strategic Council Targets

Target	Decision making route	Rough timescale	Estimate of cost	Lead Member
High Priority				
<p>5. Finance</p> <p><u>To maintain a prudent Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS):-</u></p> <p>within the current national uncertainty on Local Government finance to put the Council in the best financial position by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessing our assets • Developing a commercial strategy • Generate income ideas • Appointing a Commercial Manager 	<p>Cabinet</p>	<p>Financial Prospects report presented to Cabinet on 2 September 2019.</p> <p>Annual updates to Cabinet and Full Council</p>	<p>£80k p.a for a new post (Commercial & Acquisition Manager)</p>	<p>Councillor Francis Oppler</p>

Appendix A – Strategic Council Targets

Target	Decision making route	Rough timescale	Estimate of cost	Lead Member
Medium Priority				
<p>6. Housing</p> <p><u>Maximise the number of social houses/units provided annually:-</u></p> <p>within the confines of the HRA Business Plan by utilising all resources available.</p>	<p>Housing and Customer Services Working Group and then Cabinet</p>	<p>Annual Review starting with Housing and Customer Services Working Group in May 2020</p>	<p>As set out in HRA business plan. TBC</p>	<p>Councillor Pauline Gregory</p>
<p>7. Public engagement strategy</p> <p><u>To engage better with the public:-</u></p> <p>by creating a digital and public engagement strategy that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the Council's relationship with the public • Improve access to the Council and its services through better digital channels. 	<p>Arun Improvement Board, Cabinet and Full Council.</p>	<p>Autumn 2020</p>	<p>Additional money for implementation</p>	<p>Councillor Dr James Walsh</p>

Appendix A – Strategic Council Targets

Target	Decision making route	Rough timescale	Estimate of cost	Lead Member
Medium Priority				
<p>8. Future of Bognor Regis Town Hall</p> <p><u>To consider how best to utilise the Town Hall for the community:-</u> ensuring any actions are legally compliant</p>	Cabinet and then Full Council	By summer 2020	Nominal	Councillor Matt Stanley
<p>9. Improve local wage levels</p> <p><u>To assist in improving the average wage of people working in Arun by exploring all potential options, including:-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with the Greater Brighton Economic Board • Working with the Local Enterprise Partnership • Encouraging new start up businesses 	Cabinet and Full Council	Probably 9 months for evidence and 3 months for Action Plan. January 2021	Implementation costs unknown at present time	Councillor Dr James Walsh

This page is intentionally left blank

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO AND DECISION OF FULL COUNCIL ON 13 NOVEMBER 2019

PART A : REPORT

SUBJECT: Code of Conduct for Employees

REPORT AUTHOR: Alan Peach, Group Head for Corporate Support

DATE: 9 October 2019

EXTN: 37558

PORTFOLIO AREA: Corporate Support

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

A revised Code of Conduct was approved at the Formal Unison/Employer Consultation Meeting on 25 September 2019. The Code of Conduct needs formal approval by Full Council before it can be adopted.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a) The Council is requested to approve and formally adopt the Code of Conduct for employees;
- and
- b) The Group Head for Corporate Support be authorised to make any further consequential changes to the Code of Conduct.

1. BACKGROUND:

A revised Code of Conduct was presented at the Formal Unison/Employer Consultation meeting on 25 September 2019 by Karen Pearce, Human Resources Manager. The Code of Conduct sets out the standards expected from all employees and it is for each Local Authority to develop their own code. The Code covers a number of areas including personal interests, hospitality, professional boundaries and use of Council facilities. A copy of the revised Code of Conduct is attached.

2. PROPOSAL(S):

Members are asked to approve the revised Code of Conduct for adoption by the Council.

3. OPTIONS:

To adopt the Code of Conduct, this has been updated and provides greater clarity and more information on the standard of conduct expected of staff.

To reject the revised procedure and the Council will continue to use the current Code of Conduct.

4. CONSULTATION:

HR Management has consulted with Unison Representatives at informal meetings and the final version was agreed at the Formal Unison/Employer Consultation Meeting.

Has consultation been undertaken with:	YES	NO
Relevant Town/Parish Council		✓
Relevant District Ward Councillors		✓
Other groups/persons (please specify) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate Management Team • Formal Staff Consultation Panel 	✓	

5. ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS IN RELATION TO THE FOLLOWING COUNCIL POLICIES: (Explain in more detail at 6 below)

	YES	NO
Financial		✓
Legal	✓	
Human Rights/Equality Impact Assessment		✓
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime & Disorder Act		✓
Sustainability		✓
Asset Management/Property/Land		✓
Technology		✓
Other (please explain)		✓

6. IMPLICATIONS:

There are certain elements of the current code of conduct that require updating in line with legislation changes, such as the section on Disclosure of Information with reference to GDPR. Without the adoption of this updated document, any potential disciplinary action resulting from a breach of the code may not be enforceable as the contents may not be relevant or reflect current policy/practice.

7. REASON FOR THE DECISION:

The Code of Conduct is needed to ensure that staff are aware of the standards of conduct expected of them and the potential consequences if those standards are not upheld.

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

A copy of the revised Code of Conduct.

This page is intentionally left blank



EMPLOYEE CODE OF CONDUCT

Contents

Section	Title	Page Number
1	Introduction	3
2	Standards	3
3	General Conduct	3
4	Confidentiality/Disclosure of Information	4
5	Political Neutrality	5
6	Personal Interests	5
7	Annual Declaration of Interest	6
8	Outside Commitments	6
9	Professional Boundaries/Relationships	7
10	Equality Issues	8
11	Fraud and Money Laundering	9
12	Bribery and Corruption	9
13	Separation of Roles During Tendering	9
14	Use of Financial Resources	10
15	Hospitality	10
16	Gifts	10
17	Sponsorship	11
18	IT Security	11
19	Contact with the Media	11
20	Publications	12
21	Use of Council Facilities	12
22	Public Office	12
23	Criminal Charges	13
24	Copyright	13
25	Breaches of the Code of Conduct	13

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Code of Conduct applies to all employees and workers, including casual, seasonal, agency workers and volunteers while they are engaged in carrying out duties for the Council (collectively referred to as employees throughout this document for ease of reading).
- 1.2 The purpose of this code is to protect employees from misunderstanding and criticism. All employees have a responsibility to read this code and be aware of the standards of behaviour expected of them and the rules around official conduct.
- 1.3 If any aspect of this code is not fully understood, the employee should seek advice from their line manager.
- 1.4 Employees must comply with this code of conduct as it forms part of their terms and conditions of employment. Breaches of code will be investigated and may result in action in accordance with the Council's disciplinary procedure.

2. Standards

- 2.1 Local government employees are expected to give the highest possible standard of service to the public, and where it is part of their duties, to provide appropriate advice to Councillors and fellow workers with impartiality.
- 2.2 Employees are expected to abide by all Council policies and procedures, and are expected to raise any potential conflicts of interest at the earliest opportunity. Employees have a duty to act in the best interests of the Council.
- 2.3 Employees will be expected to bring to the attention of the appropriate level of management any deficiency in the provision of service, any impropriety or any breach of this code, or other policy or procedure, through agreed procedures and without fear of recrimination.
- 2.4 Should a member of staff have genuine concerns regarding unlawful conduct, financial malpractice or dangers to the public or the environment, but feels unable to raise them directly with the appropriate level of management, reference should be made to the Council's Whistleblowing Policy. This is available via the Council's intranet.

3. General Conduct

- 3.1 Employees are expected to conduct themselves at all times (inside and outside of work) in a manner which will maintain public confidence in both their integrity, and the services provided by the Council. In general, what an employee does while not at work is his/her personal concern, unless those actions would cause a breakdown in the employment relationship. However, an employee shall at all times, while at work, observe this code of conduct, the Council's constitution and other relevant policies, procedures, rules and regulations.

- 3.2 Misconduct outside of work may result in disciplinary action if it directly affects the employee's performance of their work or the reputation of the Council. Any employee who is the subject of any criminal proceedings which might affect their ability to do their job or the reputation of the Council must disclose this to their line manager as soon as practicable who will discuss this with the Human Resources team.
- 3.3 Staff must also follow any role specific policies (available from their manager) or rules as set out by their Professional body/Institute as appropriate.
- 3.4 Employees must not misuse their official position or information acquired in their official duties to further their private interests or those of others.
- 3.5 Where employees have dealings with the Council on a personal level e.g. as a tenant or applicant for planning permission, they should never seek or accept preferential treatment in such dealings and should avoid placing themselves in a position which could lead to accusations of preferential treatment. Officers who are involved in a planning application should make this known on the planning application form. This will mean that in the interests of transparency and fairness, the application will be dealt with by the Development Control Committee rather than under officer delegated powers.

4.0 Confidentiality/Disclosure of information

- 4.1 It is generally accepted that open government is best. The law requires that certain types of information must be available to Members, auditors, Government Departments, service users and the public.
- 4.2 Employees must ensure that they are clear about what information is confidential and their responsibility to maintain that confidentiality. Employees in any doubt as to whether they should release information must consult with their Line Manager or the Data Protection Officer before any disclosure is made.
- 4.3 Where confidentiality is necessary to protect the privacy or rights of individuals or organisations, the information should not be released to anyone other than the individual who has a right to know, or another person who is entitled to receive it for the proper discharge of their duties.
- 4.4 Employees must not divulge any personal or organisational confidential or commercially valuable information which they have access to in the course of their employment. This also applies after staff have left the Council.
- 4.5 All information relating to the Council, however stored, is the property of the Council and staff must not keep or use it for their own purposes. When staff leave the Council for whatever reason, any such information in their possession must be returned to their line manager.
- 4.6 The law also requires that personal information held about individuals must be treated in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and the General Data Protection

Regulation (GDPR). Employees must ensure that they process data lawfully in accordance with the data protection principles.

- 4.7 Information requested under the Freedom of Information Act must be sent to the Information Management Team to be logged and responded to centrally. Employees should attend any training sessions provided by the Council – and seek advice when unsure from their Line Manager or the Data Protection Officer.
- 4.8 Employees need to be aware that potentially any information held by the Council can be disclosed under a Subject Access Request or the Freedom of Information Act, and must always use appropriate and professional language when making notes, reports or sending emails. Information cannot be withheld on the grounds that disclosure would cause embarrassment.
- 4.9 Any particular information received by an employee from a Councillor which is personal to that Councillor, and does not belong to the Council, should not be divulged by the employee without the prior approval of that Councillor, except where such disclosure is required or sanctioned by the law.

5. Political Neutrality

- 5.1 Employees serve the Council as a whole. It follows they must serve all Councillors and not just those of the controlling group, and must ensure that the individual rights of all Councillors are respected.
- 5.2 Where employees are required to advise political groups, they must do so in ways which do not compromise their political neutrality.
- 5.3 Employees, whether or not politically restricted, must not allow their own personal or political opinions to influence or interfere with their work.
- 5.4 If an employee has a post that is politically restricted they will have been made aware of this formally and of the restrictions in place. These restrictions will be deemed to be incorporated into the employee's contract of employment.
- 5.5 While the Council recognises the right of every individual to hold political opinions and to take part in political activity in his/her own time, it also recognises that politics is a subject on which individuals hold many different views. Therefore, employees may not take part in any type of political activity¹ while at work or during work time.

6. Personal Interests

- 6.1 Employees must declare to an appropriate manager any financial or non-financial interests that could be considered to bring about a conflict with Arun District Council's interests.

¹ 'Political activity' means any activity in support of, within or in opposition to, a political party or to a specific candidate. Examples include fundraising; developing publishing or promoting political material, rallies or political gatherings (this list is not exhaustive).

- 6.2 Employees should declare to their Group Head or Director any membership of any organisation not open to the public without formal membership and commitment of allegiance and which as secrecy about rules or membership or conduct.
- 6.3 If an employee, or their spouse/partner or other family members have previously had or currently have any interest (direct or indirect) in any contract under consideration by the Council, then the employee must declare this in writing to their Group Head or Director.

7. Annual Declaration of Interest

- 7.1 Employees are responsible for declaring any possible conflicts of interest as described in this Code or any related policies, procedures, regulations or the Council's Constitution. This can include; any financial or non-financial interests, relationships, secondary employment, or membership of other groups or societies that could conflict with Arun District Council's interests. Each year an employee will be sent an annual Declaration of Interest eform to complete, which the employee must action and submit.
- 7.2 An employee should not wait to complete the annual declaration if they have a change in circumstances which affect whether they have any interests which could conflict with Arun District Council's interests. Any such declaration will be kept on a Register of Interests which can be accessed by the employee or line manager via the e-support team.
- 7.3 If, during the course of their duties, the employee is presented with a potential conflict of interest, the employee should bring this to the immediate attention of the line manager.

8. Outside Commitments

- 8.1 An employee should not put themselves in a position where their outside commitments could conflict with their position at work.
- 8.2 Before taking secondary employment or voluntary work that could conflict with the Council's interests, an employee should speak to their Group Head or Director and seek their prior consent. An employee will need to submit a Declaration of Interest form if there is a potential conflict of interest.
- 8.3 Within certain limits an employee may undertake paid or unpaid private or secondary employment or voluntary work within or outside the Council so long as it does not overlap with an employee's official duties or cause a conflict of interest. The use of facilities e.g. telephones, photocopying, email etc. in connection with private work is not permitted, nor is undertaking private/voluntary work during working time allowed.
- 8.4 If after taking such employment/voluntary work, a conflict or a potential conflict arises then the employee must declare this to their Group Head or Director and complete a Declaration of Interest form.

9. Professional Boundaries/Relationships

9.1 Professional boundaries set limits for safe, acceptable and effective behaviour by staff. They are important because they help to clarify acceptable behaviour and protect staff against leaving themselves open to allegations of abuse or misconduct. There are many different ways in which we have to manage boundaries in our work practice and these include:

- Treating service users respectfully
- Respecting and looking after ourselves and other team members
- Keeping within our role, following organisational policies and procedures
- Managing interpersonal relationships
- Managing our own emotions
- Managing our own behaviour
- Having clear and regular communication (with customers/managers/team)
- Not colluding with service users

9.2 Councillors

Employees are responsible to the Council through its senior managers. Mutual respect between employees and Councillors is essential to good local government. Close personal familiarity between employees and individual Councillors can damage the relationship and prove embarrassing to other employees and Councillors. An employee must promptly declare in writing in their Declaration of Interest any family relationship or close association to a Councillor. Both the Chief Executive and the relevant Group Leader will be made aware of this declaration.

9.3 An employee must not seek to influence an individual Councillor to make a decision in his or her personal favour nor raise matters to do with his/her job nor make claims or allegations about other employees.

9.4 A Councillor should not put pressure on an employee to deal with an issue outside established policies and procedures. Any issues that arise within this area should be reported and will be dealt with in line with the Member/Officer Relations as detailed in the Council's Constitution.

9.5 Local Community and Service Users

Employees should always remember their responsibilities to the community they serve and ensure courteous, efficient and impartial service delivery to all groups and individuals within that community as defined by the policies of the Council.

9.6 Sometimes a service user may ask for support that breaks professional boundaries because they are unable to understand the need for boundaries themselves, this may be particularly pertinent for children and vulnerable adults. A professional relationship between an employee and a service user is **very** different from one between friends or family members. It can lead to misunderstanding and confusion if an employee and a customer are not clear as to their respective roles. Therefore employees are expected to take the lead in ensuring that professional boundaries are adhered to and report any concerns they may have regarding a service user to their Line Manager.

- 9.7 Employees should be careful about self-disclosure. There are occasions when sharing information about yourself would enhance the relationship with the customer but you must ask yourself ‘does this information about me, my family or friends serve the best interest of the customer?’ The most common pitfall is when personal information is inappropriately disclosed – this might be with regard to family/relationship problems, financial difficulties or work-related issues instead of focusing on the service user and listening to their needs.
- 9.8 Contractors
All relationships of a business or private nature with external contractors, or potential contractors, should be made known to the appropriate manager and declared on the declaration of interest form. Orders and contracts must be awarded on merit, by fair competition against other tenders, and no special favour should be shown to businesses run by, for example, partners, or relatives in the tendering process. No part of the local community should be discriminated against.
- 9.9 Employees who engage or supervise contractors or have any other official relationship with contractors and have previously had or currently have a relationship in a private or domestic capacity with contractors, should declare that relationship to their Group Head or Director.
- 9.10 Employees must not accept money or any other reward from anyone who may benefit from work or funding provided by the council.
- 9.11 Colleagues
The Council recognises that employees who work together may form personal friendships and in some cases close personal relationships. While it does not wish to interfere with these personal relationships, it is necessary for the Council to ensure that all employees behave in an appropriate and professional manner at work, at all times.
- 9.12 Any employee who embarks on a close personal relationship with a colleague working in the same department/section must declare the relationship to his/her manager. If the relationship is between a manager/supervisor and an employee whom he/she supervises, the relationship should be declared to the appropriate Group Head. The information declared will be treated in strict confidence.
- 9.13 In order to avoid a situation in which an employee has managerial authority over another with whom he/she is having a close personal relationship, the Council reserves the right to elect to transfer one or both of the employees involved in the relationship to a suitable, alternative role within the Council.
- 9.14 The same principles will apply to relatives who work together.
- 9.15 Appointment and other employment matters
Employees involved in selection and appointments of persons to jobs should ensure that any recruitment is made on the basis of merit. It would be unlawful for an employee to make an appointment which was based on anything other than the ability of the candidate to undertake the duties of the post. In order to avoid any possible accusation of bias, employees should not be involved in an appointment where they

are related to an applicant, or have a close personal relationship outside work with him or her.

- 9.16 Similarly, employees should not be involved in decisions relating to discipline, promotion or pay adjustments for any other employee who is a relative, partner, etc.
- 9.17 Employees in close personal relationships or related to one another should wherever possible avoid authorising payment of invoices raised by their relative, partner, etc. Where this is unavoidable, this should be brought to the attention of the Line Manager.
- 9.18 If staff wish to be accompanied on a business trip (i.e. an occasion where they are representing the Council) by a partner or other personal contact, they must have prior authorisation of their line manager to do so. Under no circumstances will any expenses (including although not limited to travel, subsistence or accommodation) relating to the companion be paid for by the Council.

10. Equality issues

- 10.1 All local government employees should ensure that policies relating to equality issues as agreed by the Council are complied with in addition to the requirements of the law. All members of the local community, customers and other employees have a right to be treated with fairness and equity.
- 10.2 Employees must undertake Equality training, and when making decisions on matters including decisions relating to future services and funding, an employee must take into consideration impact of that decision on the protected characteristics as listed in the Equality Act 2010, and be able to evidence that they have done this, using an equality impact assessment when appropriate.

11. Fraud and Money Laundering

- 11.1 The Council's Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering) Policy is in place to remind employees about the behaviour and standards expected of them.
- 11.2 Money laundering has the objective of concealing the origin of money generated through criminal activity, and the Council needs to be alert to the possibility that it might be the subject of an attempt to involve it in a transaction involving the laundering of money.
- 11.3 Staff must report any suspicions or wrong-doing to the Group Head of Corporate Support if they believe the Council may be the subject of an attempt to involve it in a transaction that is fraudulent or involves the laundering of money.

12. Bribery and Corruption

- 12.1 Employees must be aware that it is a serious criminal offence for them to receive or give any gift, loan, fee, reward or advantage for doing or not doing, anything or showing favour, or disfavour, to any person in his/her official capacity. If an allegation

is made it is for the employee to demonstrate that any such rewards have not been corruptly obtained.

- 12.2 Employees must be aware of the requirements within the Bribery Act 2010 which introduced general offences of offering or receiving bribes and the corporate offence of failing to prevent bribery. Employees must familiarise themselves with the Anti-Fraud, Corruption and Bribery Policy.

13. Separation of Roles during Tendering

- 13.1 Employees involved in the tendering process and dealing with contractors should be clear on the separation of client and contractor roles within the Council. Senior employees who have both a client and contractor responsibility must be aware of the need for accountability and openness.
- 13.2 Employees in contractor or client units must exercise fairness and impartiality when dealing with all customers, suppliers, other contractors and sub-contractors.
- 13.3 Employees who are privy to confidential information relating to the tendering process should not disclose that information to any unauthorised party or organisation.
- 13.4 Employees should ensure that no special favour is shown to current or recent former employees or their partners, close relatives or associates in awarding contracts to businesses run by them or employing them in a senior or relevant managerial capacity.
- 13.5 The Council's Constitution covers Standing Orders – Purchasing, Procurement, Contracts and Disposal, and all procurement rules and EU Public Procurement legislation must be followed by staff involved with contracts, tenders, purchasing, procurement and disposal arrangements.
- 13.6 In the event that employees are contemplating a management buyout or workers co-operative, they should, as soon as they have formed a definite intent, inform the appropriate manager/Director and withdraw from any contract awarding processes.

14. Use of Financial Resources

- 14.1 Employees must ensure that they use public funds entrusted to them in a responsible and lawful manner. They should strive to ensure value for money to the local community and to avoid legal challenge to the authority.

15. Hospitality

- 15.1 Employees should not put themselves in a position which could damage their impartiality or the public's confidence in the Council. Employees should only accept offers of hospitality if there is a genuine need to impart information or represent the local authority in the community. Offers to attend purely social or sporting functions should be accepted only when these are part of the life of the community or where the authority should be seen to be represented. They should be properly authorised in advance and recorded.

- 15.2 When receiving authorised hospitality employees should be particularly sensitive as to its timing in relation to decisions which Arun District Council may be taking affecting those providing the hospitality.
- 15.3 Acceptance by employees of hospitality through attendance at relevant conferences and courses is acceptable where it is clear the hospitality is corporate rather than personal (e.g. where a working lunch is being provided), or in situations where the Council gives consent in advance and where the Council is satisfied that any purchasing decisions are not compromised. Where visits to inspect equipment etc., are required, employees should ensure that the Council meets the cost of such visits to avoid jeopardising the integrity of any subsequent purchasing decisions.
- 15.4 Offers of a personal nature such as holidays, hotel accommodation, or use of a company flat are unacceptable. When hospitality has to be declined those making the offer should be courteously but firmly informed of the procedures and standards operating within the authority.

16. Gifts

- 16.1 Employees should not accept significant personal gifts from contractors and outside suppliers, although the Council will allow employees to keep insignificant items of token value such as pens, diaries, etc.
- 16.2 Employees should be aware that it is against the law to solicit or accept gifts or reward in return for allowing them to be influenced in any way in their official capacity.
- 16.3 Any other offers or attempts at gifts which are not of a token value should be reported by the employee to their Group Head or Director. If any goods or gratuities are delivered to an employee directly, then these should be returned to the sender and the matter reported to the Group Head and Director.

17. Sponsorship

- 17.1 Where an outside organisation wishes to sponsor or is seeking to sponsor a local government activity, whether by invitation, tender, negotiation or voluntarily, the basic conventions concerning acceptance of gifts or hospitality apply. Particular care must be taken when dealing with contractors or potential contractors.
- 17.2 Where the Council wishes to sponsor an event or service neither an employee nor any partner, spouse or relative must benefit from such sponsorship in a direct way without there being full disclosure to an appropriate manager of any such interest. Similarly, where the authority through sponsorship, grant aid, financial or other means, gives support in the community, employees should ensure that impartial advice is given and that there is no conflict of interest involved.

18. IT Security

- 18.1 Information is one of the Council's key assets. Employees must use and look after information in a responsible way and in accordance with all relevant policies and must

familiarise themselves with the Information Security Policy, and users of GCSx must also comply with the GCSx Acceptable Usage Policy.

- 18.2 Preventing unauthorised access to council IT systems and data is extremely important; passwords must never be shared, and special care must be taken when sending personal data outside of the organisation. Any suspected data breach must be reported immediately to the Council's Information Management Team / Data Protection Officer.
- 18.3 Employees are reminded that computer systems are monitored including internet and email usage and all employees must read and accept the Internet and Email Acceptable Usage Agreement.
- 18.4 Employees using laptop computers, tablets and other portable equipment must take special care because this equipment is valuable and much more susceptible to theft or loss. Employees must never leave such equipment unattended in a public area or on display in vehicles.
- 18.5 When using social media either inside or outside of work, employees are reminded not to post defamatory or inappropriate comments about the Council or its staff, Councillors and service users. Employees must follow the Staff Social Media policy, which is available on the intranet.

19. Contact with the Media

- 19.1 Relations with the media require specific skills and expertise. All contact with the media should be conducted through or in consultation with the Communications Team to protect individual employees from unwanted media attention and to ensure the corporate promotion of the policies and reputation of the Council.
- 19.2 If an employee is asked by the media to comment, give an interview or answer questions on a Council matter, the employee should seek the permission of their Group Head and Director and discuss it with or refer it to the Communications team.

20. Publications

- 20.1 If an employee wishes to write to a newspaper or other journal or publish or authorise the publication of any book or article where the employee could be identified as a Council employee they must obtain permission from their Group Head or Director and in the latter case ensure that a statement appears in a prominent position in the book or article which states that the Council accepts no responsibility for the employee's opinions and conclusions.
- 20.2 Where an employee is acting in a personal capacity or as a spokesperson for a private group, an employee must not bring the Council into disrepute by publicising material which is against the Council's interest or other employees or could cause the Council embarrassment.

21. Use of Council Facilities

- 21.1 Council buildings and facilities must not be used for unauthorised purposes.
- 21.2 Access is granted to the internet, telephones and other electronic systems for legitimate business purposes only.
- 21.3 Incidental personal use of the Council's phone is permitted; however, this concession may be withdrawn from the individual if use is considered excessive.
- 21.4 The use of mobile phones whilst at work for personal use is allowed, however, employees are expected to be moderate in their use, they should not be used for general socialising or entertainment purposes, this concession may be withdrawn if it is felt this is being abused or usage considered excessive. Employees in customer facing roles should refrain from using their mobile phone when in sight of the public.

22. Public Office

- 22.1 If an employee wishes to seek public office (either elected or non-elected) they must apply for permission to do so from their Director beforehand.
- 22.2. Prior to any application being made, an employee must:
- Ensure that they have checked with Human Resources whether their post is politically restricted under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989;
 - They must be aware of the possible conflicts of loyalty between being a Councillor in one authority and an employee of another;
 - Keep the two roles distinct and not use confidential information obtained in one position to gain advantage in the other; and
 - Give careful consideration to their involvement in local politics or community matters which affect the Council.

23. Criminal Charges

- 23.1 An employee must inform Human Resources as soon as possible if they are arrested by the police in the UK or any other country or where their conduct is the subject of a criminal investigation, charge, pending prosecution, caution or conviction so that proper consideration can be given by the Council as to the appropriate response.
- 23.2 A criminal investigation, pending prosecution, charge, caution or conviction relating to conduct (whether inside or outside of work) may be treated as a disciplinary matter if Arun District Council consider that it is relevant to the employee's employment.

24. Copyright

- 24.1 All copyright created in the course of an employee's employment will belong to the Council.

25. Breaches of the Code of Conduct

25.1 Any breach by an employee of any part of the Code of Conduct or its supporting policies and guidance may render the employee liable to disciplinary proceedings.