

Public Document Pack

Subject to approval at the next Full Council meeting

209

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

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

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

284. WELCOME

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

285. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

286. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

Full Council - 13.11.19

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

287. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chairman then drew Public Question Time to a close.

288. PETITIONS

The Chairman confirmed that no petitions had been received.

Full Council - 13.11.19

289. MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

290. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

291. URGENT MATTERS

There were no items for this meeting.

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

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

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

The Council

RESOLVED

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

293. LICENSING COMMITTEE - 20 SEPTEMBER 2019

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

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

The Council

RESOLVED – That

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

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

294. CABINET - 7 OCTOBER 2019

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

Full Council - 13.11.19

295. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 9 OCTOBER 2019

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

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

296. PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE - 15 OCTOBER 2019

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

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

The Council

RESOLVED – That

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

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

The Council

RESOLVED – That

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

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

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

The Council

RESOLVED

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

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

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

297. ELECTORAL REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE - 16 OCTOBER 2019

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

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

The Council

Full Council - 13.11.19

RESOLVED – That

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

298. GOVERNANCE WORKING PARTY - 21 OCTOBER 2019

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

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

299. OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE - 22 OCTOBER 2019

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Full Council - 13.11.19

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

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

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

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

This amendment was seconded by Councillor Brooks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Full Council - 13.11.19

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

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

The Chairman then returned to the substantive recommendation and the Council

RESOLVED

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

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

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

301. MOTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Motion was then seconded by Councillor Chapman.

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

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

Full Council - 13.11.19

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

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

The Council

RESOLVED

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

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

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

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

302. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

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

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

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

303. STRATEGIC COUNCIL TARGETS FOR THE PERIOD 2019/2023

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

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

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

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

In debating the report varying comments were made.

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

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

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

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

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

Full Council - 13.11.19

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

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

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

The Council

RESOLVED – That

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

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

304. CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EMPLOYEES

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

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

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

The Council

RESOLVED – That

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

305. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

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

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

306. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES

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

(The meeting concluded at 9.55 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.3

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

Q1 Can the Cabinet Member for Residential Services now confirm that all elected Members of this council are fully compliant with their responsibility's regarding the payment of council tax?

A1 Thank you for your question. No, three Councillors remain uncompliant.

Supp

Q1 I am disappointed with this response and the fact that the Council has three Councillors who have not, despite receiving 5-6 month's of allowances, not settled their debt. Can you please confirm what the Council is doing to ensure that these debts are cleared?

Supp

A1 I cannot respond in full this evening and so I shall provide a response in writing.

A request was made that this response be copied to all Members of the Council.

Q2 Councillor Ms Thurston to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh

Q2 Transport for the South East is a new body created to plan strategy for transport across the south east. It has just published its draft transport strategy for consultation. I believe this is a very important document for the Council as it will result in long term benefits for our communities. Given the Council's forthcoming planning activity, can the Leader assure me that the Council will respond to the consultation by the deadline of 10 January 2020? I have spoken to officers and the response can be formulated by the Chief Executive and party Group Leaders, in consultation with the Group Head of Planning and the Cabinet Member for Planning".

A2 Thank you for your question. Yes, I can give you an assurance that the Council will respond to this consultation by the deadline date of 10 January 2020.

Supp

Q2 I was drawing Members' attention to this consultation and report and I wish to outline that anyone can respond to this consultation. I would like to ask that a Member Briefing is organised at some stage so that Members are made aware of this matter perhaps in early in 2020 when the report has been finalised.

Supp

A2 I am happy for this to be arranged and once the Council's response has been formulated.

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

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

Q3 From Councillor Chapman to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh

Q3 At the Council meeting held on 18 September I asked you a question specifically relating to the exclusion of the Conservative Group from meetings of the Leaders and Deputy Leaders of the political groups of the Council with the Chief Executive at which future strategies of the Council would be discussed.

In your written response you stated, among other things, that “the Liberal Democrats and Independent Group currently have 28 seats and have together decided to hold strategic policy discussions in private before bringing them to Committee or Cabinet.”

On the basis of this response I then asked you in a supplementary question; “your response indicates that your Group including the Independent Group have 28 seats so are you in formal coalition with the independent Group?”

Your answer was “we are not in a formal coalition we are a Liberal Democrat minority with general support via a Memo of Understanding with the independents and Greens.”

Since you made that response, I have taken the trouble to examine the detail that you gave and have found that;

Firstly; the decision to exclude the Conservative Group from strategic discussions was not, in fact, supported by the Independent Group, it was supported by the Leader of the Independent Group Cllr Dixon.

Secondly; your claim to have a Memo of Understanding with the Independent Group relies on a statement made to this Council by Cllr Dixon at the last Annual meeting in which he made clear that his Group would work “in a spirit of co-operation with the Liberal Democrats” but “there would be no whip and that where there was no consensus members will be free to vote as their conscience dictates.” This does not indicate to me that you have a memorandum of understanding upon which your claim to have 28 votes can be substantiated in regard to the strategies and policies needing to be decided by this Council.

In view of the points above, therefore, will you now give an answer to this specific question **“how does the decision taken by the Liberal Democrat Group and Cllr Dixon meet the principles of representative Democracy on which the Constitution of this Council is founded so that “clear leadership to the community in partnership with residents, businesses and other organisations” can be honourably and consistently delivered?**

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.3

A3 Thank you Councillor Chapman for the question. The agreement by the Independent Group to offer broad support to the Liberal Democrat Group, with support also from the Green Group, gives an effective working majority in the Council, in accordance with the wishes of the local electorate in May 2019. This meets the principles of representative democracy through the ballot box, and accords with the Constitution of the Council through the proportionality rules for committee places etc. All Members of the Council are fully involved in discussing and delivering the strategic policies of the Council, but the meeting from which the Conservative Group was excluded was in fact a meeting of the Leaders of those groups supporting the new administration, prior to proposals coming to Council, Committees or Cabinet. Your previous Conservative administrations over 40 years routinely did not involve Opposition Group Leaders in such discussions. Clear leadership is being given to and in the community through existing and new partnerships with residents, businesses and other organisations, and more generally through a commitment to earlier, wider and more meaningful public consultations with residents and stakeholder groups.

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

Q4 The Sir Richard Hotham Project wrote to you many weeks ago seeking a meeting to discuss their Regeneration project for Bognor Regis encompassing 3e sites owned by the Council. Since then, apart from a brief acknowledgement, there has been no further response.

In the light of the decision to abandon the Linear Park project, will he:

1. confirm whether or not the Council intends to respond to the SRH request and when
2. state whether or not the position of the previous administration as landowner re SRH will continue or whether a more balanced view of engagement will emerge
3. agree that this project with full planning permission, fully drawn-up plans and funding is now the most-advanced Regeneration proposal and that Councillors should have opportunity to consider it on its merits and stage of development based on a level playing field
4. agree that whatever Councillors' personal preferences, the duty is to consider the well-being of Bognor Regis and its residents, and that as landowner the sites are held in trust for them rather than being 'private property'
5. agree that a flexible, open approach by SRH and Arun, within the context of the planning consent given by the Inspector, is the most assured route to a successful regeneration and also to other ideas/proposals being considered for incorporation within the scheme with the prospect of the £90m funding secured by SRH gaining additional private and public sector funding

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.3

6. Confirm that cross-subsidy remains a key element between the Regis Centre and Hothamton sites and that sustainable Regeneration not redevelopment is the overriding objective and

7. that the public should be consulted as a detailed implementation is progressed.

Does he understand that Regeneration figures highly in the concerns of residents and that many feel we should get Regeneration done, after at least twenty years and 4 since the consultation?

A4 Thank you for your question Councillor Northeast. I am sure you are aware of the facts surrounding the decisions already made by Arun District Council, but I will take this opportunity to remind you.

The first report went to Full Council on 9 November 2016. This considered the Council's position, as landowner, to any planning application received relating to the regeneration of the Regis and Hothamton car park sites. It was resolved that it would not be appropriate for the Council to make any binding decisions, regarding its position as landowner, until after certain milestones had been reached. These were that a feasibility study was completed for the development of the sites and that the Council had determined the course of action it wished to pursue to take forward redevelopment.

The second relevant report went to the Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee on 27 February 2017 and Full Council on 8 March 2017. This report set out the conclusions of the feasibility studies and development options (based on consultation feedback) on the Regis Centre and Hothamton Car Park sites.

It was resolved that the Gardens by the Sea/Winter Gardens concept be supported and that Option 2 (New Theatre Option) of the Masterplan for the Regis Centre site was the preferred option. Since then the Council had been developing more detailed plans to progress the Masterplan and had focused on delivery of a new park, [then] (Pavilion) at the Hothamton site.

You may not be aware that the Chief Executive responded to Thomas Elliott at the Sir Richard Hotham Project by email on 7 November.

He reminded Mr Elliott that the land in question is owned and controlled by Arun District Council. Following the change of administration in May 2019, a report was considered by Cabinet on 8 July 2019 in which the Council reconsidered the Pavilion Park proposals and the future of the Hothamton site. It was resolved that the previously approved proposals for the new park be terminated and three alternative proposals be prepared for public consultation for the areas previously designated for the Pavilion Park, which focus on the Sunken

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.3

Gardens and Hothamton play areas only, and retain the split levels. These proposals will not include any residential development and the health centre will not be affected by any of the plans put forward. The Council decision of 18 July 2018 was to 'reaffirm not making any commitment as landowner to enter into any binding legal agreements pursuant to the granting of any planning permission in 2018, for the regeneration of the Regis Centre and Hothamton car park sites under its freehold ownership'. This position remains unchanged.

I am not aware of a recent request from Sir Richard Hotham Project to meet with myself or the Chief Executive although I am aware that representatives have met with some Officers in the past. The Chief Executive stated in his email of 7 November that he would be willing to do so in order to make the Council's position abundantly clear.

The Council is focusing on the Sunken Garden options and a report will be taken to Cabinet in Spring 2020.

Supp

Q Thank you for your answers, however, I feel that with item 6, I cannot see from the response that this has been addressed. Can that cross-subsidy remain the key element between the Regis Centre and the Hothamton site and that sustainable regeneration and not development is the overriding objective?.

Supp

A This is correct. We wish to see regeneration not more and more redevelopment of housing units in that part of Bognor Regis.

Q5 **From Councillor Dixon to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury**

Q5 On 1 November the House of Commons Environment Food and Rural Affairs Committee published a report called "Coastal Flooding and Erosion, and adaptation to climate change: Interim Report". The Committee was so concerned by the evidence it heard that it decided to rush out an interim report in advance of the General Election. (Source: see 1 below)

In essence, DEFRA's Select Committee has concluded that some local authorities are allowing "inappropriate development" in coastal areas which are at high risk from flooding and erosion, in order to achieve centrally-driven housing targets.

Concerns raised in the report include;

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

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

“The committee received evidence that local authorities are not effectively using their land use planning powers to prevent inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding or erosion or to support adaptation measures or planned realignments of the coastline in SMPs.”

and

“The National Trust suggested that some local authorities were not designating areas at risk of coastal change over the next 100 years as Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMA) in their local plans, which would restrict development, because it would prevent them from meeting their targets for house building.”

One of the conclusions in the report states;

“The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Ministers should respond to concerns that their house building targets may be leading to councils allowing inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and erosion; and to what extent the planning system as a whole is currently prioritising managing the risks from coastal flooding and erosion or needs strengthening.”

Selsey to Pagham Beaches, Spit and Tidal Inlet is identified in the national top 10 potential CCMA's but is not designated in the Arun Local Plan. (Source: see 2 below).

Do you agree with me that the Council should take urgent steps to designate Pagham as a Coastal Change Management Area?

If so, could this be achieved through a new Development Planning Document?

This report reinforces the concerns raised in our recent motion relating to climate change and the implications for large scale development on the coastal plain - do you agree with me that we should also raise this matter with the Minister when we meet him to discuss the motion?

Sources:

Source 1 - Coastal Flooding and Erosion, and adaptation to climate change: Interim Report – see <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201920/cmselect/cmenvfru/56/56.pdf>

Source 2 - Royal Haskoning DHV 2019 Coastal Change Management Areas: Opportunities for more sustainable solutions in areas subject to coastal change. Natural England Commissioned Reports, number 275 – published January 2019) – see <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5869554089852928>

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.3

A5 Councillor Dixon, thank you for your question.

I am sure you will agree with me that it is always sensible to consider additional evidence or opinions in a measured way and I know officers will consider the content of both reports in the coming months.

In terms of the first report by the Select Committee I can confirm that the only strategic allocation in the Local Plan acknowledged to be at risk from coastal erosion or flooding is at West Bank, Littlehampton. However, as you will be aware the provision of new flood defences to serve both the proposed and existing communities are proposed.

Of more concern is the potential risk from coastal erosion or flooding to existing communities. The Council over the coming months and years will have to consider how best to tackle these challenges having regard to the level of resources available. In this regard the second report published by Natural England into potential Coastal Change Management Areas is helpful and officers will consider it carefully, although it should be noted that they had no input to it and were not aware of it until its publication.

It is important to recognise that the suggested CCMA covers the Pagham Beach area and not the development sites further inland. Indeed as you will be aware significant amounts of the existing residential development in the Pagham Beach area is actually built on the remnants of a former spit. The controlled breach cited in the NE report is a community led proposal (not Arun, Chichester DC or EA) and has yet to be implemented as the spit naturally breached in 2016.

The Shoreline Management Plan for this area is currently being reviewed and the relevant outcomes of this review will be brought before members in due course. Any consideration of the need to designate this area as a CCMA should follow (and not precede) this review.

If in due course a CCMA is designated then this would be reflected in any subsequent Local Plan and its policies. However, these policies would in the main impact upon existing communities rather than any future development.

It may be helpful to raise the matter with the minister but with the objective of seeking funding to support the necessary research and analysis into the dynamic situation along the coast at Pagham.

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

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

Q6 From Councillor Dixon to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh

Q6 As part of our election campaigning we pledged to challenge/review the Local Plan produced by the previous administration and, in essence, to explore what changes, if any, are possible.

In pursuit of transparency it is important that we provide the public with an update on the work we have undertaken so far.

My understanding is as follows;

Lib Dems, Independent and Green groups have together reviewed Local Plan options internally over the last 5 months, have taken advice from officers, and have informally concluded that:

- a) We cannot open up the Local Plan to a full review, including a review of existing strategic locations, without exposing the Council to the risk of legal challenges and substantial compensation payments.
- b) We cannot open up the Local Plan to a full review, without making provision for a further 6,000 houses.
- c) Any costs associated with a full review, although unknown at this stage, would be substantial.

We therefore have no choice other than to work with the Local Plan, as inherited from the previous administration, whilst at the same time robustly examining all planning applications for their full compliance with Local Plan policies.

We can and will:

- d) Introduce Supplementary Planning Guidance to strengthen existing policies
- e) Update Development Management Policies to make them more robust

If the Local Plan, as created by the previous administration, proves to be a failure in that it does not meet the required Housing Land Supply and Housing Delivery Targets over a two year period, then we will, in any case, have no choice other than to review it.

Is this an accurate assessment of the situation as it currently stands?

If so, should the Council take appropriate steps to inform the public?

A6 Thank you for your question Councillor Dixon. The general tenor of your summary regarding the existing Local Plan is correct. Regarding the future you will be aware that the next report on the agenda to be considered at this meeting relates to the Council priorities and states to continue to deliver the Local Plan whilst developing a new planning framework to deliver the Council's priorities:- This includes: Improving the level of sustainability and infrastructure in new

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.3

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. Should Members endorse this approach this evening then officers will prepare an appropriate report for a future Planning Policy Sub Committee with specific recommendations and this item was included on the Forward Plan on 1 November 2019. These recommendations will come back to Full Council for agreement. This would be the appropriate time to communicate the agreed way forward to a wider audience.

Q7 From Councillor Dixon to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh

Q7 As you know, back in 2008, I was one of the promoters of proposals for an Eco Town at Ford Airfield.

One of the objectives we had in mind at that time was to provide an opportunity for inmates from HM Prison Ford (category D) to work on the site. The idea was to provide vocational training combined with on the job work experience, and thus to enable some inmates to leave prison as experienced carpenters, bricklayers, roofers, electricians, plumbers, scaffolders etc.

The 520 or so inmates at Ford are temporary residents in our district and, whilst they are here, this local authority can, and should, do as much as it can to create circumstances that will help them to integrate back into society once they have paid their debt.

It seems to me that, if we are compelled to build 20,000 new homes by government, we can at least use the large-scale strategic developments as an opportunity to provide training and work experience for inmates of HM Prison Ford.

Obviously, we would need to discuss this first with the management of HM Prison Ford and perhaps also the Ministry of Justice to ascertain if they are willing to support such a scheme (there may already be similar precedents elsewhere in the country?).

Developers might need an "incentive" to support such a scheme and I have in mind the creation of Supplementary Planning Guidance or Section 106 agreements – i.e. for every 100 houses on a strategic development this local planning authority "requires" that the developer provides vocational training and work experience for X inmates.

Would you be willing to explore this possibility?

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

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

A7 Thank you Councillor Dixon for your question. Whilst I support the underlying objective behind your question I am aware that the Prison already has several training programmes along similar lines to what you suggest. We will therefore make enquires with the Prison to see whether such an initiative is necessary.

Q8 **From Councillor Charles to the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Stanley**

Q8 There has been much recent speculation in the Bognor area about the future of Bognor Regis Town Hall.

What is Arun District Council's Policy on the retention of disposal of this building?

A8 Thank you Councillor Charles for your question. You may have noted that this matter is one which is due to be discussed in the next agenda item as part of considering the Council's future priorities. I look forward to hearing any debate on this subject.

Q9 **From Councillor Edwards to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

Q9 At the first Cabinet Meeting of this administration a member of the public asked whether the £325,000 spent up to that date on the proposed Pavilion Park would now be wasted. Councillor Dr Walsh, you stated that the monies would not be wasted.

At a subsequent Council meeting in response to a question from Councillor Chapman, you stated, unequivocally that elements of the scheme on which the money had been spent, would not be included in any new scheme. These two statements appear to be contradictory.

In light of that contradiction what is this administration doing to ensure the taxpayers money has not been wasted.

A9 A Cabinet Briefing Workshop was held on Monday 11 November 2019 with officers and Landscape Consultants LUC to agree the essential elements of the new Sunken Gardens project and ensure that elements such as the original survey work and site analysis can be used to inform the new scheme. The sum spent to date of the £325k is £90k.

Supp

Q I am unsure as to what has happened to the £325k already spent on this scheme for Pavilion Park as you state that only £90k has been spent so are we still £235k in credit?

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

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

Supp

A It is quite simple, £90k has been spent out of the £325k.

Q10 **From Councillor Coster to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh**

Q10 We have a Local Plan with excellent major strategic objectives, including "...the provision of...better infrastructure including road access..." and which also refers to the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011 - 2026 identifying key transport issues in the District including "Road congestion during peak hours which causes disruption and air pollution..."

We also have a key Transport Policy, TSP1 which seeks to ensure that growth in the District reduces congestion and that development contributes to highway improvements, reduces the need to travel by car and that the "transport effects of development on the local and strategic road network can be satisfactorily mitigated..."

Our Local Plan also has an excellent section on Air Pollution which states that: "A significant contributor to air pollution in Arun is traffic congestion..." and a Policy QE DM3 which requires all major development proposals to contribute "towards the improvement of the highway network where the development is predicted to result in increased congestion on the highway network."

And I am delighted to see Councillor Charles supporting all this in his foreword to the Plan where he says: "We want new development to help us tackle infrastructure difficulties in order to free up lost business hours and enable people to plan their journeys with more certainty."

And yet, in spite of all these fine words we repeatedly have major planning applications coming to Development Control where our ability to apply these crucial major objectives and policies is effectively undermined and destroyed by the statutory consultee West Sussex County Council Highways Department. I am not criticising any particular officer, but this department almost without exception either fails to object to the damaging effect of hundreds, sometimes thousands, more cars being thrown onto our roads, or requires such feeble mitigation and insignificant "improvements" as to make no difference whatever to the resulting congestion, pollution and delays that our residents suffer even now.

To ignore this disaster in the making is the modern equivalent of fiddling while Rome burns, and if we have any respect for the residents of our District this cannot be allowed to continue. I am therefore asking what action this Council will take, with immediate effect, to work with West Sussex County Council in correcting this disastrous state of affairs?

A10 Thank you for your question.

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.3

Whilst, I understand your desire for a greater scale of mitigation or improvements it is important to recognise that the County Council like us is governed by the same guidance which is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Specifically, paragraph 109 which states;

“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an **unacceptable impact** on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be **severe**.”

These are very high hurdles to overcome. If we seek change, then our fire needs to be directed at Whitehall not County Hall.

Overall, I believe if we look at what has been collectively achieved or secured with the County Council, it is clear that there has been or will be significant improvements to the A259, A284 and A29. However, I believe we collectively need to do more to encourage walking and cycling and therefore I am pleased to learn that as a Council we are looking to develop and expand existing strategies to improve the existing network supported financially by new development.

Supp

Q What action will this Council take to work with WSCC in correcting this state of affairs. What we can do in conjunction with WSCC to work on the unacceptable impact for highway safety. Your responses are subjective comments and you state that the fire needs to be directed towards Whitehall and not WSCC. However, I am asking if we can work with WSCC to direct the fire to Whitehall in terms of the issues raised in connection with pollution. There are many issues here that need to be raised and I am asking if you can confirm what action will be taken to work with WSCC? I am asking you to give some confidence that you will make moves as far as we can to work with WSCC to correct this state of affair.

Supp

A You say that the unacceptable impact on the community is severe and my responses are subjective comments. All of this has been tested in the Courts and elsewhere and are extremely high hurdles to overcome. It is a lack of legislation not interpretation by WSCC that needs to be looked at. The Council's Officers are working all of the time with WSSCC to mitigate affects of development.

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

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

Q11 From Councillor Goodheart to the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Stanley

Q11 Is there a bigger regeneration picture for Bognor Regis, if no why not? If yes please, can it be shared?

Does it include all the land owned by ADC within the greater Bognor Regis area?

Does the chair agree that the development of the lorry & coach park should be part of a bigger project, than just student accommodation & car-parking which includes the police station?

Do you as the chair agree that the whole debate for regeneration of Bognor Regis needs to be started again.

A11 Thank you for your question Councillor Goodheart.

In terms of regeneration plans the 2003 Bognor Regis Masterplan still remains a very relevant document. I believe it would be a mistake to start the whole process again when what we need to be focusing on is delivery.

The people of Bognor Regis have waited too long already, and we have a great deal of information that already exists including the ideas and responses received back in 2015 from the consultations.

An immediate concern is the challenges that our town centres face, hence why in the report on the Council's priorities which is before us tonight the focus of our regeneration activity is on helping the town centres.

Regarding the London Road Car Park, as a Council we need to ask ourselves a question. What is more important – progressing a something which achieves much of what we seek or continue waiting for the perfect scheme?

Supp

Q I was hoping for a verbal response. What are the plans as regeneration is such an important issue and we have not seen much of it from the previous administration. With the new administration I and many others are expecting to see initiatives showing that there is the understanding that Bognor Regis has a lot to offer. I hope that as Chairman of the Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee you understand what is needed going forward as we are now being told that it will be Town Centre regeneration which does not cover all of Bognor Regis.

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 NOVEMBER 2019

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

Supp

- A** There was a written response provided and circulated to the meeting. Bognor Regis has massive potential and the regeneration of it is long overdue. The Town Centre Regeneration is a priority area but not the only area we need to focus upon in the Town. I am more than happy to meet with you to discuss regeneration further.