



Public Document Pack

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

This meeting will be a virtual meeting and will be webcast live

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

e-mail: committees@arun.gov.uk

4 May 2021

COUNCIL MEETING

To all Members of the Council

You are summoned to attend a virtual meeting of the ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL to be held on **Wednesday 12 May 2021 at 6.00 pm** to transact the business set out below:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. V. Lynn", is positioned above the name and title of the Chief Executive.

Nigel Lynn
Chief Executive

PLEASE NOTE: *This meeting will be a 'virtual meeting' and any member of the press and public may listen-in and view the proceedings via a weblink which will be publicised on the Council website at least 24 hours before the meeting.*

This Council's revised Rules of Procedures for 'virtual meetings' can be found by clicking on this link: <https://www.arun.gov.uk/constitution>

Any members of the public wishing to address the Full Council meeting during Public Question Time, will need to email Committees@arun.gov.uk by 5.15 pm on Thursday, 6 May 2021 on line with current Council Procedure Rules. It will be at the Chief Executive's/Chairman's discretion if any questions received after this deadline are considered.

For further information on the items to be discussed, please contact: committees@arun.gov.uk

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. REPORT FROM THE RETURNING OFFICER OF THOSE PERSONS ELECTED AS DISTRICT COUNCILLORS FOR ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 6 MAY 2021

The Returning Officer will report to the Council on the result of the District Council By-Elections held on 6 May 2021.

This report will be circulated separately to the agenda.

3. 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

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

5. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS WITH PECUNIARY/PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

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

6. PETITIONS

To consider any petitions received from the public.

7. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 38)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Meetings of the Council held on 17 and 24 March 2021, which are *attached*.

8. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

9. 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.

10. MOTIONS

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

OFFICER REPORTS

11. TRANSITION TO COMMITTEE STYLE OF GOVERNANCE (Pages 39 - 42)

This is a follow up status report on the progress of transition to the Committee style Constitution and associated matters. It explains that the revision and re-writing of the Constitution is complete and that the new constitutional document is ready for publication and that at the request of Full Council, this report is brought back after Members have been offered a briefing on the new Constitution.

As a hard copy of the Constitution has been supplied to those Members who requested it, therefore if you wish to view the Constitution you can do so by clicking on this link - [The 2021 Constitution](#).

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

12. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 3 MARCH 2021 (Pages 43 - 52)

The Chair, Councillor Bennett, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 3 March 2021. There are no recommendations.

13. LITTLEHAMPTON REGENERATION SUB-COMMITTEE - 11 MARCH 2021 (Pages 53 - 58)

The Chair, Councillor Seex, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee held on 11 March 2021. There are recommendations at:

- Minute 23 – [Seafront Regeneration Report] – to view the Officer’s report, please click on this link – [Report](#)

14. HOUSING & CUSTOMER SERVICES WORKING GROUP - 16 MARCH 2021 (Pages 59 - 62)

The Chair, Councillor Bennet, will present the Minutes from the Housing & Customer Services Working Group held on 16 March 2021. There are no recommendations.

15. CABINET - 22 MARCH 2021 (Pages 63 - 90)

The Chair, Councillor Walsh, will present the Minutes from the meeting of Cabinet held on 22 March 2021. There are a range of recommendations at:

- Minute 495 – [Options to Progress Webcast Improvement Project] – to view the Officer’s report, please click on this link – [Report](#)

- Minute 497 – [Anti-Graffiti Systems Ltd – Trading as AGS One – Admissions Agreement to Local Government Pension Scheme] – to view the Officer’s report, please click on this link – [Report](#)

16. OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE - 23 MARCH 2021 (Pages 91 - 100)

The Chair, Councillor Northeast, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Overview Select Committee held on 23 March 2021. There are no recommendations.

17. ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE WORKING GROUP - 25 MARCH 2021 (Pages 101 - 106)

The Chair, Councillor Warr, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Environment & Leisure Working Group held on 25 March 2021. There are no recommendations.

18. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 31 MARCH 2021 (Pages 107 - 110)

The Chair, Councillor Bennett, will present the Minutes from the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 31 March 2021. There are no recommendations.

19. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 28 APRIL 2021

The Chair, Councillor Bennett, will present the Minutes from the Development Control Committee held on 28 April 2021.

These minutes will be circulated separately, and any recommendations will be reported to the meeting.

20. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

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

21. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

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

22. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES

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

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

Note : Where there are recommendations from other Committees, please refer to the e-link under the specific agenda item to access the Officer report.

Note : Filming, Photography and Recording at Council Meetings – The District Council supports the principles of openness and transparency in its decision making and permits filming, recording and the taking of photographs at its meetings that are open to the public. This meeting may therefore be recorded, filmed or broadcast by video or audio, by third parties. Arrangements for these activities should operate in accordance with guidelines agreed by the Council and as available via the following link [Filming Policy](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 7

Subject to approval at the next Full Council meeting

397

MINUTES OF A VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD ON 17 MARCH 2021 AT 6.00 PM

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

Honorary Alderman Mrs Stinchcombe and Dingemans were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

[Note: The following Councillors were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters detailed in the Minutes indicated – Councillor Purchase – Minute 469 to Minute 485 (Part)].

469. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Councillors, representatives of the public, press and officers to the Meeting. She extended a special welcome to Honorary Aldermen Mrs Stinchcombe and Mr Dingemans.

470. FORMER MEMBER OF STAFF - CHRISTINE DENYER

The Chairman announced the sad news that former member of staff Christine Denyer had sadly passed away at the beginning of March 2021.

Christine had been a long serving staff member joining the Council in 1986 and leaving in December 2014. Christine had worked as a Customer Liaison Officer at the Bognor Regis Town Hall.

The Chairman asked Members and those present to join her in sending Christine's family and friends the Council's condolences and she asked if they could join her taking part in a minute's silence.

471. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Batley, Mrs Erskine and Oliver-Redgate and from Honorary Aldermen, Mrs Goad, MBE and Mrs Morrish.

Full Council - 17.03.21

472. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

Councillor Coster declared the following declaration in relation to Agenda Items 14 [Feedback on Presentations Relating to Bognor Regis Regeneration] and 8 [Urgent Matters – HM Treasury Levelling Up Fund]. Councillor Coster stated that he wished to make this meeting aware that prior to his role as a District Councillor he may have been involved in engaging with the community on regeneration for the area through the Bognor Regis Civic Society and that that engagement, and the understanding that had been gained from the experience with the Society, caused him to make comments in the past in connection with this item. However, he had an open mind regarding this item and would listen and consider all the relevant issues presented and so would reach his decision on merit. Councillor Coster requested that his role in the Bognor Regis Civic Society be recorded in the minutes as Personal Interest.

Councillor Goodheart declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 14 [Feedback on Presentations Relating to Bognor Regis Regeneration] as he knew the Managing Director of one of the organisations that had provided a presentation to Councillors and had been the co-founder for 4BR. Councillor Goodheart confirmed that he was no longer involved in any professional way with this organisation and had no pecuniary interest.

Councillor Mrs Daniells also declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 14 as she had a family member that had made one of the submissions being the Plaza Cinema Ltd. Councillor Mrs Daniells confirmed that she planned to stay in the meeting for the discussion but that she would not take part in the vote.

Councillor Northeast declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 12 [Pay Policy Statement 2021/22] as his wife was an employee of the Council. Councillor Northeast confirmed that he would not take part in the debate or the voting on this item.

Councillor Dixon declared the following declaration in relation to Agenda Items 14 [Feedback on Presentations Relating to Bognor Regis Regeneration] and he stated that he wished to make this meeting aware that prior to his role as a District Councillor he may have been involved in engaging with the community on regeneration for the area through the Bognor Regis Civic Society and that that engagement, and the understanding that had been gained from the experience with the Society, caused him to make comments in the past in connection with this item. However, he had an open mind regarding this item and would listen and consider all the relevant issues presented and so would reach his decision on merit. Councillor Coster requested that his role in the Bognor Regis Civic Society be recorded in the minutes as Personal Interest.

473. 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 and the Virtual Meeting Procedure Rules amended by the Council on 15 July 2020.

Full Council - 17.03.21

The Chairman confirmed that fifteen questions had been submitted – these have been very briefly summarised below:

1. From Mr Collins to the Cabinet Member for Planning regarding land north of Summer Lane, Pagham
2. From Mr Cosgrove to the Leader of the Council regarding the Place St Maur regeneration project in Bognor Regis
3. From Ms Lownsborough to the Cabinet Member for Planning, regarding planning approval for the Sir Richard Hotham Project and pre-development conditions
4. From Mrs Collins to the Cabinet for Planning regarding the Summer Land development site
5. From Mr Meadmore to the Leader of the Council regarding the presentation to be made by Southern Water Services to the Environment & Leisure Working Group
6. From Ms Jarvis to the Cabinet Member for Planning regarding The Arun Local Plan 2018 and strategic allocations at Angmering
7. From Mr Collins to the Cabinet Member for Planning regarding
8. From Mr Cosgrove to the Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development regarding the London Road Lorry Coach Park, Bognor Regis
9. From Mrs Collins to the Cabinet Member for Planning regarding strategic site allocations
10. From Mr Meadmore to the Cabinet Member for Planning regarding highways infrastructure improvement imperatives
11. From Mr Collins to the Cabinet Member for Planning regarding Arun Local Plan strategic allocations SD1 Pagham South and SD2 Pagham North
12. From Mr Cosgrove to the Leader of the Council regarding Bognor Regis regeneration
13. From Mrs Collins to the Leader of the Council regarding the Council's new Governance structure
14. From Mr Meadmore to the Cabinet Member for Planning regarding the Health Authority in relation to identified infrastructure improvements necessary to support the strategic development sites
15. From Mr Collins to the Cabinet Member for Planning regarding strategic allocations SD1/SD2 – Pagham North and Pagham South and related matters

Having considerably extended the time allowed for Public Question Time to all of the questions to be asked and responded to at the meeting, the Chairman confirmed that if any questioner wished to ask a supplementary question for them to do so in writing outside of this meeting. It was confirmed that any such questions submitted would be responded to by the appropriate Cabinet Member in writing.

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

The Chairman then drew Public Question Time to a close.

474. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS WITH PECUNIARY/PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

There were no questions asked.

475. PETITIONS

There were no petitions presented to this meeting.

476. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Special meeting of the Council held on 17 February 2021 were approved by the Council as a correct record and would be signed by the Chairman when normal office functions started again.

Councillor Huntley confirmed that petitions had been received by the Council but that they were still being validated and so were not ready to be presented to this Council meeting.

477. CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

The Chairman confirmed a change to the order of the agenda which was to bring forward Item 32 [Representation on Outside Bodies] to ensure that changes in representation to some Outside Bodies were approved in view of meetings taking place next week.

478. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman confirmed the arrangements in place for her Day of Reflection which was being held virtually on 23 March 2021 at 2.00 pm to mark the first anniversary of the start of the Covid-19 pandemic. This service was aimed to recognise the extreme impact the pandemic had had on people's lives in the District. Members of the public had been invited to speak and an invite had been sent to several Councillors to take part. The Chairman extended an invitation for all Councillors to attend and to share this unique experience.

479. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh, confirmed the following changes in representation to Outside Bodies:

- (1) Councillor Stanley would replace Councillor Oppler on the Bognor Regis Regeneration Board;
- (2) As the term of office for the Littlehampton Harbour Board representatives had expired, the Council's representations would be:

Full Council - 17.03.21

- Councillor Dr Walsh
- Councillor Mrs Haywood
- Roger Spencer [Engineering Services Manager]
- Leaving one vacancy to be filled

(3) The following Councillors being confirmed for the A27 Elected Members' Forum:

- Councillor Dr Walsh
- Councillor Mrs Catterson
- Councillor Dendle
- Councillor Roberts

These changes to representations on Outside Bodies were then formally proposed by Councillor Dr Walsh and seconded by Councillor Gunner.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the changes in representation to Outside Bodies as set out above be approved.

480. URGENT MATTERS - HM TREASURY LEVELLING UP FUND

The Chairman announced that there was one urgent matter that needed to be considered by the Council this evening on the HM Treasury Levelling Up Fund. She confirmed that this report had been emailed to all Councillors earlier that afternoon and had been uploaded to the Council's Full Council web page as a supplement.

The Chief Executive was invited to introduce this report. He firstly apologised for its lateness and explained that the full details had only been received last week setting out how the Council could take this matter forward. It was explained that if the Council decided to bid for this fund, then it needed to move very quickly, hence the urgent nature of the report, as bids needed to be submitted by 18 June 2021. There was no clarity provided at the moment in terms of future bidding round dates only that there would be future rounds but it could be confirmed that Arun District Council fitted within Category 2 of the bidding level and that bids could be successful "if they were of exceptional quality".

The Leader of the Council then provided further detail to the report and formally proposed its recommendations. Councillor Dr Walsh highlighted that this was a very exciting announcement from the Government made only a few days ago announcing a total fund value of £4.8 billion pounds was to be spent by 2024. The Council was able to bid up to a maximum level of £20m for projects in the Arun District. The Government had made it clear that they wished to target these funds on Council's that had coastal communities and deprived areas so this could include Bognor Regis and Littlehampton.

The timetable in place to undertake this work was extremely tight in that the Council had to submit its bids by 18 June 2021, with the Government announcing the outcome of those bids in the Autumn of this year. The Government had also specified that the bids for projects needed to be well worked up so that they were not new projects or concepts. The expectation was that a mini business case would need to be submitted for each of the projects with the Council being able to bid for up to three different projects.

Councillor Dr Walsh outlined that in order to progress this urgent work, he proposed to set up a Levelling Up Fund Working Party, which would have the necessary political balance, and that the Working Party's remit would be to advise Officers, very quickly, on the project preferences for bidding, including confirming a priority order. It was hoped that approval would be given to establish this Working Party tonight to allow it to meet very soon with Group Leaders confirming membership. Councillor Dr Walsh therefore urged Councillors to support this proposal as it was very unusual for Councils to be given the opportunity to bid for funding of this size.

Councillor Oppler then seconded the recommendations.

The Chairman then invited debate. This commenced with various concerns being raised, mostly in relation to another item on the agenda being Item 14 [Feedback on Presentations Relating to Bognor Regis Regeneration]. It was one Councillors understanding that Group Leaders had met and had agreed that there would be a private briefing for all Councillors to debate the Bognor Regis regeneration proposals with the intention of presenting a way forward. It was now concerning to learn that consideration of Item 14 would be deferred with priority now being given to the Levelling Up Fund work. Concerns were also raised in terms of the membership size of the Working Party which had been set at 7 Members. This meant that the Arun Independent Group; the Green Group and the Labour Party would automatically be excluded. There was also concern that the Working Party would not consider new ideas when it was new ideas that were needed. Views were outlined that the work that would need to be undertaken on the Levelling Up Fund should not be at the detriment of considering the Bognor Regis Regeneration proposals as it could be that those new ideas could form part of the Council's bid. Points were made over the urgency of this item and the 18 June deadline for submitting a bid. It was felt that this was inaccurate as at Section 6.5 of the prospectus provided, it clearly set out that the 18 June deadline was for the first tranche of bidding. Section 6.15 of the prospectus provided further guidance on bidding which allowed Councils to submit bids as part of later rounds allowing Councils more time to consider and develop proposals which some Councillors felt that the Council should also consider. There were Councillors who did not want recycled and refreshed old ideas to form the bids put forward by the Council.

Further debate took place with regard to Agenda Item 14 with very strong views being made that consideration of the Bognor Regis regeneration proposals should not be delayed as this could have implications for those who had submitted bids and questions were asked as to why both projects could not be run together.

Full Council - 17.03.21

Others spoke in full support of the recommendations explaining that the Levelling Up Fund presented a unique opportunity for the Council which could not be missed. This was why a Working Party was being proposed, so that work could commence quickly with a way forward being reported back to either the next meeting of Cabinet or Full Council in May 2021. Consideration of the regeneration proposals could be deferred until after 18 June 2021 when the work had been completed on the Council's bid. The issue of Officer capacity could not be ignored, and the proposals presented a way to work around this to achieve the submission of a bid and to then consider the regeneration proposals.

There were Councillors who spoke in support of undertaking the required work on the Levelling Up Fund but expressed concern over the type of bid(s) that might be submitted. It was hoped that new, fresh and radical ideas that would support the recovery and regeneration of the District's Town Centres, especially Littlehampton, would be considered. To submit plans that were 10-15 years old would not work as such schemes were not relevant to the District's needs as they stood now, especially following a pandemic and an urgent need to provide attractions that would increase footfall and attract visitors.

Debate returned to the proposed membership of the Working Party and the need to ensure that its membership would consider both sides of the District equally, not favouring one over the other. In view of this, reassurance was requested that membership would consist of Members from Littlehampton and Bognor Regis.

In view of the continued discussion focusing on Agenda Item 14, Councillors asked if it could be confirmed now if this item was going to be deferred or whether they would have the opportunity to take part in debating it.

Councillor Oppler, as seconder to the recommendations, reminded Councillors that the opportunity to bid for £20m for both principal Towns could not be ignored, especially when this funding was specifically targeted towards Councils that had deprived wards in seaside communities. Having read the report, so much of the criteria fitted in with what the Council was doing for communities in Bognor Regis and Littlehampton.

Councillor Dr Walsh, as proposer to the recommendations, provided some further information in response to the concerns that had been raised. He explained that having received the news about the Fund and how Councils could bid, in view of the urgent nature and timescales set, the decision to create a Working Party could have been made as an Executive function of Cabinet. However, he had taken the decision to bring this matter of urgency to Full Council for all Councillors to consider in view of the fact that this opportunity had such major importance for the entire District and needed support from across the Council. It made sense to submit a bid for the first round of funding so that if this did not succeed, then other bids could be made. In the event that the bid was successful, it would then give the Council more time to complete projects within stipulated deadlines. The engagement of outside consultants would almost certainly be necessary to assist Officer capacity and Councillor Dr Walsh confirmed that

the Government was setting up a small sub-fund allowing Councils to bid for support to bid for the grant. Councillor Dr Walsh confirmed that the Working Party would have to have representation from both Bognor Regis and Littlehampton and that there was no reason why a Members' Seminar on the Bognor Regis presentations could still not take place, as agreed.

Points of Order were then raised whereby Councillors insisted they receive a response confirming whether Agenda Item 14 would be deferred or whether there would be opportunity for Member debate.

Councillor Dr Walsh in response confirmed that the deferral of Agenda Item 14 would be the subject of debate at that agenda item.

Following further debate and Points of Orders raised, further clarification was sought on what the recommendations in the report meant. Councillor Dr Walsh confirmed that the recommendations proposed the establishment of a Working Party that would consider proposals that the Council would put into a bid for the £20m Levelling Up Fund.

Further Points of Order were raised on the recommendations and where the recommendations from the Working Party would be reported to, would this be Cabinet or Full Council? The Chief Executive explained that it would be one or the other depending upon timescales. Requests were made for this to be added as a third recommendation. The Chief Executive highlighted that this point was clearly set out in the report.

The Director of Place then explained various sections from the prospectus in response to earlier questions raised on bidding timelines.

A request had been received that the voting on the two recommendations be recorded. Those voting for were Councillors Mrs Baker, Bennett, Bicknell, Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Brooks, Ms Caffyn, Mrs Catterson, Charles, Clayden, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Mrs Daniells, Dendle, Dixon, Edwards, Elkins, Goodheart, Mrs Gregory, Gunner, Mrs Hamilton, Mrs Haywood, Hughes, Huntley, Jones, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Madeley, Miss Needs, Oppler, Mrs Pendleton, Miss Rhodes, Roberts, Miss Seex, Smith, Mrs Staniforth, Mrs Stainton, Stanley, Tilbrook, Ms Thurston, Dr Walsh, Mrs Warr and Mrs Yeates (45). No Councillors voted against. Councillors Chapman, English and Mrs Worne abstained from voting (3).

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) Agreement be given to setting up a Levelling Up Fund Working Party with the necessary political balance; and
- (2) The Working Party's remit will be to advise Officers on their project preferences for bidding, including the priority order.

Full Council - 17.03.21

The Chairman then called a short adjournment.

481. MOTIONS

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

482. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2021/22

In accordance with Article 4 of the Constitution, the Council was requested to appoint a Vice-Chairman and Chairman Elect for the Municipal Year 2021/22.

One candidate, Councillor Samantha Staniforth, had been nominated for the role. Following a statement made from the Leader of the Council in support of his respective candidate, a secret ballot was undertaken and the results declared by the Committee Services Manager, who announced that Councillor Samantha Staniforth had been selected for the appointment of Vice-Chairman of the Council for 2021/22 and Chairman Elect of the Council for 2022/23.

Congratulations were then extended to Councillor Mrs Staniforth in being appointed Vice-Chairman of the Council for 2021/22 and Chairman Elect for 2022/23.

483. PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2021/22

(Prior to the vote taking place on this item – Northeast redeclared his Personal Interest made at the start of the meeting).

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh, presented this report which detailed the draft Pay Policy Statement for 2021/22. Councillor Dr Walsh formally proposed that the Pay Policy Statement for 2021/22 be approved for publication onto the Council's web site by 1 April 2021. This was then seconded by Councillor Oppler.

Following some discussion on the gender pay gap,

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) The Pay Policy Statement 2021/22 be approved for publication on the Arun website by 1 April 2021;

(2) Delegated authority be given to the Group Head of Corporate Support to make changes to the Pay Policy Statement which might arise from new legislation concerning employee severance payments should this be introduced later this year.

484. TO 'MAKE' THE FELPHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN - 2019-2031

(Prior to the discussion on this item, Councillor English declared a Personal Interest as a Member of Felpham Parish Council).

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury, firstly congratulated Felpham Parish Council for its work undertaken on this project. He then provided some background confirming that the Felpham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2031 passed Examination in December 2020. The Examiner of this modified Plan concluded that the Plan passed the Examination and that the material modifications did not change the nature of the Plan and so it did not require a Referendum so should proceed to be 'made'.

The 'making' of this Plan would give it legal force and it would form part of the statutory Development Plan for that area. Consequently, decisions on planning applications in the neighbourhood area would need to be made in accordance with the Neighbourhood Development Plan or Order, unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

Councillor Lury formally proposed the 'making' of this Plan which was seconded by Councillor Dr Walsh.

In considering this matter, many congratulations were extended to Felpham Parish Council as this was one of the first Neighbourhood Development Plans that had been updated without the need for a referendum. The work of Arun's Planning Officer and her team were also praised.

The Council

RESOLVED

That it 'makes' the Felpham Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2031 and it becomes part of the Development Plan for Arun District Council.

485. FEEDBACK ON PRESENTATIONS RELATING TO BOGNOR REGIS REGENERATION

(Prior to the discussion on this item, Councillors Coster and Goodheart redeclared their interests made at the start of the meeting).

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh, outlined that the Council had received the presentations which had been summarised in the documentation included as part of the report. What was now needed was to set a clear way forward. He confirmed that Group Leaders had decided that a Members' Seminar be organised where all the presentations and Member impressions from these would be considered in much greater detail than what could be achieved tonight. Councillor Dr Walsh therefore proposed that a Members' Seminar be organised in the very near future

Full Council - 17.03.21

allowing all Members of the Council to have the opportunity, virtually, to take part in that debate which would allow for Officers to sit in and provide advice as necessary and from that to prepare a report for Full Council distilling Members views into a series of options or an option for the Council to consider. This was his proposal which was an alternative to having a very long debate on the presentations now which might not lead to an easy conclusion. Councillor Dr Walsh concluded by thanking those who had attended and given presentations to the Council and had provided summaries setting out the detail of their presentation.

Councillor Oppler then seconded this proposal.

The Chairman then invited debate on this proposal. Councillor Goodheart confirmed that he had a proposal to put forward. This was "that the Council commissions an independent consultant, working alongside officers, to devise a shortlisting selection criterion and to mark the presentations against the criteria and report to the next Full Council with a recommendation on which scheme to take forward and project initiation plans. Councillor Goodheart confirmed that he had a list of fundamental areas that should be covered by the consultant and officers.

A Point of Order was then raised, and clarification sought as it was felt that Councillor Goodheart's proposal could not be classed as an amendment, as it was a completely new proposal. Advice from the Interim Monitoring Officer was sought.

The Interim Monitoring Officer referred to the Director of Place's report which had no set recommendation, it was asking Full Council to provide a steer on what type of regeneration activity the Council might want to pursue in Bognor Regis following debate. Councillor Dr Walsh had proposed a separate motion and Councillor Goodheart's proposal was an amendment to Councillor Dr Walsh's motion.

Councillor Dendle then seconded Councillor Goodheart's proposal.

In view of the length and detail of Councillor Goodheart's amendment, a request was made to share this to the meeting. Councillor Goodheart's amendment was then shared to the screen.

The wording of Councillor Goodheart's amendment was confirmed as follows:

"Commissioning an independent Consultant working alongside Officers to devise a shortlisting and selection criteria to mark the presentation against that criteria and to present a report to the next Council Meeting with a recommendation on which scheme to take forward and a project initiation plan.

The wording below sets out the content for proposing the motion:

(1) Based on this, the Officers are asked to prepare reports for the next Full Council dealing with:

- Timetable and implementation
- Planning consent
- Due diligence
- Funding by/to the Council (including Leases)
- Willingness/ability to accommodate other proposals
- The position regarding Whitbread Plc and Arun Arts
- Economic and environmental impact statements

(2) Options to be discussed on development such as Sole Developer, Joint Venture or Partnership

(3) Logic would suggest that Councillors might well now consider which of the presentations they would wish to take forward. This means creating some form of short-list based on:

- Perceived appropriateness and viability
- Financial sustainability
- Each proposal can satisfy an independent consultant on each aspect of the projects including financial aspects and delivery of final projects.

The Interim Monitoring Officer was invited to provide advice. He outlined that the original recommendation set out in the report had a form of words which when Councillor Dr Walsh had made his presentation appeared to be different from the recommendation as set out in the report. Councillor Goodheart then made an amendment to what Councillor Dr Walsh had proposed.

Councillor Dr Walsh should be invited to move and second his proposal again with Councillor Goodheart then being invited to confirm if he would wish to amend further that clarified motion.

The Chairman then called a short adjournment to allow Officers time to write up the amendments so that these could be shared to the meeting.

Having seen the detail of Councillor Goodheart's amendment shared to the meeting, the Interim Monitoring Officer confirmed that this amendment could only include the first three sentences, not the remaining content.

This was:

“Commissioning an independent Consultant working alongside Officers to devise a shortlisting and selection criteria to mark the presentation against that criteria and to present a report to the next Council Meeting with a recommendation on which scheme to take forward and a project initiation plan”.

Full Council - 17.03.21

For clarity purposes, Councillor Dr Walsh's proposal was shared to the meeting.

Councillor Dr Walsh reconfirmed his proposal which read as follows:

"Officers are asked to prepare a Members' Seminar to discuss the presentations and provide guidance for Officers to prepare a report for a future meeting of the Full Council regarding what type of regeneration activity the Council might want to pursue in Bognor Regis, and any relevant procurement requirements and associated funding issues".

This proposal was seconded by Councillor Gunner however he questioned the establishment of a Working Party as part of this proposal.

In response, Councillor Dr Walsh added the following words to his proposal to read as follows – the additional wording has been highlighted in **bold**.

"Officers are asked to prepare a Members' Seminar to discuss the presentations and provide guidance for Officers **and engage with the Levelling Up Working Party** to prepare a report for a future meeting of the Full Council regarding what type of regeneration activity the Council might want to pursue in Bognor Regis, and any relevant procurement requirements and associated funding issues".

Councillor Edwards and Councillor Dendle asked Councillor Dr Walsh if some minor changes could be made. These were to confirm that the Members' Seminar would be held in private session and to confirm the date for the Seminar so that a report could be brought back to the next meeting of Full Council. Councillor Dr Walsh agreed to these requests and so his proposal was amended further to read [additions shown in **bold**].

"Officers are asked to prepare a **private** Members' Seminar **at the earliest opportunity** for Members to discuss the presentations and provide guidance for Officers **and engage with the Levelling Up Working Party** to prepare a report for a future meeting of the Full Council regarding what type of regeneration activity the Council might want to pursue in Bognor Regis, and any relevant procurement requirements and associated funding issues".

Further clarification was sought on the above wording from Councillor Dixon. He stated that Group Leaders had talked about a seminar followed by a briefing on the procurement rules [which would have changed following Brexit] and that a Working Party be set up to bring proposals back to Full Council. It seemed from this proposal, that this Working Party had been abandoned and so he asked for confirmation as to whether this was the intention.

Councillor Dr Walsh stated that he did not think that this Working Party was abandoned, it would be up to the Members' Seminar to confirm how this would be taken forward and if it was felt that the establishment of a Working Party was needed, then this is what would happen.

Councillor Gunner was asked to confirm, as seconder, if he could accept the further changes made. He confirmed that he agreed with the points that had been made by Councillor Dixon and would like the proposal to be amended to reflect this.

Following further discussion, Councillor Dr Walsh's proposal was amended further to read as follows [deletions are shown using ~~strike through~~ and additions are shown using **bold**:

“Officers are asked to prepare a **private** Members' Seminar **at the earliest opportunity** for Members to discuss the presentations and provide guidance for Officers ~~and engage with the Levelling Up Working Party and set up a Working Party~~ to prepare a report for a future meeting of the Full Council regarding what type of regeneration activity the Council might want to pursue in Bognor Regis, and any relevant procurement requirements and associated funding issues”.

Having been formally amended by Councillor Dr Walsh, this further amendment was seconded by Councillor Gunner.

The Chairman then asked Councillors Goodheart and Dendle, as the proposer and seconder of the amendment to Councillor Dr Walsh's proposal if they could accept this proposal. Councillor Goodheart confirmed that he could accept this revised proposal but would have liked to have had included the appointment of an external consultant to assist with this work. He also had concerns over the timing element in undertaking this work.

The Chief Executive provided some clarification confirming that if Council might choose to pursue the appointment of a consultant, details of the level of funding required would need to be known. He confirmed that having agreed the establishment of the Levelling Up Fund Working Party earlier, that this work would need to commence first before the arrangement of a Seminar on Bognor Regis regeneration presentation proposals.

The Chairman confirmed that she was now inviting debate on this new motion.

In discussing the amendment, a question was asked as to why the Gardens by the Sea proposal had not been included in the list of presentations forming the report. A request was made that this be included in the Seminar to be organised.

Other points raised were over the timings involved in organising the Members' Seminar having heard that the work of the Levelling Up Fund Working Party would take priority. Strong views were expressed that both projects should have equal priority and that a strict time limit should be confirmed for when the Seminar would be held.

Councillor Roberts confirmed that he therefore wished to make an amendment to include the points raised above; to address Officer capacity and the membership of the Working Party.

Full Council - 17.03.21

Councillor Dendle seconded this further amendment.

Advice was sought from the Monitoring Officer as the amendment put forward by Councillor Roberts formed three separate amendments. Councillor Roberts was asked to confirm out of these three amendments he had proposed which was his first amendment.

Councillor Roberts confirmed his first amendment to be as set out below [additions have been set out in **bold**].

“Officers are asked to prepare a private seminar, **with the same priority, resource and time allocation as that to be invested in the levelling up fund project at the earliest opportunity** for Members to discuss the presentations and provide guidance for officers and set up a Working Party to prepare a report for a future meeting of Full Council regarding what type of regeneration activity the Council might want to pursue in Bognor Regis, and any relevant procurement requirements and associated funding issues”.

Councillor Dendle, as seconder, confirmed that he agreed with this wording.

The Chairman then invited debate on Councillor Robert's amendment. Many Councillors spoke confirming that they could not support this amendment and felt it to be unnecessary.

Following further debate, Councillor Roberts confirmed that he wished to withdraw this amendment and that he would not be proposing his second or third amendment.

The Chairman then returned to the substantive amendment and invited debate. This debate asked for confirmation that the Gardens by the Sea project would be included as part of the Members' Seminar.

Councillor Gunner, as seconder to the proposal, confirmed that he and Councillor Dr Walsh had liaised with the Chief Executive about presenting the Gardens by the Sea project to Members and he confirmed that this would take place. In response to queries raised on the timing of this work, Councillor Gunner believed that stipulating that this would be at the earliest opportunity would achieve a confirmation date soon. In terms of the establishment of a Working Party and political make-up, this would be discussed by Group Leaders who would decide how this would be apportioned.

Councillor Dr Walsh, as proposer of the proposal, confirmed what Councillor Gunner had said and he stated his viewpoint that the membership of this Working Party would need to be larger as it would be focusing on larger scale issues.

The Council

RESOLVED

That Officers are asked to prepare a private seminar, at the earliest opportunity, for Members to discuss the presentations and provide guidance for Officers and set up a Working Party to prepare a report for a future meeting of Full Council regarding what type of regeneration activity the Council might want to pursue in Bognor Regis, and any relevant procurement requirements and associated funding issues.

The Chairman then adjourned the meeting to 24 March 2021 at 6.00 pm confirming that Agenda Items 15 to 31 would be considered at that meeting.

(The meeting concluded at 10.40 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack

Subject to approval at the next Full Council meeting

437

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE ARUN CIVIC CENTRE ON 24 MARCH 2021 AT 6.00 PM

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

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

[Note: The following Councillors were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters detailed in the Minutes indicated – Councillor Goodheart – Minute 512 to Minute 521 (Part); Councillor Miss Seex – Minute 512 to Minute 523 (Part); Councillor Dendle – Minute 512 to Minute 524 (Part)]; Councillor Jones – Minute 524 (Part) to Minute 534].

512. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Councillors, representatives of the public, press and officers to a further Full Council Meeting to conclude the items of business that remained outstanding from the last Council meeting held on 17 March 2021. She extended a special welcome to Honorary Alderman Mrs Stinchcombe.

513. CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

The Chairman confirmed that in view of the remaining items still to be concluded for this agenda, that in line with Council Procedure Rule 3.1 [Timing and Business] (xiii) she proposed a change to the order of the agenda as set out below:

After Agenda Item 15 [Transition to Committee Style of Governance] items would be considered in this order:

- Item 17 – Cabinet – 11 January 2021
- Item 19 – Constitution Working Party – 27 January 2021
- Item 25 – Standards – 18 February 2021
- Item 26 – Planning Policy Sub-Committee – 23 February 2021
- Item 27 – Audit & Governance Committee – 25 February 2021

Full Council - 24.03.21

- Item 28 – Constitution Working Party – 2 March 2021
- Item 30 – Bognor Regis Sub-Committee – 4 March 2021
- Item 10 – Questions from Members

The Chairman confirmed that if the remaining items listed below could not be concluded tonight then they would stand adjourned to a Special Meeting of the Council on 12 May 2021 – being items:

- Item 16 – Development Control – 6 January 2021
- Item 18 - Overview Select Committee – 26 January 201
- Item 20 – Electoral Review Sub-Committee – 28 January 2021
- Item 21 – Licensing Committee – 29 January 2021
- Item 22 – Development Control Committee – 3 February 2021
- Item 23 – Housing & Customer Services WG – 4 February 2021
- Item 24 – Cabinet – 8 February 2021
- Item 29 – Development Control Committee – 3 March 2021
- Item 31 – Committee Memberships

514. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mrs Catterson, Clayden, Mrs Daniells, Mrs Erskine and Hughes and in respect of the Council's remaining Honorary Aldermen.

515. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

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

Name	Town or Parish Council or West Sussex County Council [WSSC]
Councillor Tracy Baker	Littlehampton
Councillor Kenton Batley	Bognor Regis
Councillor Jamie Bennett	Rustington
Councillor Paul Bicknell	Angmering
Councillor Billy Blanchard-Cooper	Littlehampton
Councillor Jim Brooks	Bognor Regis
Councillor Ian Buckland	Littlehampton and WSSC
Councillor Mike Clayden	Rustington
Councillor Andy Cooper	Rustington

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

516. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS WITH PECUNIARY/PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

There were no questions asked.

517. TRANSITION TO COMMITTEE STYLE OF GOVERNANCE

The Interim Monitoring Officer introduced this report reminding Councillors that the Council had made a binding statutory resolution on 15 January 2020 to change its form of governance to a Committee system effective from its Annual Council Meeting on 19 May 2021.

This was a status report outlining the progress of transition to the Committee style Constitution and associated matters. It explained the revision and rewriting of the Constitution, which was complete, and that the new Constitutional document was almost ready for publication.

Full Council - 24.03.21

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Dr Walsh, in proposing the four recommendations set out in the report, confirmed that the Council had now concluded most of its work and he thanked Members and Officers for their work undertaken in re-writing the Council's constitution.

The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Mrs Yeates.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) The completion of the writing of the new Constitution be noted;
- (2) The plans to brief Members on the contents of the new Constitution be noted;
- (3) It be agreed that on completion of the briefing for Members on the new Constitution, it will be submitted to Full Council on 12 May 2021 for publication; and
- (4) It be noted that the next meeting of the Constitution Working Party is scheduled for 28 June 2021.

518. CABINET - 11 JANUARY 2021

The Chairman, Councillor Dr Walsh, presented the Minutes from the meeting of Cabinet held on 11 January 2021.

Councillor Dr Walsh alerted Members to the first recommendation at Minute 401 [Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update] which he formally proposed. The recommendation was seconded by Councillor Mrs Gregory.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the updated Housing Revenue Account Business Plan for 2020/21 be noted.

Councillor Dr Walsh then drew Members' attention to the next recommendation at Minute 403 [Supplementary Estimate to Cover Costs Awarded Against the Council in Appeals – Y/103/18/PL and EP/148/20/PL] which he formally proposed. The recommendation was then seconded by Councillor Lury.

The Council

RESOLVED

That a supplementary estimate of a maximum of £33,000 be approved to settle the award of costs in respect of applications Y/103/18/PL and EP/148.20/PL. This equates to a Band D Council Tax equivalent of £0.53.

519. CONSTITUTION WORKING PARTY - 27 JANUARY 2021

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Yeates, presented the minutes from the Constitution Working Party held on 27 January 2021.

Councillor Mrs Yeates alerted Members to the first set of recommendations at Minute 36 [The New 2021 Constitution – Update Report] which she formally proposed. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Mrs Gregory.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

- (1) The progress and update provided in respect of the new Constitution be noted;
- (2) It be noted that the Licensing Sub-Committee functions be moved from Part 4, Section 4 to Part 3, Section 5 (Regulatory Committees);
- (3) The proposed changes to Part 6, Section 6, of the Constitution (Financial Procedure Rules) deferred by the Council on 26 November 2020 be approved to become Part 6, Section 3 of the new Constitution;
- (4) Provision be made for the business of a meeting to be varied by the Chairman or by the meeting – as set out below:

“the Order of Business other than business relating to (a) choosing a person to preside if the Chair and Vice-Chair are absent (b) apologies for absence (c) declarations of interest shall not be varied but, subject thereto, the order of business may be varied: a) by the chair in consultation with the Monitoring Officer or representative b) by resolution pass on a motion which shall be put without debate”.
- (5) All references to Chairman and Vice-Chairman in the Constitution be replaced with Chair and Vice-Chair; and
- (6) All titles, Miss, Mrs, Ms and Dr be discontinued.

Full Council - 24.03.21

520. STANDARDS COMMITTEE - 18 FEBRUARY 2021

The Chair, Councillor Edwards, presented the minutes from the meeting of the Standards Committee held 18 February 2021.

Councillor Edwards drew Members attention to three recommendations at Minute 484 [Review and Revision of the Member Code of Conduct] which he duly proposed. The recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Bennett.

The Council

RESOLVED – That

(1) It be noted that the adoption of a Code of Conduct for Members is merely one aspect of the overriding duty to promote and maintain high standards of conduct by Members;

(2) The Local Government Association's new Model Member Code of Conduct 2020 be adapted with the substitution of the Arun Appendix B for the LGA Appendix B and adopted as the proposed Statutory Arun Member Code of Conduct; and

(3) The Interim Monitoring Officer consult with the County Council and the ADC Parish Councils with a view to adopting a consistent Code across the Arun District.

521. PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE - 23 FEBRUARY 2021

The Chair, Councillor Yeates, presented the Minutes from the Planning Policy Sub-Committee held on 23 February 2021.

Councillor Yeates alerted Members to a recommendation at Minute 37 [Interim Housing Statement] which she formally proposed with this recommendation being seconded by Councillor Lury.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the Housing Interim Statement be approved.

Councillor Yeates then referred to Minute 35 [Local Plan Update – Vision and Objectives] and made a statement. She confirmed that the Planning Policy Sub-Committee had been unable to agree the Local Plan Vision and Objectives. A suggested way forward, as reflected in the minutes, had not been constitutionally accurate and so further consideration of this matter would stand deferred and would be

referred to the most appropriate meeting of the new Planning Policy Committee within the new Committee structure.

In response to this statement, Councillors spoke in support of the action taken confirming that they were pleased that this constitutional inaccuracy had been addressed. Also, in recognition of the many points and views made at the Sub-Committee meeting, it made sense to allow for all of these ideas and suggestions to be brought together into a further document for Councillors to discuss again prior to the Local Plan Aims and Objectives being approved.

There was one Councillor who expressed concern over the delay this might cause to the work being undertaken by Officers in progressing important evidence studies and other work associated with reviewing the Local Plan. Concern was also raised over the issue of coastal gaps and as reference to strategic gaps had been removed from the vision and objectives along with other major issues such as references to increasing diversity and increasing general employment; reducing the need for travel; promoting sustainable forms of transport, reference to affordability and the housing mix. In view of these omissions, another opportunity to review the vision and objectives against what had been agreed at the Members' Seminar and workshops held was welcomed.

522. AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE - 25 FEBRUARY 2021

The Vice-Chair, Councillor Haywood, presented the minutes from the meeting of the Audit & Governance Committee held on 25 February 2021.

Councillor Haywood alerted Members to the first of a series of recommendations the first being at Minute 497 [Capital Strategy] which she formally proposed. This recommendation was then seconded by Councillor Bennett.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the Capital Strategy 2021/22 be approved.

Councillor Haywood then turned to three recommendations at Minute 498 [Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy] which she formally proposed. The recommendations were then formally seconded by Councillor Bennett.

The Council

Full Council - 24.03.21

RESOLVED – That

- (1) The Treasury Management Strategy for 2021/22 be approved;
- (2) The Annual Investment Strategy for 2021/22 be approved; and
- (3) The Prudential Indicators for 2021/22, 2022/23 and 2023/24 as contained in Appendix 1 and the body of the report be approved.

523. CONSTITUTION WORKING PARTY - 2 MARCH 2021

The Chair, Councillor Yeates, presented the minutes from the Constitution Working Party meeting held on 2 March 2021.

Councillor Yeates alerted Members to a series of recommendations at Minute 41 [Final Report – Review of the Constitution for Transition to Committee Style of Governance]. In proposing the recommendations, Councillor Yeates confirmed that Recommendation 2, regarding the Financial Procedure Rules, needed to be withdrawn as this recommendation was a duplication and had just been approved when Councillors had considered and approved the recommendations from the meeting of the Constitution Working Party held on 27 January 2021. The remaining recommendations were then seconded by Councillor Gregory, these being Recommendations (1), (3), (4) and (5).

Some Councillors spoke to confirm their views on the change to the Committee system which they opposed. They felt that the change in governance arrangements was a great mistake which could be easily proved as out of 162 District Councils only 5 operated a Committee system and some had already reverted back to a Leader and Cabinet form of governance highlighting that the Committee system did not work.

Other Councillors supported the viewpoints made and added their concern that there was still a lot of work that had not been finished and that the work undertaken to date had been rushed. A Members' Seminar had been promised but not delivered. This was vital, as there were many Councillors who did not fully understand how the new Committee system would function and operate. Questions were asked as to whether a Members' Seminar and training would be provided and if so, when? Similarly, Councillors asked if Officers had received appropriate training and how this was progressing.

Following some debate, the Chief Executive confirmed that out of the Council's Senior Managers around 70-80 Officers had received training. Also, two new Committee Services Officers had been appointed ahead of the new Committee structure commencing on 19 May 2021.

Following further discussion on the timescales for this work, Councillor Yeates confirmed that a huge amount of work had been undertaken in reviewing the Council's Constitution in preparing for the new Committee structure and she thanked Officers, especially the Chief Executive and Interim Monitoring Officer, for the work that had been presented to many meetings of the Working Party held during the last year to facilitate the change in governance structure. The result of this work was that the Council now had a final working document which would be reviewed as the new structure commenced and could be changed if it was found that there were elements that were not working or needed to be adjusted.

Following further discussion, a request was made that the voting on the recommendations be split so that a separate and recorded vote could be taken on Recommendation 1 [That the completion of the writing of the new Constitution be noted].

Those voting for Recommendation 1 were Councillors Batley, Bennett, Blanchard-Cooper, Brooks, Buckland, Coster, Dixon, Goodheart, Gregory, Hamilton, Haywood, Huntley, Jones, Lury, Needs, Oppler, Purchase, Smith, Staniforth, Stanley, Tilbrook, Thurston, Walsh, Warr and Yeates (25). No Councillors voted against. Councillors Baker, Bicknell, Bower, Caffyn, Chapman, Charles, Cooper, Cooper, Edwards, Elkins, English, Gunner, Kelly, Northeast, Oliver-Redgate, Pendleton, Roberts and Worne [19].

Recommendation 1 was therefore approved as being noted.

The Council then

RESOLVED – That

- (1) The completion of the writing of the new Constitution be noted;
- (2) The revised procedure in Part 5, Section 1, Rule 17 made for clarifying the procedure for Closure Motions in the proposed Constitution be approved;
- (3) The revised procedure in Part 5, Section 2, Rule 13 made for clarifying the procedures for Closure Motions in the proposed Constitution be approved; and
- (4) Delegated authority be given to the Interim Monitoring Officer to make consequential changes to the Constitution following this meeting.

524. BOGNOR REGIS REGENERATION SUB-COMMITTEE - 4 MARCH 2021

(At the commencement of this item, Councillor Goodheart declared a Personal Interest in Minute 19 – Bognor Regis Place Branding and in relation to any reference made to the Rox Festival).

Full Council - 24.03.21

The Chair, Councillor Stanley, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee held on 4 March 2021.

Councillor Stanley then referred Members to a recommendation at Minute 19 [Bognor Regis Place Branding] which he duly proposed. This recommendation was then seconded by Councillor Brooks.

The Council

RESOLVED

That the findings of the place branding perception study be noted as a reflection on community perceptions following the public consultation exercise.

Councillor Stanley confirmed that there was now a second recommendation for the Council to consider and he provided some background to this and to the revised minutes which had been uploaded to the Full Council webpage as a supplement. He outlined that at the Sub-Committee meeting, a vote had been undertaken on whether the Place Branding core values and brand filter for all Council activity in Bognor Regis should be adopted. The result of the vote undertaken was that the Sub-Committee voted against this recommendation. Following consultation with the Interim Monitoring Officer, it was confirmed that the Bognor Regis Regeneration Sub-Committee did not have the authority to not bring this matter to Full Council based on the outcome of the vote, but that a recommendation to not to adopt the place branding core value should have been forwarded to Full Council to allow debate by all Members to make the final decision. In view of this, Councillor Stanley confirmed that this formed the second recommendation for the Council to consider. In proposing it, Councillor Stanley confirmed that he wished to make an amendment and he provided some background information to this. The recommendation read as follows: additions are shown in **bold** and deletions shown using ~~strikethrough~~

“Full Council adopts the place branding Core Values and “Brand Filter” approach ~~are not adopted~~ for all Council activity in Bognor Regis with a review by the relevant Committee after a twelve month period to assess progress”.

This amendment was seconded by Councillor Staniforth.

The Chair then invited debate on this amendment.

Debate commenced with Councillors speaking against this amendment. This was because they could not agree with the detail surrounding the core values which they felt contained outdated information and as only 600 people had been involved in the topic and been asked questions. It was also felt that the information presented only related to Bognor Regis and no other part of the area such as Bersted, Aldwick or Pagham.

Other Councillors confirmed that they could not support the amendment on the grounds that the Sub-Committee had already decided that it did not want this to be presented to Full Council for further determination. This amendment was an attempt to bypass the Sub-Committee's conclusion of this item.

Following further debate, Councillor Stanley confirmed that he wished to withdraw this amendment.

The Chairman then returned to the substantive recommendation and for clarity asked this to be confirmed. The substantive recommendation was confirmed as follows:

“To recommend to Full Council to not to adopt the place branding Core Values and “Brand Filter” approach for all Council activity in Bognor Regis”.

The substantive recommendation was seconded by Councillor Brooks.

The Chairman then invited debate on the substantive recommendation. This saw Councillors speaking in support of it based on the comments that had been raised earlier in that the study contained out of date information; had not reached out to a large representation of people residing in the area; and that its content was restrictive and the values listed could be improved. There were Councillors who agreed with these statements but still wished for this matter to be brought before the new Economic Committee for further consideration. Following further debate, Councillor Bennett proposed a further amendment which was to “refer this back to the new Economic Committee to review” based on comments made by some Members that a place branding exercise should be conducted for the whole of the District, not just for Bognor Regis.

Councillor Seex then seconded this amendment.

Debate then took place on this amendment and a recorded vote was requested and if this vote failed, that a recorded vote also be undertaken on the substantive recommendation.

The Chairman then invited debate on this amendment.

There were Councillors who supported this new amendment and felt strongly that it should be reviewed further by the new Economic Committee hopefully resulting in a place branding initiative being devised to cover and enhance the entire District to include Arundel and Littlehampton.

Following further debate, Councillor Cooper proposed “that the question be now be put”. This was agreed by the Chairman and seconded by Councillor English.

Full Council - 24.03.21

A recorded vote was then undertaken on Councillor Bennett's amendment. Those voting for were Councillors Batley, Bennett, Blanchard-Cooper, Brooks, Buckland, Goodheart, Gregory, Haywood, Jones, Lury, Needs, Oppler, Purchase, Seex, Smith, Staniforth, Stanley, Tilbrook, Walsh, Warr and Mrs Yeates (21). Those voting against were Councillors Bicknell, Bower, Caffyn, Chapman, Charles, Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Dixon, Edwards, Elkins, English, Gunner, Hamilton, Huntley, Kelly, Oliver-Redgate, Pendleton, and Roberts (19). Councillors Baker, Northeast, Thurston and Worne abstained from voting (4).

The amendment was therefore CARRIED.

The Chairman then called a short adjournment.

The Interim Monitoring Officer then reminded Members what the next process was in concluding this item. This was that the amendment put forward by Councillor Bennett, which had been carried, would now become the substantive recommendation. Unless there was further debate, a recorded vote would need to be undertaken.

A recorded vote was then undertaken on this substantive recommendation.

Those voting for were Councillors Batley, Bennett, Blanchard-Cooper, Buckland, Gregory, Haywood, Lury, Needs, Oppler, Purchase, Seex, Smith, Staniforth, Stanley, Tilbrook, Walsh, Warr, Worne and Yeates (19). Those voting against were Councillors Bicknell, Bower, Caffyn, Chapman, Charles, Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Dendle, Dixon, Edwards, Elkins, English, Goodheart, Gunner, Hamilton, Kelly, Oliver-Redgate, Pendleton and Roberts (21). Those abstaining were Councillors Baker, Brooks, Huntley, Northeast and Thurston (5).

The substantive recommendation was LOST.

The Committee Services Manager then confirmed that she had made a miscalculation in confirming the results of the recorded vote. A Point of Order was raised in that Councillor Goodheart's vote had not been taken. The Committee Services Manager confirmed that she had called for his vote, however, had not received a response.

The Chief Executive confirmed that a revote was required. The Committee Services Manager was asked to confirm again the wording of the substantive recommendation.

This was that "to refer the place branding item to the Economic Committee".

Several Points of Order were then raised on the wording of the substantive recommendation.

Those voting for it were Councillors Batley, Bennett, Blanchard-Cooper, Buckland, Gregory, Haywood, Lury, Needs, Oppler, Purchase, Seex, Smith, Staniforth, Stanley, Tilbrook, Walsh, Warr, Worne and Yeates (19). Those voting against were Councillors Bicknell, Bower, Brooks, Caffyn, Chapman, Charles, Cooper, Cooper, Coster, Dendle, Dixon, Edwards, Elkins, English, Goodheart, Gunner, Hamilton, Kelly, Oliver-Redgate, Pendleton and Roberts (21). Councillor Baker, Huntley, Northeast and Thurston abstained from voting (4).

The substantive recommendation was therefore LOST.

525. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

The Chairman confirmed that the Questions from Members along with their responses had been circulated to Councillors earlier in the day and had been uploaded to the Full Council website. She outlined that the questions and responses would be put without discussion, in line with the Constitution.

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

Supplementary questions were asked in relation to all questions that had been submitted. These questions and the supplementary responses would be uploaded to the Full Council website following this meeting.

Councillor Northeast confirmed that he wished to suspend Council Procedure Rules as he had been very disappointed that at last night's meeting of the Overview Select Committee, due to a lack of Cabinet Member attendance, Members of the Committee had been denied their chance to ask the Cabinet questions. The Leader of the Council had stated that the questions could be asked at this meeting as part of this item.

Councillor Northeast then formally proposed a Motion without Notice 15 (m) [to suspend a particular Council Procedure Rule] to allow Cabinet Member Questions and Updates from last night's meeting of the Overview Select Committee to be heard at the end of this item. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Roberts.

Advice was sought from the Interim Monitoring Officer who confirmed that Council Procedure Rule 15 made reference to Motions without Notice and 15(m) was the rule that needed to be applied in this instance to suspend a particular Council Procedure Rule and that the particular Council Procedure Rule that was being referred to was the rule where only those minutes that were before the Council could attract questions. His view was that Councillor Northeast had proposed to suspend that procedure rule and this was what Councillors would be asked to vote on.

In discussing this proposal, it was suggested that only Members who had attended last night's meeting of the Overview Select Committee be entitled to ask a Cabinet Member a question now, otherwise it would make this matter very complicated. This suggestion was highlighted as a very sensible way forward by the Interim Monitoring Officer.

Full Council - 24.03.21

In terms securing the good management of the meeting, it was also suggested that a timeframe be placed on the question time period allowed and that the questions be constrained to an agenda item and not be allowed to be applied to all remaining items on this agenda.

A 30 minute timeframe was suggested for these Cabinet Member questions and this was formally proposed by Councillor Dr Walsh as an amendment to Councillor Northeast's Motion without Notice 15 (m). Councillor Northeast confirmed that he was happy to accept this, however, Councillor Roberts asked if a further 15 minutes could be added to the 30 minute timeframe, to be applied at the Chairman's discretion. On this being put to the vote, it was declared CARRIED.

It was confirmed that the following Councillors [Members of the Overview Select Committee or those that had attended as substitutes], be permitted to ask the Cabinet questions. These were Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, Mrs Cooper, Cooper, Dixon, Edwards, English, Gunner, Huntley, Needs, Northeast, Roberts, Seex, Tilbrook and Thurston.

The following questions were then asked:

- (1) From Councillor Cooper to the Leader of the Council, or the appropriate Cabinet Member. In December there had been a meeting regarding much needed kelp beds organised by Wildlife Sussex. The Council had been asked to send two representatives, one from the Foreshore team with the other from the tourism team, though none of these Officers had attended what had been an important meeting. Reassurance was required that in the future, the appropriate Officer(s) would attend.

Councillor Walsh responded stating that he was a huge supporter of the kelp forest and that the extensions had now been confirmed from the east of Shoreham to Selsey. Councillor Walsh confirmed that he could not respond on the non-attendance of Officers, however, agreed that the Council needed to ensure that for all future meetings, attendance by the Council would be guaranteed.

- (2) From Councillor Gunner to the Leader of the Council regarding Littlehampton Regeneration, which was two years late, yet the Place St Maur project had sped ahead. Why was it that this administration no longer cared about Littlehampton?

Councillor Walsh confirmed that he represented part of Littlehampton on the County Council; the District Council and the Littlehampton Town Council. He confirmed that he cared very passionately about the Town and for its economic, social and health wellbeing. The reasons for the delay in the public realm works had already been explained in detail on several occasions. The money was there, the delays had been explained as being down to Covid and

contractual difficulties, and the scheme had now started and would be visible to the public from September onwards. Other schemes would be progressed for Littlehampton in response to the opportunity for the Council to apply for funding from the Levelling Up Fund and the Opening Up High Streets Fund.

A supplementary question was asked. This response was difficult to accept in terms of it being the reality. There had been many Member Briefings and Presentation on other major schemes, Littlehampton Community Wardens had no power over enforcement and so it felt that the commitment was not there – reassurance was requested that the Cabinet was committed to Littlehampton, not just Bognor Regis.

Councillor Walsh responded stating that the answer he had provided about the £3.4m being invested in the public realm for Littlehampton showed commitment. There were other attempts to incorporate the section that could not be achieved in that budget from the Station to the Church and Surrey Street and Beach Road. There were other schemes that would be looked at however it was impossible to pre-judge what the outcome of the Council's bid to the Levelling-Up Fund and Opening Up High Streets Fund would be.

- (3) From Councillor Huntley to the Leader of the Council regarding the Pagham Petition submitted to the Council on 8 February 2021. The Pandemic had had a slowing effect on processing this petition but why had no progress been made to allow it to be presented for discussion. If further valid signatures were submitted to make the required number to ensure Full Council debate, could assurance be given that this would be discussed at the earliest opportunity at Full Council?

The Interim Monitoring Officer responded explaining the varying reasons for the delay in validating this petition. He confirmed that if there were additional signatures that could be submitted, these should be so that these signatures could be added to those that had been confirmed as valid. If the required number of signatures were met to allow Full Council discussion [1,500], then it would be the next Full Council meeting on 12 May 2021 which would consider the petition.

A supplementary question was asked. There were about 1,483 signatures and at close of play today the total was 1,490 and so it was likely that further submissions would be made. This was a result of the over development at Pagham.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury, then made a statement on this item.

Full Council - 24.03.21

- (4) From Councillor Roberts to the Leader of the Council regarding the Foreshore Officers and an email exchange about a member of staff leaking the content of emails to the press with regard to their employment this season. Was the Leader of the Council aware of this email confirming to Foreshore Officers that they would not be employed this year?

Councillor Walsh confirmed that he had not seen that email but when he had been made aware of the comment made by that member of the Foreshore staff, he had spoken to the Chief Executive who agreed that it had been an internal leak from within the Council. As these were operational matters, it was felt inappropriate for him to see such emails passed between senior officers and staff members.

A supplementary question was asked. This was not about operational matters but about policy. The detail of the email referred to above was again reread by Councillor Roberts who asked for clarification.

Councillor Walsh confirmed that the Cabinet had made it clear that it wished to continue with the Foreshore service, and this had been carried out by Officers.

- (5) From Councillor Dixon regarding the Paghham Petition which had been submitted on 8 February 2021. This had taken too long for the Council to verify the signatures, though it was accepted that there were sound reasons for this. Had the Council verified the petition earlier, the petitioners would have had the opportunity to address the problems and could have met the requirements to have allowed debate at this Full Council meeting. There were good reasons as to why such a large proportion of names had been declared invalid and this was due to them residing outside of the District. Would it be possible to show the Ward Members a marked up copy of the petition showing the names that were disqualified and the reason so that they could feedback to the public, subject to GDPR guidelines.

The Interim Monitoring Officer responded stating that if the Cabinet Member for Planning was content for this information to be supplied, then this would be actioned. The Cabinet Member for Planning confirmed that he approved this course of action.

- (6) From Councillor Bicknell to the Leader of the Council regarding Littlehampton Regeneration and the contract for the public realm works. It was his understanding that all Members would have input in agreeing the design before the tender submission stage. When would the input and thoughts of Councillors be taken on board?

Councillor Walsh confirmed that Members of the Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee, as well as other Councillors, had been involved in looking at the designs and their progression and had taken part in a walkthrough of the area. The contract had been let, as confirmed earlier in the meeting, with the preliminary works already started with the visible construction works commencing in September 2021.

A supplementary question was asked. The walkthrough had not been effective, and the design proposals should have been reported to Members for approval. This had not taken place.

The Director of Place referred Councillor Bicknell back to the answers provided to the meeting of the Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee held on 11 March 2021. He had advised that the Council was in Stage 3 [the design stage] of this project and that Members would be presented with the final documents towards the end of April 2021 to allow them to give an indication as to whether the final sign-off for the design was acceptable. The Director of Place then explained the tender process to date and explained that a Members' Seminar would be organised soon.

- (7) Councillor Edwards to the Cabinet Member for Planning regarding the Pagham petition and whether sharing the petition would breach GDPR regulations.

Councillor Lury confirmed that if this was the case, the action proposed earlier would not be able to happen.

A supplementary question was asked and Councillor Edwards confirmed his view that he was pretty sure that to share the detail of the petition, with Ward Councillors, would be breaching GDPR rules.

The Interim Monitoring Officer confirmed that it would not be a breach of GDPR because those who had signed the petition had been made aware that their names and addresses would be made public. Disclosing this information to a closed group of Ward Councillors, with conditions of confidentiality applied, would meet the Council's requirements in respect of GDPR.

The Chairman then drew Cabinet Member questions to a close.

526. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 6 JANUARY 2021

The Chairman, Councillor Bennett, presented the minutes from the Development Control Committee held on 6 January 2021.

Full Council - 24.03.21

Councillor Coster then asked a question in relation to Minute 394 [Appeals] in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1. He confirmed that the first bullet point related to the Inglenook application and that he had only recently been made aware that at Development Control, Councillors could ask questions and discuss the appeals submitted and determined at the Committee. Councillor Coster then raised concerns in terms of the way this appeal had been dealt with by the Council and the Consultant that had been appointed to address the access issues and concerns raised by Members. He was concerned that Members who had been involved with this application had not been invited to take part in the appeals process and that generally, the case had been badly handled in various ways. Councillor Coster confirmed that he would be happy to receive a written response from Councillor Bennet on this matter.

527. OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE - 26 JANUARY 2021

The Chair, Councillor Northeast, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Overview Select Committee held on 26 January 2021.

528. ELECTORAL REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE - 28 JANUARY 2021

The Chair, Councillor Oppler, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Bognor Regis Sub-Committee held on 28 January 2021.

529. LICENSING COMMITTEE - 29 JANUARY 2021

The Chair, Councillor Oppler, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Bognor Regis Sub-Committee held on 28 January 2021.

530. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 3 FEBRUARY 2021

The Chair, Councillor Bennett, presented the Minutes from the Development Control Committee held on 3 February 2021.

531. HOUSING & CUSTOMER SERVICES WORKING GROUP - 4 FEBRUARY 2021

The Chair, Councillor Bennett, presented the Minutes from the meeting of the Housing & Customer Services Working Group held on 4 February 2021.

532. CABINET - 8 FEBRUARY 2021

The Chair, Councillor Walsh, presented the Minutes from the meeting of Cabinet held on 8 February 2021, with the exception of Minute 465 [Council Budget 2021/22], as this had been dealt with at the Special Meeting of the Council held on 17 February 2021.

Councillor Gunner then asked a question in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1 in relation to Minute 461 [Urgent Business] and forthcoming Elections to be held on 6 May 2021 which he wished to present to the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Corporate Support, Councillor Oppler. Planning for these elections, in a Covid-19 environment, had resulted in a staggering cut in the number of polling stations being provided. What consultation had the Cabinet Member undertaken with political parties and residents on this matter and was he comfortable with the provision of polling stations for this Election?

Councillor Oppler responded confirming that the Covid crisis had completely transformed the way in which the Council was able to conduct this Election. Central Government had taken the decision to allow the Elections to proceed and in response the Council had undertaken an extensive campaign in respect of encouraging people to take up postal votes as this was recognised as the most convenient and safest way to vote in this election. On polling stations, this had been a decision made by the Chief Executive, as the returning officer, and Councillor Oppler confirmed that he supported the decisions made.

The Chairman announced that as the duration of the meeting was nearing the threshold of 10.30 pm, in line with constitutional requirements, it was necessary to ask Councillors for their approval to extend the meeting to the maximum time allowed which was 11.00 pm, at which time the meeting would be adjourned if all business had not been concluded.

On putting this to the vote, this was CARRIED.

533. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 3 MARCH 2021

The Chair, Councillor Bennett, confirmed that the minutes from the meeting held on 3 March 2021 had not been included in the supplement pack and so would be presented to the next Full Council meeting held on 12 May 2021.

534. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

There were no changes in Committee Memberships to announce.

(The meeting concluded at 10.37 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT TO A MEETING OF FULL COUNCIL ON 12 MAY 2021

SUBJECT: Report on transition to Committee Style of Governance

REPORT AUTHOR: Solomon Agutu, Interim Monitoring Officer

DATE: 12 May 2021

EXTN: 37432

PORTFOLIO AREA:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This is a follow up status report on the progress of transition to the Committee style Constitution and associated matters. It explains that the revision and re-writing of the Constitution is complete and that the new Constitutional document is ready for publication and that at the request of Full Council this report is brought back after Members have been offered a briefing on the new Constitution.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Full is requested to:

1. Agree that the new Constitution (subject to any minor amendments made at this meeting) is published ready for use at the Annual Council meeting on 19 May 2021.

2. BACKGROUND

This is a follow up report arising from the Full Council resolution of 17 March 2021. The Full Council made a binding statutory resolution on 15 January 2020 (Minute 388) to change its form of governance to a Committee system effective from the Annual Council Meeting on 19 May 2021. The Constitution Working Party was convened to work through the necessary changes to the Council's Constitution and report back to the Full Council. The final report of CWP was presented to Full Council on 17 March 2021.

An officer status report was also presented to Full Council on 17 March 2021. That report explained that the constitutional document was being re written and proof-read and there was programme of Briefing for Officers and Members. A calendar of meetings has already been agreed by Full Council for 2021/2022 Municipal Year. Following consideration of that report Full Council RESOLVED that:

- (1) The completion of the writing of the new Constitution be noted;
- (2) The plans to brief Members on the contents of the new Constitution be noted;
- (3) It be agreed that on completion of the briefing for Members on the new Constitution, it will be submitted to Full Council on 12 May 2021 for publication; and
- (4) It be noted that the next meeting of the Constitution Working Party is scheduled for 28 June 2021.

Briefing for Members took place on 14 and 20 April 2021. 41 Members attended both sessions and 11 had not been able to attend. Full Council is now asked to agree the publication of the Constitution.

3. OPTIONS:

There is a legal requirement for the constitution to be published so there is no option not to publish.

4. CONSULTATION:

Has consultation been undertaken with:	YES	NO
Relevant Town/Parish Council	NA	
Relevant District Ward Councillors	NA	
Other groups/persons (please specify)	NA	
5. ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS IN RELATION TO THE FOLLOWING COUNCIL POLICIES: (Explain in more detail at 6 below)	YES	NO
Financial		NO
Legal	yes	
Human Rights/Equality Impact Assessment	yes	
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime & Disorder Act		NO
Sustainability	yes	
Asset Management/Property/Land		NO
Technology		
Other (please explain)		

6. IMPLICATIONS:

LEGAL :The Council must publish a new Constitution before the Annual Council Meeting on 19 May 2021 as this is the “relevant change time” (ie the effective date) for moving to a Committee system form of governance defined in the Council’s statutory resolution of 15 January 2020. Whilst the legislation allows the Council to delay the “relevant change time” for introducing its new arrangements, there is no provision to delay this once the date has been resolved. In addition, the Council cannot make a further change to its governance

arrangements for a period of 5 years from the date of its statutory resolution, ie not before 15 January 2025, unless this decision is approved by a referendum.

These provisions are set out in Sections 9L and 9KC of the Local Government Act 2000 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011)

EQUALITIES: Under the public sector equality duty (section 149 Equality Act 2010)the council has a duty to consider the impact of policies on people who share protected characteristics - the review of the constitution considered start and finish times of meetings with a view to not disadvantaging those Members and Staff with caring responsibilities or those Members and Staff who are disabled.

SUSTAINABILITY: In accordance with policy of reducing the use of paper the constitution is to be published on the Council website and no hard (paper)copies are intended to be produced.

7. REASON FOR THE DECISION:

To comply with the decision of Full Council to move to a Committee style of governance and to comply with the legal requirement to publish the Constitution

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

The 2021 Constitution - [The 2021 Constitution](#)

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 12

Subject to approval at the next Development Control Committee meeting

531

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

3 March 2021 at 2.30 pm

Present: Councillors Bennett (Chairman), Ms Thurston (Vice-Chair), B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Charles, Coster, Edwards, Mrs Hamilton, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Pendleton, Roberts, Tilbrook, Mrs Warr and Mrs Yeates

Councillor Huntley were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

Apologies: Councillors

Chairman's Announcement

The Chairman announced that after consultation with the Committee the new start times for the Committee would be 13:30pm for the remaining meetings of this municipal year.

503. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman declared a personal interest in item 15 [R/227/20/PL Laundry, 38 Oakhurst Gardens, Rustington BN16 3AN] as a member of Rustington Parish Council.

Cllr Mrs Yeates declared a prejudicial interest in item 14 [P/1/21/PL Land at Summer Lane, Pagham] as she knew one of the applicants.

504. MINUTES

Councillors Coster and Mrs Pendleton wanted it clarified, that in Minute 456 [*SD8 – Ford Strategic Site Allocation, Masterplan Document Endorsement Report*] in the last paragraph the name of the road should read Horsemere Green Lane and not Horsemere Road. It was also mentioned that the direction of the road referenced in the minute should state a direction of north-east, not east.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2021 were then put to the vote and approved by the Committee, it was also agreed that the Chairman would sign the minutes as soon as practicably possible.

505. AB/109/20/HH WHITE COTTAGE, 32 KING STREET, ARUNDEL BN18 9BW

2 Public Speakers

Alistair Smith - Objector
Jennifer & Anthony Moore – Applicant

Development Control Committee - 3.03.21

Rear single storey extension for new kitchen and living area, internal alterations, new and adjusted windows and doors, part replacement roof structure with 2 x conservation roof lights to the main building, re-covering of main roof and partial re-build of the detached garage with replacement pitched roof. This application affects the character & appearance of the Arundel Conservation Area & may affect the setting of listed buildings.

The Planning Officer presented his report including matters detailed in the update report. This was followed by two Public Speakers and response to comments made was provided by the Planning Officer.

On turning to the debate, one member spoke and stated that he was pleased with the actions that had been taken by the applicant, neighbour and officers to resolve the previous disputes that had been raised.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report and report update subject to the conditions outlined.

506. AL/79/20/OUT LAND WEST OF HOOK LANE, HOOK LANE, WESTERGATE PO 20 ETE

2 Public Speakers

1 – Wendy Corney - Objector
2 – Jeremy Farrelly – Agent

Outline planning application with some matters reserved (Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping are to be determined as reserved matters) for the construction of 10 No. dwellings & the creation of a new vehicular & pedestrian access on to Hook Lane. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan.

The Planning Officer presented his report including matters detailed in the update report. This was followed by Public Speakers and response was provided by the Planning Officer.

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including how many of the houses would be affordable and what would the section 106 advantages be for this application. Concerns were raised regarding both entrances for this application, the impact on the landscape, road safety and traffic flow through Oving Road to join the A27.

The Planning Officer provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report and report update subject to the conditions outlined.

507. AW/3/21/HH 4 SHORECROFT, ALDWICK PO21 4AS

4 Public Speakers

- 1- Cllr Alan Smith – Aldwick Parish Council
- 2 – Stan Woolhead - Objector
- 3 – Danielle Delaney – Applicant
- 4 – Tom Hayes - Supporter

Single storey rear extension and loft conversion with enlarged rear dormer window and two modest front facing dormer windows. Alterations to fenestration, Canopy to side elevation, Planter and replacement handrail to roof terrace.

The Planning Officer presented his report including matters detailed in the update report. This was followed by Public Speakers and response was provided by the Planning Officer.

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including concerns regarding the dormer windows at the front of the property and did these comply with the Council's design guide as well as concerns raised relating to the impact on the street scene, the glass obscurity at the back of the property as well as discussion in reference to these windows being non-openable.

The Planning Officer and the Group Head of Planning both provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

On further discussion regarding the windows at the back of the property it was then proposed and duly seconded that a condition be added to the application to ensure that the dormer windows at the back of the property were to be non-openable and fully obscured glazing.

The Planning Officer then presented Members with the new condition to be added to the recommendation and this was that the rear dormer hereby approved shall have non-openable and fully obscured glazed windows to be installed prior to the first use of the rooms the windows shall be retained as obscured glazed and non-openable in perpetuity, in line with DDM1 and DDM4 of the Local Plan

Development Control Committee - 3.03.21

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report, report update and subject to the conditions outlined.

508. BN/151/20/PL LAND AT REAR OF POACHERS, EASTERGATE LANE, EASTERGATE PO20 3SJ

1 Public Speaker

1 – Mr Occleshaw – Applicant

Erection of 1 No. 4 bedroom detached dwelling with detached carport (resubmission following BN/46/20/PL). This site is in CIL Zone 3 & is CIL Liable as new dwelling & is a Departure from the Development Plan.

The Planning Officer presented his report. This was followed by a Public Speaker and response was provided by the Planning Officer.

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including the reasons for the refusal and whether these were both consistent with previous approved applications and strong enough in face of an appeal, access issues and width of the drive, the nature of the built up area boundary, support for this application from the parish council, no objections from neighbours, the generous garden to house ratio and the carbon negative nature of the application. The Planning Officer provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

In response to the Chairman asking for advice in terms of the committee going against the officer recommendation, the Group Head of Planning clarified that in order to make a lawful decision the committee would need to be very specific as to why they wanted to disagree with the officer's recommendation and, in order to approve the application, would need to reference the specific policies and material considerations. The Arun District Council Solicitor added that it would be departure from the development plan and that this would also have to be detailed in the reasons as well.

On the Chairman's casting vote

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be REFUSED as detailed in the report.

(Chairman called an adjournment to the meeting at 16:34pm and the meeting resumed at 16:50pm)

509. K/55/20/PL 57 COASTAL ROAD, KINGSTON BN16 1SN

2 Public Speakers

- 1 – Cllr Roger Wetherall – Kingston parish Council
- 2 – David Sawers - Objector

Demolition & erection of 1 No. dwelling. This application is in CIL Zone 4 and is CIL Liable as new dwelling.

The Planning Officer presented his report. This was followed by Public Speakers and response was provided by the Planning Officer.

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including the impact of the design on both the road and Greensward facades, the design moving the building line nearer to the Greensward and the detrimental effect this might have, whether the style of design was in keeping with the pre-existing road architecture and whether the proposed materials were appropriate for the setting. The Planning Officer provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be REFUSED as the proposed dwelling by reason of its increase in rear projection and alien materials will have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with policies D DM1 and D SP1 of the Arun Local Plan and policy KPNP7 of the Kingston Neighbourhood Plan.

510. LU/13/21/PL 125 BAYFORD ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON BN17 5HW

(Cllr Blanchard-Cooper declared a personal interest in this item as a Member of Littlehampton Town Council)

3 Public Speakers

- 1 – Cllr Freddy Tandy – Littlehampton Town Council
- 2 – Adrian Bradford – Objector
- 3 – Gareth Giles – Agent

Change of use of existing single dwelling house (C3) to an 8-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (Sui Generis).

The Planning Officer presented his report. This was followed by Public Speakers and response was provided by the Planning Officer.

Development Control Committee - 3.03.21

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including parking concerns, one Member asked if a Parking survey had been completed in the area recently, the majority of the debate concentrated on the parking issues that could be presented with a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO) of this size being approved with only 2 parking spaces at the rear of the property included in the application an additional concern with the parking spaces at the rear of the property was that would this leave sufficient open-space for a HMO of this size. Member's asked for clarification on the open-space concern and the Planning Officer advised that the size of the Garden inclusive of the 2 parking spaces was sufficient and not a valid refusal reason.

Further debate followed, and the Chairman expressed that the Committee were in a difficult position with this application.

The Planning Officer provided members with answers to all further points raised during the debate.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report and report update subject to the conditions outlined.

511. LU/295/20/PL 15 BEACH ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON BN17 8HZ

1 Public Speaker

1 – Graham Nicolls - Agent

Full Planning application incorporating permitted change of use of part of the existing office (A2 Professional & Financial Services) & use to form 2 No. dwellings (C3 Dwelling houses) on the two upper floors (resubmission following LU/107/20PL). This site is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as flats.

The Planning Officer presented his report. This was followed by Public Speakers and response was provided by the Planning Officer.

Members then turned to the debate on the application where a number of points were raised including the permitted development rights that the applicant had without the approval of this application and the external space available once converted to flats was a concern.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there were balconies proposed in the application to allow for further external space and that it should also be considered that the coastal promenade was close to the location.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report and report update subject to the conditions outlined.

512. LU/327/20/PL 38 ARUNDEL ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON BN17 7DB

No Public Speakers

Application under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 2015 for the change of use of single dwelling house to 2 No. residential apartments & associated external alterations. This site is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as flats.

The Planning Officer presented his report to members.

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised around the issue of parking. These included whether the Council was contravening its own parking standards and risked creating potential parking issues and access difficulties for larger vehicles. It was noted that where the council's parking standards had previously been applied, these had been rejected by a planning inspector. The creation of off-street parking would have involved part-removal of a flint wall, a characteristic of the area. Proximity to both bus and train options and public parking spaces was considered sufficient mitigation for approval. The possibility of car-free development, no car conditions on occupants and residents permit parking were mentioned as topics for possible future discussion.

Concerns were also raised about the foundations of the current extension and whether each apartment had a designated garden.

The Planning Officer provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report and report update subject to the conditions outlined.

Development Control Committee - 3.03.21

513. P/1/21/PL LAND AT SUMMER LANE, PAGHAM

(Cllr Mrs Yeates declared a prejudicial interest in this item and left the meeting before discussion of the application and Cllr Mrs Hamilton declared a personal interest in this item during the debate as member of Pagham Parish Council)

1 Public Speakers

1 – Cllr David Huntley – Ward Member

Material change of use of land from agricultural use to use for open space. This application is in part a Departure from the Development Plan, affects a Public Right of Way & is in CIL Zone 5 (Zero Rated) as other development.

The Planning Officer presented his report including matters detailed in the update report. This was followed by one Public Speaker and a response by way of clarification was provided by the Council's Solicitor.

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including if this application was approved then the landowners would have two approved applications to pick from, one member raised that the proposed change of use of the land was contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the local plan TFP1 and the Arun Local Plan and for these reasons highlighted the refusal reasons were clear. Clarification was sought with regard to what effect would approving this application have on the current approved application.

The Council's Solicitor and the Group Head of Planning both provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be REFUSED as detailed in the report and report update.

514. R/227/20/PL LAUNDRY, 38 OAKHURST GARDENS, RUSTINGTON BN16 3AN

[Cllr Bennett declared a personal interest in this item as a member of Rustington Parish Councillor]

4 Public Speakers

- 1 – Cllr Peter Warren – Rustington Parish Council
- 2 – Emily Scott – Agent
- 3 – Peter Cleveland – Supporter
- 4 – Cllr Terry Chapman – Ward Member

Demolition of existing laundry building lean to & shed, construction of a ground & first storey accommodation building housing 3 No. sheltered housing flats & construction of a single storey laundry building including upgrade of associated clothes drying area & surrounding landscaping. This site is in CIL Zone 5 (Zero Rated) as sheltered housing.

The Planning Officer presented his report including matters detailed in the update report. This was followed by Public Speakers and a response was provided by the Planning Officer.

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including concerns over the amenity space, an unacceptable overlook for the neighbours and the distances documented versus the Arun Design Guide acceptable distance. There was also a concern raised regarding the trees that would be planted to create a visual screen and could consideration be given to fast growing trees.

The Planning Officer provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report and report update subject to the conditions outlined.

515. APPEALS

(Cllr Mrs Pendleton had left this meeting at the start of this item).

The Committee received and noted the appeals list within the agenda.

(The meeting concluded at 7.07 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 13

Subject to approval at the next Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee meeting

13

LITTLEHAMPTON REGENERATION SUB-COMMITTEE

11 March 2021 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Miss Seex (Chairman), Bicknell, Buckland, Mrs Caffyn, Goodheart, Gunner, Miss Rhodes and Dr Walsh

Councillors Cooper, Mrs Cooper, Dixon, Edwards and Roberts were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

Apologies: Councillor B Blanchard-Cooper

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made.

20. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the last meeting of the Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee held on 7 October 2020 were approved and it was agreed that the Chairman would sign these as soon as practicably possible.

21. SEAFRONT REGENERATION REPORT

The Director of Place presented this report, which was requested by the Covid-19 Recovery Working Group to consider regeneration matters relating to the sea front. The report brought together ideas put forward for Littlehampton, but it was made clear that officers had not put forward a specific plan of actions and had rather provided members with a list from which they could decide for which they would like to seek more information. He noted that the report had been written before the latest central Government Budget announcements. In particular the Levelling Up fund was brought to members' attention. Arun District Council had the opportunity to consider making a bid for funding under the scheme and members could consider whether any of the ideas in the report might go into a bid submission. The bid process would be competitive, and any submission would need to refresh and tightly focus a lot of the information this report already picked up on to demonstrate the Council's vision, as well as garner support from the local MP. He reminded members that the issue of financial resources was previously responsible for limiting regeneration ambitions.

The Chairman thanked the Director of Place for his report and opened up the debate to members. Members raised many points including support for improvements to parking facilities, support from the leaseholders of Harbour Park who were keen to move things forward and supported many of the ideas in the report, the need for 'oven ready' attractive project proposals that could be worked into visually exciting bids and how key the Levelling Up fund would be to delivering these, the need to develop the staying guest market with their larger spend per head, the possibility of investigating private sector funding opportunities in support of development, allaying the fears of

local businesses by working in liaison with them and the need for members to provide direction and leadership and give the public confidence that they can deliver.

Members also raised concerns over the age of the evidence in the report and whether any progress had been made since their original publication, the ordering and potential prioritisation of the projects that did not seem to reflect the scoring system employed, accommodation not being mentioned in the report and the current movement in the hospitality and tourism sectors that may hinder partnership.

The Director of Place provided members with answers to all points raised. The Chief Executive concluded the debate by stressing to members that firstly officers needed to establish what councillors wanted and secondly that officers needed the delegated power to determine how best to get there.

The Sub - Committee

RECOMMENDS TO FULL COUNCIL that;

- 1) the sub-committee supports the development of projects, including possible bids for funding to the levelling up fund, for new green and beach links, improvements to the Promenade and secondly the creation of a vision for the redevelopment of the harbour park and windmill area, exploring options for the provision of a cinema/theatre in the town.
- 2) the sub-committee supports engagement with any leaseholders
- 3) a progress report be submitted to the Economic Committee.

22. ARUN CYCLE WAY FEASIBILITY STUDY

The Director of Place presented his report. Members then took part in a full debate where a number of points were raised including a perceived lack of content to the study, whether a cycling proposal should more appropriately be considered at County level or by the Environment and Leisure Working Group, the high cost and the possibility of reducing that cost through redesign, whether other cycle routes should be prioritised that better connect outlying communities or improve commuter links between Arundel and Ford train station, the economic benefits of cycling and the benefits to tourism, the potential of using such a cycle way as an entrance to Littlehampton upon which guest accommodation could be located and as this was external funding earmarked for cycling infrastructure it was better to use it than lose it.

The Director of Place provided members with answers to all points raised and concluded that the cycle way was an exciting project in an attractive location making more of an underdeveloped resource from a tourism perspective which was one of the objectives of the Arun Local Plan. The Chief Executive confirmed that the funding was coming from the Business Rate Pool fund and was to deliver particular projects for cycling development.

The Sub – Committee noted the report update.

23. LITTLEHAMPTON REGENERATION POSITION STATEMENT

The Littlehampton Town Centre Regeneration Officer provided members with an overview of each item contained within the position statement. Members were then able to ask a series of questions of which are highlighted below;

- What powers would Community Wardens have and what was the source of the funding of the £90k contribution received from the Safer Arun Partnership and how would success be evaluated on this and finally would the Wardens be active throughout the entire town and what were the controls for these areas? The Regeneration Officer advised that a member briefing was to be organised by Community Safety colleagues an answer on his questions would be provided in writing outside of the meeting.
- Clarification was sought on why the Community Wardens in Littlehampton were being subsidised by Arun District Council when the Bognor Regis Community Wardens were subsidised by the Bognor Regis Bid.
- In reference to the Littlehampton Traders Partnership update, clarification was sought on those businesses who were not part of the partnership specifically if they made financial contributions to the parking fund.
- In reference to the Market and events update, there was general discussion of support for a Youth Market to be organised as well as clarification sought regarding if the Artisan Market would be continuing. The Regeneration Officer advised that there would be a number of events planned on easing of restrictions and that they may incorporate elements of the Artisan Market.
- Clarification was sought in terms of whether funding was directly coming from Arun District Council for the Art Works and answers were provided by the Regeneration Officer and the Chief Executive.
- Free Parking over the Christmas period was raised as an interest point and would this be considered again for December 2021.
- Gigabit West Sussex the Regeneration Officer advised Members that a further update had been provided too late to update members prior to the meeting today, he advised that this update would be circulated after the meeting.
- Fitzalan Link, Lyminster Bypass it was confirmed that by end of May 2021 the link road (northern section) would be completed and the Southern section by September 2021. Members raised a number of concerns that had been driven from members of the public specifically relating to the height of the fence that was to be erected as well as concerns over the agreed 40mph speed limit of the new road. It was confirmed by the Chairman that all complaints that had been received were in the process of being dealt with and the Director of Place advised that he was in the

process of reviewing all of the reports and would provide all members with a comprehensive update report outside of the meeting.

- St Martins Car Park, it was confirmed that progress on this item had been stifled due to the pandemic, however there were several options still being considered for this area, development being one of those.
- Concern was raised regarding the number of empty shops in the town centre. The Director of Place provided a response to this concern.

The Chairman then invited the Director of Place to provide an update to members on the Littlehampton Public Realm project management. Following this update members then raised the following points;

- The Leader of the Opposition felt that this project had been a public relations disaster and that the Leader of the Council did not have a handle on the project, stating that it was behind schedule by 2 years not 2 weeks as the Sub-Committee had been advised. The Director of Place provided full and detailed response on the points raised.
- Concerns raised over the consultation process with Members, it was stated by the Chairman that she felt that members had not been consulted specifically in relation to Beech Road section of the plan. She sought reassurance that progress would be made swiftly.
- Further concerns were raised by members on the possibility of changing some of the decisions that had currently been made in reference to Phase 3 being stopped and the monies that would have been spent there being redirected to Phases 1 and 2. The Director of Place advised on the consequences of this decision being made and that it would involve going back to the drawing board entirely.
- Further discussion was had in reference to concerns that had been made in November 2020 and again in January 2021. It was stated that the Leader of the Council advised in January 2021 that work would start in May 2021. It was also queried of the Leader of the Council sat on the Project Board membership. The Leader of the Council provided full and detailed response.
- Further discussion was had on the membership of the Project Board, and clarification was sought from members as to who were the correct Officers to liaise. The Leader of the Council and the Director of Place advised that attendance of the project board meetings could be discussed outside of this meeting and that for clarity if members have questions in relation to this project the officer to engage with was the Director of Place.

The Chief Executive advised members that he listened and taken on board the comments that had been made very passionately tonight. Her stated that improvements were needed in how good, open communication with Members is key to keep everyone in the loop. He reassured members that he would be having discussions to move this forward.

The Chairman then thanked all those in attendance at the meeting tonight and a closed the meeting.

Subject to approval at the next Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee meeting

17

Littlehampton Regeneration Sub-Committee - 11.03.21

(The meeting concluded at 9.39 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 14

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

15

HOUSING & CUSTOMER SERVICES WORKING GROUP

16 March 2021 at 6.00 pm

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

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

Apologies: Councillors Mrs Catterson and Goodheart

24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

25. MINUTES

The minutes of the Housing and Customer Services Working Group meeting held on 4 February 2021 were approved.

26. REPAIRS HANDBOOK

The Business Improvement Manager provided members with an overview of her report. She then drew members attention to the Repairs Handbook being a guide to tenants outlining common repair issues and clarifying at a glance where repair responsibilities lay, that it was also an opportunity to provide home safety advice and detail around the Council's compliance responsibilities as a landlord and, as a tool for communicating with residents, was an addition to the Council's commitment to improving the service delivery details shared with each tenant.

Members then took part in a full debate and points raised included commendation to the people involved in drafting it, praise for the idea of checking ID of people before letting them in, the communication between contractors and householders when making arrangements for repair, whether guidelines are issued for how long to expect to wait before a repair is done and the possibility of making more explicit the fact that the illustrative lists of repairs in the handbook were indicative and not exhaustive so that tenants would be clear about theirs' and the Council's responsibilities.

The Business Improvement Manager and Group Head of Residential Services provided full answers to the points raised. It was confirmed that the timing of repairs was agreed between the contractor and householder at the time of arranging the appointment and that the illustrative list not being exhaustive was to be emphasised in the final version of the handbook in multiple locations including a clearly marked paragraph at the beginning of the guide.

Based on members approving a revised version without having seen it and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman approving the final version before it went onto on the website,

The Working Group

RECOMMEND to Cabinet that:

- 1) the Tenants Repair Handbook be adopted; and
- 2) delegated authority be given to the Group Head of Residential Services to approve changes to the handbook

27. INCOME RECOVERY POLICY

The Neighbourhood Services Manager provided members with an overview of her report. She then drew members attention to recognising that rental income was the main source of income to the Housing Revenue Account and that maximising the collection of rent ensured that the Council was able to deliver essential services to tenants in terms of managing their tenancies and investing in the Council's properties. She explained the policy set out a robust approach to collecting rent but also recognised many residents required support and advice in making payments so that they could sustain their tenancies.

The Working Group

RECOMMEND to Cabinet that;

- 1) the Income Policy 2021 be adopted;
- 2) delegated authority be given to the Group Head of Residential Services to make changes to the Policy.

28. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR POLICY

The Neighbourhood Services Manager provided members with an overview of her report. She drew members attention to section 218 of the Housing Act 2004 which required social landlords to publish a policy and procedure for dealing with reports of anti-social behaviour. She explained that the Council currently dealt with a very high level of anti-social behaviour, approximately 30 reports a month, the majority of which was drug related. She noted that it was important for staff and residents to have clear guidelines on how the Council will deal with any reports, and in particular how this policy would support victims in terms of making sure that the Council was very clear on the support it provided as well as how it investigated and dealt with anti-social behaviour.

The Working Group

RECOMMEND to Cabinet that;

- 1) the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy 2021 be adopted; and
- 2) delegated authority be given to the Group Head of Residential Services to make changes to the Policy

29. DECANT POLICY

The Neighbourhood Services Manager provided members with an overview of her report. She explained that a decant was when the Council needed to do work to a property but could not carry out the work with the tenant in situ, whether that be a tenant, a licence or a leaseholder in shared ownership, due to the work being extensive or because it would take a very long time so there would be significant disruption to the resident. She noted that the policy set out clearly for both staff and residents the stages of which a decant was considered permanent or temporary, and the support and advice offered in addition to any statutory payments to recompense the residents for having to move when ordinarily they would not have chosen to.

The Working Group

RECOMMEND to Cabinet;

- 1) the Decant Policy 2021 be adopted; and
- 2) delegated authority be given to the Group Head of Residential Services to make changes to the Policy.

30. ANNUAL TENANTS REPORT 2019/20

The Group Head of Residential Services provided members with an overview of her report. She drew members attention to Appendix 1, the Annual Report to Tenants and Leaseholders 2019/20, which detailed the range of activity across the housing service for that year.

The Working Group then noted the report.

31. REPORT BACK FROM CABINET/FULL COUNCIL

The Chairman confirmed to the Working Group that the recommendations made to Cabinet from the last meeting held on 4 February 2021 were yet to be reported to Cabinet. They were scheduled to be reported to Cabinet next week on 22 March 2021.

Housing & Customer Services Working Group - 16.03.21

32. WORK PROGRAMME

The Chairman confirmed to the Working Group that there was no Work Programme to review or approve, due to the change in Governance structure that would be implemented by the Council in May 2021. The Work Programme for the New Residential & Wellbeing Services Committee would be agreed at its first meeting on 3 June 2021, under the new Governance Structure.

The Chairman took the opportunity to thank everyone involved in the Working Group over the past 2 years he had been Chairman. He commented that the team had achieved a lot and that there was a lot to be very proud of. The Vice-Chairman added her thanks to the whole team and noted how well they had performed and how appreciated the amount of work they had put in was.

(The meeting concluded at 6.23 pm)

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 15

Subject to approval at the next Cabinet meeting

415

CABINET

22 March 2021 at 5.00 pm

Present: Councillors Dr Walsh (Chairman), Coster, Mrs Gregory, Lury, Stanley, Mrs Staniforth and Mrs Yeates

Councillors Bennett, Bicknell, Bower, Clayden, Cooper, Mrs Cooper, Edwards, English, Gunner, Huntley, Mrs Pendleton and Roberts were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

[Note: The following Councillors were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters detailed in the Minutes indicated – Councillor Mrs Yeates – Minute 501 to Minute 503 (Part)].

Apologies: Councillors Oppler

486. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Members, Officers, non-Cabinet Members, representatives from Land Use and those watching this from the public and press for the eleventh virtual meeting of Cabinet. He provided a brief summary of how the meeting would be conducted and the protocol that would be followed and how any break in the proceedings due to technical difficulties would be managed.

487. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

488. QUESTION TIME

The Chairman confirmed that no questions had been submitted for this meeting.

489. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chairman confirmed that there was one urgent item for this meeting regarding the sound barriers on the Fitzalan Road extension in Littlehampton.

The Chairman invited the Chief Executive to update the Cabinet. He explained that he had only very recently been made aware of a problem with the height of the barriers which were originally understood to be 2.5m high but had now been raised to a height of 3.5m. In view of the concerns expressed by Councillors, he had approached Officers at West Sussex County Council to see if the concerns raised over the height of the barrier could be addressed and reduced to a more satisfactory level. The Executive Director of Place and Services at West Sussex County Council had confirmed that the County Council had raised the issue of the fence height with the developer who was exploring the options available. A further update was expected soon and the Chief Executive confirmed that he would report this back to Members.

Cabinet - 22.03.21

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury, asked whether by reducing the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph the barrier height could be returned to 2.5m, but reiterated that the issue was a County Council Highway matter. He did note that he was pleased that the Council had at least tried through different channels to talk to West Sussex County Council and the developer, and thought that it would be useful if Cabinet could draft a letter to the County Council to add further pressure. The Chairman agreed that a letter would be sent urging WSCC to reconsider the proposed speed limit on the new road which was located in an urban setting and very near to a school.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED

That a letter be sent to West Sussex County Council urging reconsideration of the proposed speed limit on the new road.

490. MINUTES

The minutes from the meeting of Cabinet held on 8 February 2021 were approved as a correct by Cabinet. The Chairman confirmed that these would be signed at the earliest opportunity to him.

491. BUDGET VARIATION REPORTS

There were no matters discussed.

492. CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

The Chairman requested and Cabinet agreed to a change in the order of the Agenda allowing Agenda Item 9 [Place St Maur and Esplanade Project, Bognor Regis] to be considered next as there were external representatives in attendance.

493. PLACE ST MAUR AND ESPLANADE PROJECT, BOGNOR REGIS

The Chairman welcomed Ed Manning, Principal Landscape Architect and Alex Massey, Associate Landscape Architect, from Land Use Consultants (LUC) to the meeting. He then invited the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services, Councillor Mrs Staniforth, to introduce this item. She highlighted that the Place St Maur project had reached an important stage with the conclusion of the public consultation process. As part of the report, an update would be provided on the results of the consultation and how the project team had used the feedback to produce the preferred design for the site. Councillor Mrs Staniforth confirmed that she was delighted that consultants from LUC were in attendance to present the key findings from the consultation undertaken.

The Principal Landscape & Project Officer emphasised that if approved, the design would become frozen to ensure the landscape architects were working to a fixed scope that would avoid any impact on the cost and programme of the project which she noted was already very tight. Ed Manning and Alex Massey from LUC then gave their

presentation including the results of the consultation and an explanation of their designs.

The Chairman thanked them and then invited questions from Cabinet Members. Councillors Stanley, Staniforth, Yeates and Lury spoke in favour of the design proposal. Questions were asked around how the consultation compared with other projects LUC had been involved with, how the design may positively impact issues around anti-social behaviour and the colour of paving during the winter months when the water jets would be switched off. LUC responded that the level of engagement with the consultation was significantly higher than with some other projects they had been involved with, that design could reinvigorate civic pride in areas that could positively impact behaviour and that paving design was likely to develop throughout the project.

Questions were asked by Non-Cabinet Councillors about whether this was the extent of regeneration in Bognor Regis, why the preferred option was neither of the two designs in the consultation, the return on investment, the maintenance of the water jets and lights and the costs involved, the impact of bad weather on performance, the budget for the project, the speed of delivery, the use of green energy and the storage and movement of the moveable items involved. The Chairman, LUC, Principal Landscape & Project Officer and Group Head of Technical Services provided Councillors with answers to all points raised.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED

That the designs presented at the meeting for the Place St Maur and the Esplanade be approved, and that the delivery of Place St Maur is progressed in line with the project programme.

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/056/22032021, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

494. ARUN IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME - UPDATE

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Stanley, to introduce this item. He noted that this year had been busier than previous years due to the impacts of the pandemic and he thanked the team for all their work whilst still making progress on other significant projects such as the digital agenda. The Head of Technology & Digital then highlighted key aspects of the report including it having been a very busy year, the change of priorities with a shift to a mostly homeworking Council still delivering services but remotely and the building of new applications and channels to make it easier for customers to deal with the Council over the internet whilst still managing to deliver planned major projects.

The Chairman thanked the Head of Technology & Digital and his team for all their work that had allowed the Council to continue delivering its services during the lockdown. Questions were asked by Non-Cabinet Councillors about website

Cabinet - 22.03.21

development and search engine functionality. The Head of Technology & Digital provided Members with answers to all points raised.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED

To note the activities of the Arun Improvement Programme.

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/057/22032021, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

495. OPTIONS TO PROGRESS WEBCAST IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Stanley, to introduce this item. He explained that after discussion at Full Council in September 2020, where webcasting upgrade options were put forward, it was agreed that the matter be referred back to Cabinet for an update. The Director of Place then presented the detail of the report.

The Chairman thanked the Director of Place and then invited questions and comments from Cabinet Members. Councillor Stanley, stated that having reflected on the discussion and concerns raised at Full Council, he proposed making some small amendments to Recommendation 1 in the report, which was that the upgrades to the webcasting system set out in the table within the report be approved apart from:

- The projector and screen upgrades – new laser projector and screen = £18,000
- Replacement screens at outlying desks - £7,000

The remaining items listed were then proposed to be agreed as the upgrades needed to the webcasting system and that a supplementary estimate in the sum of £40k for these one-off projects costs for the webcasting hardware installation be approved. The amount that this equates for a Band D property in terms of equivalent Council Tax to be reported at the Full Council meeting.

Councillors Lury and Mrs Gregory also spoke in support of this. Questions were asked by Non-Cabinet Councillors about the essentiality of the proposed upgrades and how the Council was working to futureproof these upgrades. The Director of Place provided Members with answers to all points raised.

The Cabinet

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL – That

- (1) Approval be given to those items listed in Table A, with the exception of the projector and screen upgrades (£18,000) and replacement screens at outlying desks (£7,000), and that a supplementary estimate in the sum of £40,000 be approved for the one-off project cost for the webcasting hardware installation. The amount that this equates to for a Band D property in terms of equivalent Council Tax will be reported to Full Council verbally.
- (2) The proposed action to purchase the hardware required to facilitate hybrid meetings is noted; and
- (3) Subject to the approval of recommendation (1), to approve the additional on-going revenue costs for annual maintenance and broadband subscription of £21k per annum to be included in the Budget for 2021/22.

The Cabinet also

RESOLVED

That approval be given to extending the contract with the current provider of webcasting facilities for a further 12 months until June 2022.

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/058/22022021, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

496. CUSTOMER SERVICES STRATEGY

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services, Councillor Mrs Staniforth, to introduce this item. She explained that this report set out the Customer Services Strategy 2021 – 2026 and included the process for implementation to embed it into the organisation. This new Strategy was the culmination of work within the organisation and promoted a vision which aimed to put the customer at the heart of everything that the Council did. The Strategy included a Customer Charter which set out what the Council's customers should expect and the Council was committed to do.

The Group Head of Neighbourhood Services then presented the detail of the report. He emphasised the aim of strategy to be a customer focussed organisation working to understand our customers better and put them at the heart of everything the Council does and support customers to do more for themselves, and further noted the customer charter.

Cabinet - 22.03.21

The Chairman thanked the Group Head of Neighbourhood Services and then invited questions and comments from Cabinet Members. Following a Cabinet Member question, it was confirmed that the strategy applied to all aspects of the Council's business and all interactions with customers. A Non-Cabinet Member asked about the 10 day response rule. The Group Head of Neighbourhood Services provided Members with answers to all points raised.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED

To formally adopt the Customer Services Strategy 2021- 2026 and approve the process of implementation to embed it into the organisation.

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/059/22032021, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

497. ANTI-GRAFFITI SYSTEMS LTD - TRADING AS AGS ONE - ADMISSIONS AGREEMENT TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSION SCHEME

(Councillor Dr Walsh declared a personal interest in this item in his capacity as a Trustee of the West Sussex Pensions Scheme administered by West Sussex County Council.)

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Stanley, to introduce this item. He reminded Cabinet Members that in January of last year, Cabinet had resolved to outsource the Council's Pest Control service and that following a competitive procurement process, the contract for delivery of the Council's Pest Control service had been awarded to AGS One who began operating the service on 1 March in a seamless transfer of the function. As expected, this had led to savings for the taxpayer and overall lower prices for customers using the service, whilst securing quality service provision.

The Group Head of Technical Services provided further background explaining that at the time of transfer of the function to our new contractor, there was a member of staff engaged in the delivery of the pest control service. The member of staff was TUPE transferred to the contractor and in accordance with TUPE regulations, the new employer was obliged to ensure that the staff member received a pension no less favourable than the Local Government Pension Scheme. The solution to resolving this situation was for the contractor to become an admitted body to the Local Government Pension Scheme. To do this, West Sussex County Council required Arun to be a guarantor in the event that AGS One failed to make their employer contributions. The report set out the proposal that Cabinet should recommend that Full Council should agree to act as guarantor.

The Cabinet

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL

That the Council acts as a guarantor in respect of any and all pension liabilities which may arise through the term of the Pest Control Contract and delegated authority is given to Legal Services to enter into the Admission Agreement and Guarantee.

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/060/220321, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

498. CONTRACT AWARD FOR PASSIVE FIRE WORKS FOR COUNCIL OWNED HOUSING STOCK

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Residential Services, Councillor Mrs Gregory, to introduce this item. The Group Head of Residential Services then presented the detail of the report. She explained that the proposed passive fire works to council housing had been identified as part of the regular programme of fire risk assessments done in accordance with the Council's legal and regulatory responsibilities. It was acknowledged by Cabinet that this report superseded ICM/182/18022021 which was withdrawn.

Questions were asked by Non-Cabinet Councillors regarding the budget predictions and how these had been calculated. The Group Head of Residential Services provided Members with answers to all points raised. The Chairman confirmed that the funding was coming from the Housing Revenue Account.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED

To approve the Calling off the CHIC framework to award Keystone Fire Safety Limited a 3-year contract up to £5m in value to undertake passive fire works.

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/061/220321, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

499. THE COUNCIL'S FUTURE FINANCIAL ISSUES

The Chairman introduced this item in the absence of the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Corporate Support, Councillor Oppler. He thanked the Council's financial team for their ongoing support and regular updates on the financial position and explained that the Corporate Management Team had been continually monitoring the Council's budget and that this report provided an update on some of these proposed approaches.

Cabinet - 22.03.21

The Chief Executive was then invited to present the detail of the report. He highlighted the achieved, ongoing and new projects listed in Appendix A, and explained that Officers now needed guidance from Cabinet on the way forward to ensure that financial security would be delivered for the Council and that valuable Officer time would not be wasted on areas that did not have Cabinet support.

The Chairman then invited questions and comments from Cabinet Members. Councillors Stanley and Coster spoke in favour and particularly noted the proposals for additional beach huts and solar panels in car parks. Non-Cabinet Members raised points about there being too many beach huts, the return on investment from beach huts and the absence of future savings. The Chairman, Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development and Director of Place provided Members with answers to all points raised.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED

To note the financial actions achieved and it instructed Officers to proceed with all of the proposals listed in the report and the Appendix.

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/062/220321, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

500. COMMERCIAL MANAGER POST

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development, Councillor Coster, to introduce this item. He reminded Councillors that through the Council's strategic targets, it had agreed funding for a new Commercial Manager post which had been planned for 2020/21. Unfortunately, the Coronavirus pandemic had impacted on the recruitment process. The Chief Executive explained the need for the Council to be more commercial in its approach and its need for expertise to support this aspect. He also shared his disappointment around the issues with recruitment.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED

To support the principle of delaying the appointment process of the Commercial Manager post, until after the Covid pandemic has reduced demands on the resources of the Council.

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/063/220321, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

501. THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC SITUATION

The Chairman introduced this item which was the latest update report on the Coronavirus pandemic for the period 11 February - 8 March 2021. He praised the Officer team for their continued hard work during difficult working environments, many with home schooling issues as well, until recently when schools re-opened. He explained that he and the Chief Executive had continued to provide weekly communications and noted that now was the anniversary of week 52 of these communications. He confirmed that the Council was still administering the various Government grants shown in Appendix A to the report, and, a year on, the Council continued to work hard to help residents and businesses recover from the pandemic.

The Chief Executive was then invited to present the detail of the report. He confirmed that as the weather improved, the Council's primary concern was to ensure that the public could enjoy a safe return to the District's beaches, parks, open spaces and Town Centres. The Council was using the services of Covid Marshals, funded by the Government's Covid Outbreak Management Fund, to deliver key safety messages to the public and was anticipating further funding from this through the County Council. He also provided an update on the forthcoming May Elections which remained particularly difficult to organise whilst awaiting Government guidance on some issues. The Council's main priority was to ensure the provision of sufficient staff to deliver the Election and how the Council planned to react to a substantial increase in Postal Votes. He reassured Councillors that despite these challenges, he was confident that the Council would deliver a safe and transparent Election, albeit, under Covid conditions.

The Chairman also mentioned the Hardship Fund set up to provide financial resource to those hard hit during the pandemic. The Chief Executive provided more details on this fund and the support from County Council. The Chairman then invited questions and comments from Cabinet Members. Councillor Lury spoke in favour of Arun and West Sussex Councils working together. Councillor Stanley, in noting the range of impacts of the pandemic, welcomed the fund that could support the people hardest hit.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED

To note the actions taken to date.

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/064/220321, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

502. PLANNING REVIEW WORKING PARTY - FEEDBACK FROM MEETING HELD ON 11 FEBRUARY 2021

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Stanley, as Chairman of the Planning Review Working Party, to introduce this item which contained recommendations for Cabinet to consider at Minute 9 [Consideration of

Cabinet - 22.03.21

Residents' Needs and Concerns in respect of Planning Matters]. The Chief Executive provided further detail about the planning review. He explained that there were multiple parts to the review – one part focused on recommendations concerning the role and performance of Councillors; another section related to recommendations that affected Officers and there was one other section affecting both Councillors and Officers together – and that this referred to the Members part of the review. He confirmed that the Officer review was an ongoing matter that he was dealing with as the Head of Paid Service, but that all parts of the review would eventually be brought together and brought before the relevant Committee for discussion.

The Chairman then invited questions and comments. A Non-Cabinet Member raised whether within the first recommendation there would be possible conflict should a position be declared when utilising Arun District Councillors. The Interim Monitoring Officer confirmed that as long as Members followed the Planning Protocol then the recommendation was acceptable. Another Non-Cabinet Member asked when and whether the findings of the Hanneby report would be published. The Chief Executive confirmed that a schedule would shortly be brought to Members, but confirmed that Members had seen the full report but that there might need to be some redaction to safeguard Officers before the document is made public.

Another Non-Cabinet Member raised concerns on the vagueness of recommendations 1 and 2. The Chairman amended the wording of recommendation (2) to 'the Council should improve its communication with, involvement of and training of Parish Councillors'. Councillor Bower proposed that 'in line with planning protocol' was inserted after 'Arun District Councillors' in recommendation (1). This was seconded by the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Lury, and the Chairman.

The Cabinet

RESOLVED - That

- (1) The Council should influence developers to engage more constructively with Parish Councils and the public, utilising Arun District Councillors in line with planning protocol to help do this;
- (2) The Council should improve its communication with, involvement of and training of Parish Councillors;
- (3) Officers investigate the use of digital tools to improve public engagement;
- (4) Officers consider an online community guide to the planning system (possibly through short videos); and
- (5) Cabinet to confirm that it understands that the previous four recommendations may result in resource implications (both people and financial).

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/065/220321, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

503. HOUSING & CUSTOMER SERVICES WORKING GROUP - 4 FEBRUARY 2021

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Residential Services, Councillor Mrs Gregory, to present the Minutes from the meeting of the Housing & Customer Services Working Group held on 4 February 2021. Councillor Mrs Gregory alerted Cabinet to recommendations at Minute 21 [Gaining Access to Residents' Homes Policy].

The Cabinet

RESOLVED - That

- (1) The Access Policy be adopted; and
- (2) Delegated authority be given to the Group Head of Residential Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Residential Services to make changes to the Policy.

The Cabinet confirmed its decision as per Decision Notice C/066/220321, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

(The meeting concluded at 8.20 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

DECISION NOTICES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 22 MARCH 2021

REF NO.	DECISION
ICM/056/22032021	Place St Maur and Esplanade Project, Bognor Regis
ICM/057/22032021	Arun Improvement Programme – Update
ICM/058/22032021	Options to Progress Webcast Improvement Project
ICM/059/22032021	Customer Services Strategy
ICM/060/22032021	Anti-Graffiti Systems Ltd – Trading as AGS One – Admissions Agreement to Local Government Pension Scheme
ICM/061/22032021	Contract Award for Passive Fire Works for Council Owned Housing Stock
ICM/062/22032021	The Council's Future Financial Issues
ICM/063/22032021	Commercial Manager Post
ICM/064/22032021	The Council's Response to the Covid-19 Pandemic Situation
ICM/065/22032021	Planning Review Working Party – Feedback from Meeting held on 11 February 2021
ICM/066/22032021	Housing & Customer Services Working Group – 4 February 2021

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THESE DECISIONS WILL COME INTO EFFECT FROM 10.00
A.M. ON 31 MARCH 2021 UNLESS
THE CALL-IN PROCESS IS APPLIED**

If a Councillor wishes to request a call-in of any of the decisions taken above, they will need to take the following steps in line with the Scrutiny Procedure Rules at Part 6 of the Constitution – Scrutiny Procedure Rules (Other)

They will need to:

- Submit their request in writing for a Call-In to the Group Head of Policy & Scrutiny and identify who will act as the lead Member of the Call-In
- Specify which decision is to be the subject of the Call-In
- Explain which of the criteria for the Call-In apply

REFERENCE NO: ICM/056/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: PLACE ST MAUR AND ESPLANADE PROJECT, BOGNOR REGIS	
OFFICER CONTACT: Rachel Alderson – Principal Landscape & Project Officer Tel: 01903 737946 Email: Rachel.alderson@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: To provide an update on the Place St Maur and Esplanade scheme and to seek approval for the sign-off of the preferred design following public consultation, in order to progress with the delivery of the Place St Maur.	
DECISION: The Cabinet RESOLVED The designs presented at the meeting for the Place St Maur and the Esplanade, be approved and that the delivery of the Place St Maur is progressed in line with the project programme.	
REASON FOR THE DECISION: To progress enhancement plans for the Place St Maur site in accordance with the project programme.	
OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED: To not approve the recommendations.	
CABINET MEMBER(S):	
DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:	None
DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :	N/A
CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER CONSULTED IN RESPECT OF THIS DECISION: None	

REFERENCE NO: ICM/057/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: ARUN IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME - UPDATE	
OFFICER CONTACT: Paul Symes – Head of Technology & Digital Tel: 01903 737585 Email: paul.symes@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The Arun Improvement Programme (AIP) considers proposals for new projects that enable process redesigns and service improvements typically using ICT capability to facilitate that change. This item provides a high-level summary of the activities of the AIP over the last year.	
DECISION: The Cabinet RESOLVED To note the activities of the Arun Improvement Programme.	
REASON FOR THE DECISION: It is a constitutional requirement to annually report the work of the AIP to Cabinet.	
OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED: There were no alternative options considered.	
CABINET MEMBER(S):	
DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:	None
DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :	N/A
CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER CONSULTED IN RESPECT OF THIS DECISION: None	

REFERENCE NO: ICM/058/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: OPTIONS TO PROGRESS WEBCAST IMPROVEMENT PROJECT	
OFFICER CONTACT: Karl Roberts – Director of Place Tel: 01903 737760 Email: karl.roberts@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Following previous reports, the Cabinet were provided with options for it to consider in progressing the Webcast Improvement Project with associated costs and to address the technical requirements to host hybrid meetings and extend the contract for the operation of the Council's webcasting facility to the current provider.

DECISION:

The Cabinet

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL – That

(1) That the upgrades to the webcasting system set out in the table within the report be approved apart from:

- The projector and screen upgrades – new laser projector and screen = £18,000
- Replacement screens at outlying desks - £7,000

The remaining items listed being agreed as the upgrades needed to the webcasting system and that a supplementary estimate in the sum of £40k for these one-off projects costs for the webcasting hardware installation be approved. The amount that this equates for a Band D property in terms of equivalent Council Tax to be reported at the Full Council meeting;

(2) The proposed action to purchase the hardware required to facilitate hybrid meetings is noted; and

(3) Subject to the approval of recommendation (1), to approve the additional on-going revenue costs for annual maintenance and broadband subscription of £21k per annum to be included in the Budget for 2021/22.

The Cabinet also

RESOLVED

That approval be given to extending the contract with the current provider of webcasting facilities for a further 12 months until June 2022.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

To fulfil the outcome from the previous consideration of this matter at Full Council on 26 November 2020.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED:

To determine what actions are required.

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**

REFERENCE NO: ICM/059/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: CUSTOMER SERVICES STRATEGY	
OFFICER CONTACT: Joe Russell-Wells – Group Head of Neighbourhood Services Tel: 01903 737914 Email: Joe Russell-Wells@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The Cabinet received a report which set out the Customer Services Strategy 2021 – 2026 and includes the process for implementation to embed it into the organisation. This followed the report taken to the Housing and Customer Services Group in October 2020.	
DECISION: The Cabinet RESOLVED To formally adopt the Customer Services Strategy 2021-2026 and approve the process of implementation to embed it into the organisation.	
REASON FOR THE DECISION: To implement a new Customer Services Strategy.	
OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED: Not to formally adopt the Customer Services Strategy 2021- 2026 and not to approve the process of implementation to embed it into the organisation.	
CABINET MEMBER(S):	
DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:	None
DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :	N/A
CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER CONSULTED IN RESPECT OF THIS DECISION: None	

REFERENCE NO: ICM/060/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: ANTI-GRAFFITI SYSTEMS LTD - TRADING AS AGS ONE - ADMISSIONS AGREEMENT TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSION SCHEME	
OFFICER CONTACT: Nat Slade – Group Head of Technical Services Tel: 01903 737683 Email: Nat.slade@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

On 13 January 2020 Cabinet resolved to outsource the Pest Control Service giving delegated authority to the Group Head of Technical Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Technical Services and Section 151 Officer to award the contract. This decision was taken on 3 December 2020 to award the contract to Anti Graffiti Systems Ltd trading as AGS One.

The contract which will commence on 1 March 2021 involves the TUPE transfer of a member of staff. Approval is therefore sought to authorise entering into the required Guarantee in respect of pension liabilities in the event that these are not met by Anti Graffiti Systems Ltd trading as AGS One as the admitted body, and to approve the entering into the Admissions Agreement itself.

DECISION:

The Cabinet

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL – That

The Council acts as a guarantor in respect of any and all pension liabilities which may arise through the term of the Pest Control Contract and delegated authority is given to Legal Services to enter into the Admission Agreement and Guarantee.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

To allow the Council's Legal Services to enter into the required LGPS Admissions Agreement and Guarantee with West Sussex County Council and Anti Graffiti Systems Ltd trading as AGS One.

To ensure the pension liabilities associated with the agreement are guaranteed through the duration of the Pest Control contract in the event these are not met by the admitted body.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED:

That the Council does not act as a guarantor in respect of any and all pension liabilities which may arise through the term of the Pest Control contract and that delegated authority is not given to Legal Services to enter into the Admission Agreement and Guarantee. By not entering into the admissions agreement could potentially put the contract in jeopardy as finding a pension that is better, the same or no less favourable than the LGPS could be a challenge.

CABINET MEMBER(S):

DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:	Cllr Dr Walsh Declared a Personal Interest
DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :	N/A
CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER CONSULTED IN RESPECT OF THIS DECISION: None	

REFERENCE NO: ICM/061/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: CONTRACT AWARD FOR PASSIVE FIRE WORKS FOR COUNCIL OWNED HOUSING STOCK	
OFFICER CONTACT: Satnam Kaur – Group Head of Residential Services Tel: 01903 737718 Email: Satnam.Kaur@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This item supersedes ICM/182/18022021 which has now been withdrawn.

Further to actions arising from fire risk assessments that are being undertaken within the Council's housing stock, approval is being sought to award a 3-year contract, to a specialist accredited contractor from the Central Housing Investment Consortium (CHIC) Framework to carry out passive fire works.

DECISION:

The Cabinet

RESOLVED

To approve the calling off of the Central Housing Investment Consortium (CHIC) Framework to award Keystone Fire Safety Limited a 3 year contract up to £5m in value to undertake passive fire works.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

To enable the urgently needed work to be delivered in a timely manner and in compliance with the Council's statutory duties.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED:

To not approve the award of contract and delay the delivery of urgently needed work. This is not considered a feasible option.

CABINET MEMBER(S):

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

None

DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :

N/A

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

REFERENCE NO: ICM/062/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: THE COUNCIL'S FUTURE FINANCIAL ISSUES	
OFFICER CONTACT: Nigel Lynn – Chief Executive Tel: 01903 737600 Email: nigel.lynn@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The Council's Section 151 Officer has provided regular reports over recent months highlighting the Council's current financial position and the scale of our possible financial position for 2022/23. Whilst acknowledging various uncertainties, this report provides an update on possible financial measures to help future deficits. Officers request that Cabinet considers the items identified and advise on the way forward.	
DECISION: The Cabinet RESOLVED To note the financial actions achieved and it instructed Officers to proceed with all of the proposals listed in the report and the Appendix.	
REASON FOR THE DECISION: To enable Officers to investigate a series of measures to reduce the Council's revenue budget.	
OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED: To suggest alternative proposals.	
CABINET MEMBER(S):	
DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:	None
DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :	N/A
CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER CONSULTED IN RESPECT OF THIS DECISION: None	

REFERENCE NO: ICM/063/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: COMMERCIAL MANAGER POST	
OFFICER CONTACT: Nigel Lynn – Chief Executive Tel: 01903 737600 Email: Nigel.Lynn@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Members agreed the principle of creating a new post of Commercial Manager for 2020/21. The report proposes, that due to the Coronavirus, the process of appointing to the position is delayed.	
DECISION: The Cabinet RESOLVED To support the principle of delaying the appointment process of the Commercial Manager post, until after the Covid pandemic has reduced demands on the resources of the Council.	
REASON FOR THE DECISION: The Coronavirus has impeded progress on this appointment.	
OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED: (a) to proceed with an appointment; or (b) consider an alternative approach	
CABINET MEMBER(S):	
DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:	None
DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :	N/A
CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER CONSULTED IN RESPECT OF THIS DECISION: None	

REFERENCE NO: ICM/064/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC SITUATION	
OFFICER CONTACT: Nigel Lynn – Chief Executive Tel: 01903 737600 Email: Nigel.Lynn@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The Cabinet received an update on the Council's response to the pandemic situation.	
DECISION: The Cabinet RESOLVED That the actions taken to date be noted.	
REASON FOR THE DECISION: For Cabinet to note the Council's response to the Covid-19 Pandemic.	
OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED: To request further information.	
CABINET MEMBER(S):	
DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:	None
DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :	N/A
CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER CONSULTED IN RESPECT OF THIS DECISION: None	

REFERENCE NO: ICM/065/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: PLANNING REVIEW WORKING PARTY - FEEDBACK FROM MEETING HELD ON 11 FEBRUARY 2021	
OFFICER CONTACT: Nigel Lynn – Chief Executive Tel: 01903 737600 Email: Nigel.Lynn@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

To receive and consider the minutes and recommendations from the Planning Review Working Party held on 11 February 2021.

DECISION:

The Cabinet

RESOLVED – That

- i) the Council should influence developers, in line with planning protocol, to engage more constructively with Parish Councils and the public, utilising Arun District Councillors to help do this;
- ii) the Council should improve its communication with the involvement and training of Parish Councillors;
- iii) Officers investigate the use of digital tools to improve our public engagement;
- iv) Officers consider an online community guide to the planning system (possibly through short videos); and
- v) Cabinet to confirm that it understands that the previous four recommendations may result in resource implications (both people and financial).

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

To consider and review the minutes and recommendations from the Planning Review Working Party held on 11 February 2021.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED:

To not make any amendments to the minutes or recommendations presented.

CABINET MEMBER(S):

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

None

DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :

N/A

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

REFERENCE NO: ICM/066/22032021

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES	NO
SUBJECT: HOUSING & CUSTOMER SERVICES WORKING GROUP - 4 FEBRUARY 2021	
OFFICER CONTACT: Satnam Kaur – Group Head of Residential Services Tel: 01903 737718 Email: satnam.kaur@arun.gov.uk	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: To receive the minutes and recommendations from the meeting of the Housing & Customer Services Working Group held on 4 February 2021.	
DECISION: The Cabinet RESOLVED – That (1) The Gaining Access to Residents’ Homes Policy be adopted; and (2) Delegated authority be given to the Group Head of Residential Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Residential Services to make changes to the Policy.	
REASON FOR THE DECISION: To receive the minutes and recommendations from the meeting of the Housing & Customer Services Working Group held on 4 February 2021.	
OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED: To not accept the recommendations or to make amendments.	
CABINET MEMBER(S):	
DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:	None
DISPENSATIONS GRANTED :	N/A
CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER CONSULTED IN RESPECT OF THIS DECISION: None	

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 16

Subject to approval at the next Overview Select Committee meeting

427

OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE

23 March 2021 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Northeast (Chairman), English (Vice-Chair), Bennett, Bicknell, Mrs Cooper, Cooper (Substitute for Dendle), Dixon, Edwards (Substitute for Elkins), Gunner, Huntley, Miss Needs, Miss Seex, Tilbrook and Ms Thurston (Substitute for Mrs Catterson)

Councillors Coster, Mrs Gregory, Roberts and Dr Walsh were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

Apologies: Councillors Catterson, Dendle, Elkins, Lury, Staniforth and Oppler

504. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A request to change the order of the agenda was made to bring item 10 forward to item 5 before the Cabinet members in attendance had to leave the meeting. The Chairman agreed that item's 5 and 6 would continue as planned as there were guests in attendance for these items after this then item 10 would be brought forward to item 7.

The Chairman declared a personal interest in item 8 [Equalities and Diversity] as his wife was an employee of the Council.

Councillor Bennett made an open-minded declaration in item 9 [Feedback from the Police and Crime Panel meetings held on 15 January and 29 February 2021] as he was a candidate for the Police and Crime Commissioner election.

505. MINUTES

The Committee approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on the 26 January 2021 and agreed that the Chairman would sign these as soon as practicably possible.

506. GREENSPACE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

The Environmental Services and Strategy Manager provided members with an overview of his report, where he drew members attention to the following key points;

- That there had been a consistent and constant flow of communication in terms of the planning and execution of the contract during the last 12 months and that this had strengthened the working relationship between Tivoli and the Council, enabling any day to day issues to be resolved swiftly.
- Page 5 (page 13 of the agenda) of the report before members highlighted the contract performance scores which showed that high level of standards had been maintained throughout the pandemic.

Overview Select Committee - 23.03.21

- He expressed that the hard work that had been completed behind the scenes had allowed for a consistent, largely uninterrupted service, all while keeping Tivoli staff and the Council officers safe and protected from unnecessary risk
- Finally, he drew members attention to part 6 of the report that highlighted the Council's 6th Green Flag award had been achieved in 2020 for Brookfield Park in Littlehampton.

He then introduced Ian Mcilroy, Danny Willmott and Dave O'Hare from Tivoli Group Ltd who provided members with a presentation on their performance over the last 12 months.

Members then took part in a full debate where the following points were raised;

- A question was raised regarding the flowering shrubs in Littlehampton that had been replaced by dwarf hebe, which was felt to have depleted the insect population in that area. It was advised by the Parks & Cemeteries Manager that the Council always tries to balance the appropriateness and species selected for planting schemes to the particular challenges of the space. It was also commented that the Council were always happy to hear from members of the public with their feedback.
- Discussion was had on the challenge of litter being left in public spaces and the increased collections needed to keep up with the level of visitors. Comments on education for the public on what to do with their litter if the bins were full, along with signage on the bins with clear contact details and a designated number for the bin, to ensure that it can be easily identified for the public to report. Concerns were also discussed at the increase in visitors that would also be seen at the beaches within the district over Bank Holidays and school breaks. It was confirmed that bin numbering was already in place for bins on the cleansing contract (Biffa) and that the Parks team would look to implement similar for some of the key parks. Tivoli were expecting a much busier Easter and summer period and plans were already being drawn up to be in place in time for the seasonal peaks.
- Clarification was sought on who would lead on the biodiversity plan for the Council, it was confirmed that a formal Biodiversity Action Plan is led by Planning, but that the Greenspace Service would continue working in partnership with Tivoli to deliver projects within parks and public open spaces that support biodiversity.
- Concern raised in relation to vandalism within the district and the ongoing cost of putting this right was raised. It was confirmed that this was closely monitored, and a list of hot spots did exist. Furthermore, the teams were working on plans to address and minimise the risk of vandalism happening within the district, from locking Hotham Park gates earlier, and working with the local Police. It was also confirmed that unfortunately there were a few persistent individuals who keep causing problems and unfortunately there was a cost to rectifying these issues.

Having fully debated the item the Chairman then drew the item to a close, thanked those in attendance from Tivoli Group Ltd, the Environmental Services &

Strategy Manager and the Park & Cemeteries Manager for their presentation and report update.

The Committee then noted the report.

507. COMBINED CLEANSING SERVICES CONTRACT - BIFFA

[Councillor Roberts and Dr Walsh left the meeting at 18:58pm. Councillor Gregory arrived at the meeting at 19:39pm]

The Environmental Services and Strategy Manager provided members with an overview of his report, where he drew members attention to the following key points;

- Section 1 and 2 of the report that detailed the scope of the contract that Biffa was responsible for.
- Section 3 of the report that detailed the challenges of the last 12 months, operating in a pandemic and in line with restrictions. He commented that Biffa had done a brilliant job in maintaining their excellent service levels.
- Section 4 outlined the Council's approach to managing the contract
- Section 5 covered detail of the areas of performance that were monitored in line with the Councils' Corporate Plan and Service delivery Plan.
- Section 6 summarised health and safety compliance and that this area was priority for both Biffa and the Council.

He then introduced Fabrice Bouchon and Damien O'Neill from Biffa Municipal Ltd who provided members with a presentation on their performance over the last 12 months.

Members then took part in a full debate where the following points were raised;

- The Chairman commented that he had nothing but praise for the way Biffa had seamlessly operated over the last year and that it was also really good to hear that they had kept themselves safe throughout the pandemic.
- A query regarding street washing, specifically, related to the public realm work expected to take place in Littlehampton that was inclusive of new paving through part of the town centre and would street washing of this area be something that Biffa could incorporate. It was confirmed that this would be taking place.
- In answer to a question relating to Biffa recruitment and the salary for staff, it was explained that from a contract management point this would be something that would be addressed at contract renewal stage. The representative from Biffa also confirmed that they had a companywide goal to become a real living wage company.
- Clarification was sought on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) recycling collections and what exactly can residents put out for this. It was explained that all the collection vehicles were fitted with cages to allow the crew to pick up the waste of electrical equipment. However, the cages

were limited on their size, and because of this it would be electrical appliance that would fit in a carrier bag.

- Discussion took place regarding the missed bin collections in Rustington and East Preston and that for a short period Green Waste collection were also suspended. It was also raised that there had been a significant issue in reporting and resolving the issue of the bins overflowing in the summer months throughout Rustington and, East Preston. Several members were in agreement with this concern and it was asked by the Leader of the Opposition how were the daily priorities adjusted and how were these decided at this time? It was clarified that there was no impact to the refuse collections, but there were 8 days of impact to the Green Waste collections. It was also explained that litter was a massive challenge, a combination of the lovely weather and increased visitors to the area. There were several lessons learned from this and there were elements of shared responsibility. It was a balancing act and it was difficult at times due to staffing issues. However, the Council and Biffa were now in a much stronger position; contingency planning has gone well, and there will be extra measures brought in to mitigate a busy Easter and the busy summer months. It was also clarified that there were daily communications between the Council and Biffa, where any resident complaints and or Member complaints were dealt with quickly and escalated when needed. The Environmental Services and Strategy Manager stated that he believed the approach taken last year was reasonable, and he was comfortable with the decisions and actions taken at that time.
- Comments were made regarding combatting the issue with Seagulls ripping open rubbish bags. It was explained that in Bognor Regis there was currently a trial ongoing with the use of Seagull proof bags (hessian sacks).
- A query was raised specifically as to what happens with the rubbish collected from the curb side and was any of that material able to be recycled. It was confirmed that residual waste goes through the Mechanical and Biological Treatment (MBT) Plant in Horsham and recycling collections are processed through the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) in Ford. Both of these sites are operated by West Sussex County Council (WSSC) as the waste disposal authority.
- It was raised by the Chairman that it was almost time for grass verges to be cut, he asked if there was any partnership working between Arun and West Sussex County Council (WSSC) specifically to ensure that a litter pick was completed before the verges are cut, to stop the litter that had accumulated being left to blow around the district. It was confirmed that a Working Group has been started between Arun and WSSC, not only would litter picking of the grass verges take place, but that this would also improve the communication between the two Councils to ensure that resources are in the right place at the right time.
- A concern was raised regarding the height and style of the bins along Bognor Seafront, which made it difficult for those in wheelchairs to use. It was confirmed that some larger bins had been placed to allow for a greater capacity during peak times and that more recycling bins would be installed in May 2021. The Cleansing Operations Manager was more than happy to look at options for additional bins would be easily accessible to all.

The Chief Executive then confirmed to members that the Government had been consulting on waste, he confirmed that they announced on Monday (22 March 2021) that they were entering their second round of this waste consultation. One of the options that had been put forward was food waste collections. He explained that the Council would be responding to that consultation and that Arun were working with WSCC and the District Councils' Network (DCN) on what waste collections may look like in the future.

Having fully debated the item the Chairman then drew the item to a close, thanked those in attendance from Biffa Municipal Ltd, the Environmental Services & Strategy Manager and the Cleansing Manager for their presentation and report update.

The Committee then noted the report.

The Chairman then confirmed to members that were in attendance that, as there was only one Cabinet Member in attendance at this point in the meeting he would commence with the original order of the agenda and the next item would be the Covid-19 update.

508. COVID-19 UPDATE

The Chairman stated that on this day of reflection, he was sure that we all knew someone who had lost someone to Coronavirus, including one of our own Arun colleagues. Our thoughts go out to all those that had been affected over the last year.

The Chief Executive provided members with an overview of his report, he drew members attention to the following points;

- The Government had announced today more grant money that would be made available to Councils. In particular that all Council's would be in receipt of a Covid Outbreak Management Fund (COMF) grant. This funding would be distributed via West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and could be used for a number of activities.
- Further funding for Housing bids and funding to aid homelessness, from money advice right through to digital inclusion tools

Members were then invited to ask questions on the report update which are summarised below;

- Questions in relation to Government grant monies, how much had been retained by the Council versus how much had been given out were asked. It was advised that a written answer would be given to answer these questions.
- Staff returning to the office, it was asked if staff had yet returned to working one day from the Council buildings it was confirmed that there had been approximately 15/20 people who had and were still working out of the Council buildings. It was also confirmed that the Election Team were now also working from the office preparing for the upcoming election in May 2021. It

was also stated that there was some cross-communication in terms of Government guidelines as these, still state that office workers should continue to work from home where possible until 21 June 2021. It was also confirmed that Local Government Association (LGA) and the District Council Network (DCN) had been pushing the Government for a decision to be made regarding virtual meetings at a local level to be continued beyond 7 May 2021 or for the legislation to be extended beyond this date also. Discussion was also had on the availability of lateral flow tests. A letter of support from the Chairman was agreed to be sent to ask the Prime Minister to extend the legislation.

- A briefing for members was requested on how Freedom Leisure would be opening to the public ahead of the reopening date. It was also confirmed that an update regarding grant monies received for the Leisure industry would also be given.
- Covid Marshalls, clarification was sought as to the process that had been rolled out to be followed by Covid Marshalls. Concerns were raised by two members that in Rustington the marshalls had not been engaging with business owners, but simply observing from outside and then sending letters. An answer in writing was promised.

The Committee then noted the report and the actions taken to date.

509. EQUALITIES & DIVERSITY

(Councillor Roberts returned to the meeting at 20:45pm, during discussion on this item.)

The Group Head of Policy provided members with an overview of her report, drawing their attention to the following points;

- There are two key pieces of legislation the Equality Act 2010 which sets out the 9 legally protected characteristics and the Public Sector Equality Duty.
- There are a number of key principals set out in the public sector equality duty, but fundamentally decisions makers have to make decisions with due regard to equality and diversity.
- Mandatory training for members and staff had been completed in early 2020. Further training would be made available for all Members and all staff
- Digital strategy that was approved at Cabinet on 22 March 2021, we need to ensure that the Council considers full digital inclusion, there will be a number of people who do not have access to online resources.
- All of the Council's Contractors are obligated to meet our standard practices
- Recruitment and employment flexibility, there is a need to balance our needs as a business with the needs of our staff, a lot of staff can work from anywhere in terms of a geographical location and we need to ensure that we remain an attractive employment opportunity.

Members then took part in a full debate, where the following points/concerns were raised;

- Clarification was sought about whether a Consultant should be recruited to complete an action plan, what was the budget that had been set aside for this and how would the members be kept up to date on the progress of this. It was confirmed that a budget of £10,000 had been set aside for equalities, but this was not all for consultancy support. It was also confirmed that all future updates on this item, would report into the Policy and Resources Committee from May 2021.
- Concerns were discussed in relation to why the work for this was not being completed 'in house', with an approach of reaching out to other Council's for advice and guidance if needed. As well as concerns voiced in reference to spending a large amount of money at the current time.
- It was confirmed that this work linked back to the strategic targets approved by members, and it had been budgeted for at the time the targets were approved. It was also confirmed that this work falls into a specialised and essential area, that it required a person with the right skills to complete the essential work.
- It was requested by the Leader of the Opposition that at the time the recommendation was put to the vote, that the recommendation was to be split into two parts, recommendation A and B to be taken together and C separately.

The Group Head of Policy thanked Members for their debate and reminded members that at this current time it was a balancing act in terms of workload. The Budget had already been agreed and that the £10,000 documented in her report was a maximum figure. Recruitment of an individual to complete the action plan would be carried out effectively and diligently to ensure best value for money.

On turning to the vote, the Leader of the Independent Group requested a recorded vote was requested for recommendation 1, part a) and b).

Those voting for were, Bennett, Bicknell, Mrs Cooper, Dixon, Edwards, English, Huntley, Miss Needs, Northeast, Tilbrook and Ms Thurston (11). Those voting against were, Cooper and Gunner (2). Councillors how abstained from voting were Miss Seex (1).

The recommendation was therefore carried,

The Committee

RECOMMEND to Cabinet that;

- a) a consultant is appointed to carry out an in-depth Equality and Diversity Survey and advise on a best practice action plan for the Council

Overview Select Committee - 23.03.21

- b) the Group Head of Policy be given delegated powers to appoint this resource within the available budget
- c) the Council takes full account of Equalities and Diversity in the development of the new Corporate Plan 2022- 2027

510. FEEDBACK FROM MEETINGS OF THE SUSSEX POLICE AND CRIME PANEL HELD ON 29 JANUARY & 15 FEBRUARY 2021

The Committee took the report that had been attached to the agenda as read.

511. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS AND UPDATES

The Chairman expressed his disappointment at the lack of Cabinet Members in attendance tonight. The Chief Executive stated he would follow this up the following morning. The Chairman then invited members to share their updates and ask questions from Cabinet Members who were in attendance.

There were several comments made and opinions expressed by various members regarding the lack of attendance of Cabinet Members at the meeting. Support for a motion to suspend standing orders at Full Council meeting to be held on 24 March 2021 to allow for questions to be put to those Cabinet Members who were not in attendance tonight (23 March 2021). The Chairman agreed he would put this motion forward at the meeting of Full Council tomorrow night (24 March 2021).

In turning to the questions that were asked of the Cabinet Members in attendance a summary is detailed below;

The Leader of the Opposition asked the Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development, how had he fought excessive spending and kept costs down for the Council? The reply from the Cabinet Member stated that he did have concerns about the Council's future finances, and that there needed to be a focus on finding other ways to increase income to the Council, other than increasing Council Tax.

The Leader of the Opposition then asked his supplementary question which was, one of your election pledges was that you would keep Council Tax down, are you disappointed in what you have not been able to achieve in this last year as part of this administration? The reply from the Cabinet Member stated, yes, he was disappointed. The Pandemic immediately rendered what he wanted to do, almost impossible. He explained that the complications regarding the recruitment of a Commercial Manager had been discussed and explained at the Cabinet meeting on 22 March 2021 and that the welfare and wellbeing of Council staff and our residents had taken priority and that he was remaining patient.

Councillor Roberts asked the Cabinet Member for Residential Services was she surprised when the Leader of the Council announced at the Special Council meeting that housing supplied would be well over 90 houses and that this was a very different figure that those in your update reports, did you supply this information to the Leader of

the Council? The reply from the Cabinet Member stated that this was a difficult one to explain, in terms of the properties that had, had a deposit paid on them should have been able to be delivered within the timeframe we are referring to. However, we had a Pandemic and Brexit to work through and furthermore she was disappointed that we had not been able to take more people off, of the housing register during this time.

Councillor Roberts then asked a supplementary question which was, was the Leader deliberately misleading the public when he gave his answer? The Cabinet Member stated that she did not believe that the Leader deliberately misled anyone, he took the information provided by herself. She went on to explain that there were many factors that had slowed down the building process on some of these properties. She agreed that the word 'delivery' was misleading as that insinuates that it was here and ready. However, this was standard wording that was used when purchasing property.

The Cabinet Member for Residential Services was then invited by the Chairman to present her portfolio update for March to those in attendance at the meeting.

Councillor Bennett asked the Cabinet Member for Residential Services a question on housing numbers and stated that he thought it was great that this administration was providing more social housing. The Cabinet Member advised that the HRA Business plan had indicated that the Council could purchase additional properties to take the number up to 230 houses. She also explained that the Council were buying back any ex social housing, should the owner be wanting to sell within the first 5 years of their ownership and confirmed that 2 of these properties had already be bought back.

The Leader of the Opposition asked the Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development if he would elaborate on part of the answer he gave to his earlier supplementary question and he also mentioned that the Council lacked capacity to make progress with a Commercial Strategy. The Cabinet Member advised that he was not prepared to comment further on his last answer in reference to a 'test' that he completed. He then went on to state that his ideal in terms of recruiting a Commercial Manager and that he would be able to work with that Manager to draw up a Commercial Strategy for the Council. Not that the manager would do that work on their own. He stated that he felt the work needed to be done energetically and enthusiastically and not be a pickup and put down piece. It was evident to him that this would not have been possible at this current time. When the Council does appoint, it would need to have the right amount of man or woman power behind it to be successful.

The Leader of the Opposition then asked for clarification from the Cabinet Member, which was, what you are saying is that the Council, need more officers and that these would be financed through the commercial endeavours that you hoped to be able to complete. Discussion then was had on comments made at the Cabinet meeting that was held on 22 March 2021 in reference to the Cabinet Members previous comments on his ideas on how the Council could develop a great Commercial Strategy.

Councillor Cooper asked the Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development, what have you delivered for this council and do you feel that, that

Overview Select Committee - 23.03.21

represents value for money for the Council, can anything be carried forward when your Cabinet role ends and would it have been better and better value for money for you to have stood down when you realised that you could not deliver what you wanted to and save the Council money by not paying your Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA)? The Cabinet Member stated that, he was hugely disappointed that he had not been able to do all, that he wanted. However, he had been able to provide advice and experience in terms of commercial treatment of property and that he believed had been of added value to the Council. He also reminded members that his SRA did not cost the Council any additional money, as his SRA was created by reducing the other Cabinet Member's SRA's.

The Leader of the Arun Independent Group asked the Cabinet Member for Residential Services if she believed it was possible for the Council to build enough houses to meet the current demand? And was there anything the Town Council could do to support this? The Cabinet Member provided a detailed response and in summing up she stated that we would always need social housing and in terms of the Town Council getting involved it was not something she had, had experience of.

Councillor Roberts asked the Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development in terms of value for money, given your failure to deliver anything in your Cabinet Role, do you think you have a right to Chair one of the new committees. The Cabinet Member responded. No.

Councillor English asked the Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development, how have you managed to get away with taking an SRA from public money and deliver nothing? The Cabinet Member stated that the Leader of the Council at the Cabinet meeting yesterday voiced that he believed he (I) had added value for money through my advice and expertise.

The Chairman advised the Committee that there was no Work Programme as this was the last meeting of this Committee due to the upcoming change in Governance Structure. He went on to add his thanks to the supporting Officer team and for the help and support in enabling the Council to move so quickly to virtual meetings. He gave thanks to his Vice-Chair, Cllr English. He then stated that he had concerns in reference to the new Governance Structure being one that 'self-scrutinises', he said that meaningful scrutiny came from independence and unbiased. In summing up he thanked the Committee for their performance over the last 12 months, he stated that their questions had been challenging and effective in holding those to account, Chief Inspector Carter would attest to that.

(The meeting concluded at 10.11 pm)

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 17

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

19

ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE WORKING GROUP

25 March 2021 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Mrs Warr (Chairman), Brooks (Vice-Chair), Bicknell, Mrs Catterson, Clayden, Dixon, Gunner, Huntley, Jones, Kelly and Ms Thurston

Councillors Coster, Goodheart, Mrs Hamilton and Roberts were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

26. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

The Committee Manager was asked by the Leader of the Opposition, a question in relation to the attendance of another member in the Working Group and a response was provided.

27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made.

28. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2020 were approved as a correct record, and it was agreed that these would be signed as soon as practicably possible.

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

There were no urgent items on the agenda, however the Chairman invited the Leader of the Green Party to make a statement in relation to the Kelp Forest Project.

30. SOUTHERN WATER

The Director of Place introduced the representatives from Southern Water, Dr Toby Willison Director of Environment & Corporate Affairs, Tom Gallagher Bathing Water Manager, Richard Bagwell Stakeholder Manager for Sussex and Charlotte Mayall Regional Planning Lead for Hampshire & West Sussex and invited them to give their presentation.

Environment & Leisure Working Group - 25.03.21

Members then took part in a question and answer session, where the following questions were raised:

- It was stated that the Environment Agency had given Southern Water a 1 star rating in October for their performance in 2019, and it was asked whether Southern Water felt that they were meeting the needs of Arun. Southern Water's Director of Environment & Corporate Affairs acknowledged this and said there had been a significant programme of investments, re-training and re-engineering, and they were confident they would not be rated 1 star again this year.
- Clarification was requested around Combined Sewer Overflows (CSO) and Asset Maintenance Programme (AMP). An explanation of these terms was given by Southern Water's Director of Environment & Corporate Affairs.
- It was felt that Southern Water seemed to be really trying, and it was hoped that in a couple of years the impact of this would be felt.
- A member asked whether programmes can be extended to cover run-off from roads.
- It was raised that Pagham Waste Water Treatment Plant was currently undergoing work that won't be completed until 2025, and it was asked whether a stop should be put on any development there until this was complete.
- It was asked whether there was a policy within Southern Water to move towards community groups getting involved with sites around the districts, and whether there were any plans for a national emergency phone number to report leaks.
- A question was asked around flooding and what steps Southern Water took to monitor ground water table and water table rises. Southern Water's Bathing Water Manager confirmed that this was monitored by Southern Water and that they worked with landowners and farmers on this.

It was asked that Southern Water provide written answers, to be sent to the Chairman and all members of the council, to the following questions:

- Of the 6 wastewater areas in the South, Southern Water had mentioned 3, please could they provide the names of the other 3
- Could a breakdown be provided of the investment in wastewater assets and transformation programmes?
- Could Southern Water provide clarification regarding surface water connections to sewage networks, as it was thought this was now unlawful, and that rainwater must now be separated from sewage water.
- It was noted that Pagham had previously failed bathing water standards due to high nitrate levels, and that when a meeting was set up to discuss this with farmers, this coincided with harvest so farmers were unable to attend. Had another meeting had been arranged with farmers to address this?

It was asked how Southern Water dealt with criminal conduct within their company. An answer was provided by Southern Water's Director of Environment & Corporate Affairs.

It was asked whether Southern Water were happy with Arun as a council and the conditions set as Planning Consents, or whether there was anything that Arun could do better? It was agreed that Southern Water's Director of Environment & Corporate Affairs would attend a future meeting to further discuss this matter.

The Chairman thanked the representatives from Southern Water and the presentation was noted by members.

31. FLOODING UPDATE

The Engineering Services Manager presented his report, where he provided detailed overview of various types of drainage. He advised that surface water schemes for new development were designed to ensure sustainable draining systems, and that Engineers commented on most Planning Applications to ensure the guidance is followed, and the area would be at no greater risk than if the development didn't go ahead. The hierarchy was as follows: where possible, the aim was to try and get water back into the ground (by infiltration), if this could not be achieved they looked to store the water and return it into ditches, and if this was not possible they would release into surface water sewers. They would resist any discharge into the foul system.

The Engineering Services Manager explained that although sometimes members of the public thought that a development should not go ahead due to flood risk, it was sometimes the case that because of the development, work could be carried out on ditches etc that have not been tended to for many years, which would actually reduce the flood risk. Consent would not be given for any development that may have a negative impact on the watercourses.

Members then took part in a full debate where the following points were raised:

- Concern was raised that the Local Plan did not offer sufficient protection in relation to flooding, and it was asked how this could be addressed to mitigate these problems. The Engineering Services Manager explained that a development would not proceed if it would adversely affect itself or its neighbours in a 1 in a 100 year storm plus an allowance for climate change, and gave assurances that developments coming forward now do not get to Development Control Committee until officers were happy with the proposal.
- It was discussed that the wider issue of climate change needed to be discussed at National Level, however it was also mentioned that what could be done at local level should be explored too.
- It was noted that a decision had been taken not to retain the foreshores team.
- Concern was raised about the long-term outcome for the new developments on the seafront, and it was suggested that when the Local Plan was revised, it would be good to have a consultant to advise on everything. The Engineering Services Manager confirmed the Shoreline Management Plan had a 100 year horizon, and much thought went into this. The Director of Place confirmed officers were very aware of the issues around climate change and developing the Local Plan, and thought would need to go into how much the Council would wish to spend updating the Local Plan.

Environment & Leisure Working Group - 25.03.21

Councillor Roberts declared a personal interest as he was a current member of the Littlehampton RNLI crew. He sought clarification on the decision not to re-hire the Foreshore Team. An answer was provided by the Group Head of Community Wellbeing.

32. PLACE ST MAUR

The Principal Landscape Officer introduced her report and provided the Working Group with an update on the plans for Place St Maur in Bognor Regis. It was highlighted that the consultation process was now complete, and the designs have been presented to and approved by Cabinet.

Members then took part in a full debate where the following points were raised:

- There was disappointment that Cabinet had already approved the scheme 2 days prior to the Working Group were due to meet.
- There was concern regarding the existing tree on the site, the paving and the mounds in the design.
- Concern was raised about how flexible the new space would be for events. The Principle Landscape Officer confirmed that the space had been designed with flexibility in mind, for large events water jets would be switched off and plant pots moved.
- A question was asked regarding timings of the work and whether the 2021 Folk Festival could still be held there. This was answered by the Principle Landscape Officer.
- It was asked what opportunities there may still have been for councillor input into the designs. The Principal Landscape Officer and Group Head of Neighbourhood Services explained the consultation process and confirmed the design has been frozen in order to go out to tender to get the work achieved.
- Concerns were raised about the lighting, and whether the area would be safely lit.
- Members raised concerns about locations for a stage and also whether the paved area would be robust enough to be driven over by event organisers.

The Working Group noted the report provided by a show of hands to the screen.

33. REPORT BACK FROM CABINET/FULL COUNCIL

The Chairman advised members that at the last meeting of the Working Group on 10 December 2020, they had made recommendations to Cabinet which had been reviewed by Cabinet on 11 January 2021.

Councillor Gunner expressed disappointment that Cabinet over-ruled the recommendation regarding the Tree Planting Strategy made by the Working Group and his comments were echoed by other members.

The following points were raised by members:

- Clarification was sought regarding the funding of the Safer Arun Partnership
- Questions were asked in relation to the timing of the Tree Planting Strategy.

The Working Group noted the update.

34. WORK PROGRAMME

The Chairman confirmed to members that there was no Work Programme to review or approve, due to the change in Governance structure that would be implemented by the Council in May 2021. The Work Programme for the new Environment & Neighbourhood Services Committee would be agreed at the first meeting on 27 May 2021, under the new Governance Structure.

(The meeting concluded at 8.58 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 18

Subject to approval at the next Development Control Committee meeting

457

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

31 March 2021 at 1.30 pm

Present: Councillors Bennett (Chair), Thurston (Vice-Chair), Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Charles, Coster, Hamilton, Kelly, Lury, Pendleton, Roberts, Tilbrook, Warr and Yeates

Chair's Announcement

Before the Chair commenced the meeting, he reminded Members that the politically restricted pre-election period for the May 2021 elections had now commenced and that this had two consequences. Firstly, the Council could not carry out publicity or events which were designed to show support for a political party. The Chair therefore asked Members to be careful to address the issues and not use the meeting as a platform for political purposes. He warned that anyone who infringed the rule would not be allowed to speak further in the meeting. Secondly, this meant that any person who used this meeting for political publicity took the risk that the cost of this meeting would be counted towards their election expenses or of the candidate they were supporting.

535. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

536. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2021 were approved by the Committee.

537. LU/328/20/PL - WINDROOS NURSERY, WORTHING ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON BN17 6LY

Variation of condition 20 imposed under LU/229/10/ to amend wording so as to remove specific reference to 'cars' within the condition & replace word with 'vehicles' in each instance where it features.

The Principal Planning Officer presented her report.

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including whether the term 'vehicles' was too broad and whether some restrictions were wanted, issues around more permanently parked and larger vehicles such as caravans taking up more than one parking space with cars then having to be parked on pavements and whether these could be restricted, the potential for residents-only parking, whether not changing the terms would have been overly restrictive to future residents, the absence of any enforcement mechanism and planning conditions being meaningless and open to legal challenge if not enforceable, whether the approval for the original application should have been more restrictive and district-wide implications for planning approvals more generally if only parking for specific vehicles were permitted in future.

Development Control Committee - 31.03.21

The Principal Planning Officer and Group Head of Planning provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report and report update subject to the conditions outlined.

538. LU/350/20/PL - 215 TIMBERLEYS, LITTLEHAMPTON BN17 6QD

1 Public Speaker

Joseph Pearson - Agent

Erection of 1 No new dwellinghouse.

The Principal Planning Officer presented her report. This was followed by a Public Speaker.

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including the type of materials proposed and whether these would be the same as those used in the pre-existing adjoining properties, issues with parking in the area and the application reducing parking space further, the Council not following its own parking standards, the visual impact of having a solid wall at the end of the terrace of houses on the street scene and whether this was sufficiently mitigated by the pre-existing trees and landscaping on the edge of the site.

The Principal Planning Officer and Group Head of Planning provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report and report update subject to the conditions outlined.

539. APPEALS

The Committee received and noted the appeals list within the agenda. Members then discussed concerns about the Appeals system and in particular appellants making use of information provided by Officers to Members for explanation of refusal. Members were reminded that they needed to be careful with what they said in committee meetings as well as being mindful of other statements they have made in public as these comments could be used in support of subsequent appeals, especially now that

Subject to approval at the next Development Control Committee meeting

459

Development Control Committee - 31.03.21

meetings are recorded and easily available. It was noted that where inspectors had allowed an appeal, if the original reasons for refusal were reasonable then costs would not be awarded to the appellant.

(The meeting concluded at 2.33 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank