

Public Document Pack

Subject to approval at the next Policy and Finance Committee meeting

343

POLICY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

13 December 2022 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Gunner (Chair), Pendleton (Vice-Chair), Chace (Substituting for Councillor Roberts) Cooper, Dixon, Goodheart, Stanley and Walsh.
Councillors Mrs Cooper was also in attendance at the meeting.

522. WELCOME

The Chair welcomed Members and Officers to the meeting.

523. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for Absence had been received from Councillors Oppler and Roberts.

524. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Dixon declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 6 [The Regeneration of the Regis Centre, Bognor Regis] as he owned a very small number of Whitbread shares and was a member of the Bognor Regis Civic Society.

525. MINUTES

The minutes from the meeting of the Committee held on 20 October 2022 and the Extraordinary Meeting held on 3 November 2022 were approved as a correct record and were signed by the Chair at the conclusion of the meeting.

526. 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

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

527. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chair confirmed that three questions had been submitted for this meeting all from the same questioner, these have been very briefly summarised below:

- Question 1 – regarding correspondence from the Levelling-Up Minister to Nick Gibb, MP dated June 2022 regarding the opportunities of adding private investment to improve the Levelling-Up Project for the Regis Centre
- Question 2 – finding further funding for the Levelling-Up project in Bognor Regis and contingencies

Policy and Finance Committee - 13.12.22

- Question 3 – regarding the support given by Mrs Latus for the for the Regis Centre scheme for the 450 seat version and if there has been support for any later versions of the project.

The Chair then drew Public Question Time to a close. The Public Question Time Schedule would be uploaded to the Committee's web pages within ten working days following the meeting.

528. PRESENTATION/UPDATE - REGENERATION OF THE REGIS CENTRE, BOGNOR REGIS

The Regeneration Consultant in providing his verbal update to the Committee confirmed that he planned to share a copy of the presentation that had been provided to Members of the Committee at a briefing held on 7 December 2022.

This briefing had been organised following the last meeting of the Committee on 20 October 2022 where a project update had been provided by Mace Consultants Ltd and where Members of the Committee had criticised two major areas of the scheme being the size of the auditorium and the look and design of the outside of the building.

A presentation was then shared to the meeting provided by Nicholas Hare Architects. This set out the key stages of the project and an explanation surrounding what would be needed to provide an increased (450 seat) auditorium that would be compliant with fire regulations and would be operable as a theatre. A lot of work had been undertaken with Arun Arts and with Theatre Plan, theatre consultants for this project. The remaining consultants making up the project team were also highlighted in terms of the work being undertaken to bring the project up to RIBA Stage II.

Members were reminded that Full Council had resolved to proceed with the project and design for a 378 auditorium, but this had now been revised and increased to 386 seats with the project team working to add in extra seats wherever it could. There had been several questions raised at the last meeting about increasing the auditorium capacity, as the original business case put together for the LUF bid had been based on an auditorium of 450 seats. Since then, there had been a lot of survey work and many technical designs undertaken to see how feasible that was. A slide was shown illustrating the existing plan of what the theatre looked like now with the control room behind the high level seating. The Chair asked if the control room was necessary at the back of the auditorium and it was confirmed that Arun Arts and Theatre Plan had confirmed that this was required.

The Stage II plans that the Architects had designed provided 386 seats with a number of seats at the back with the sound booth being located in the middle at the back. Plans were provided showing the existing Stage II section which had been reprofiled to provide more seats looking forward onto the stage rather than the previously lower height. It was explained that there were ways to increase capacity; one was infilling the crossover row; one was moving the rear wall of the auditorium and adding seats to the side galleries. All of these options would be required to achieve an auditorium containing 450 seats. It was confirmed that there were a number of

challenges that accompanied these options. One was sight lines, the seating on the side galleries had restricted sight lines, but the main problem would be the moving of the back wall. If this was moved this would mean the loss of disabled parking bays to Belmont Street. These were considerable challenges that had been rejected by the project team at an early stage with the Architect also accepting these. The total cost provided by the consultants in providing the additional seating, based on the architect's drawings, was £2m to increase the auditorium space by 64 seats. This equated to £31,250 per seat with a predicted payback period of 100 years. It was highlighted that Members could ask the project team to go back and bring a further report to a future meeting of the Committee on a 450 seat scheme, but that this would require Full Council being asked to fund the project by an additional £2m, without a business case and with no support from Arun Arts who had confirmed that they were happy with the current proposals. There was also risk that the Levelling-Up timescales would not be met. These were the issues that Members needed to be aware of in considering a 450 seat option.

The presentation then turned to the elevation concerns previously expressed by the Committee. At the briefing, Members had been shown different elevational approaches and different forms of massing. The original business case elevation that members liked was shown and the issues surrounding having that amount of glass were highlighted. The Stage II scheme shown on 20 October 2022 had been reviewed as Members had felt it too be too stark and blocky and so the architects had undertaken a considerable amount of work in providing some options.

The alternative options shown were:

- The Wave Option with the features and cost increases being explained
- The Cube Option with the features and cost increases being explained
- The Refined Option with the features and cost increased being explained
- Roofing options were also highlighted
- What the elevations might be treated with and how this would look – considering other buildings in the locality which were also shown

The Regeneration Consultant then concluded his presentation stating that at the briefing held on 7 December 2022, the majority of members had expressed support to proceed with the scheme with a 386 seat auditorium and had liked the Wave and the Refined design options with further support being expressed for a buff brick exterior. The next step was to take this forward to Stage III design working with the planners on these two options so that a further report could be brought back to a future meeting of the Committee.

The Chair then called a short ten minute adjournment due to a camera problem in the Chamber. This was proposed by Councillor Gunner and seconded by Councillor Pendleton and unanimously approved by the Committee.

The meeting then resumed. The Chair thanked the Regeneration Consultant for his detailed presentation and invited debate.

A very detailed debate took place. There were Councillors who wanted further clarification on the costs associated with providing a 450 seat auditorium. This was provided. Discussion then focused on information that they had previously received which they felt was contradictory in terms of the quality of acts that the new theatre would be able to attract as the town grew as a result of this regeneration. Questions were also asked around whether the Government would ask or demand for the LUF funding to be returned if project timescales were not met. Questions were asked around if the government were kept up to date and if the council did deliver a project broadly in line with what was initially submitted it would be difficult for the government to do this.

There were points made that it was vital to get this project right and that there was an awareness of suggestions put forward by other Councillors to rebuild and explore another planning application for 500 seats with another architect. There was a Councillor confirming that he would like the council to have this conversation with the Government to ensure that the council was getting this right. In terms of the design, the options shown were a definite improvement, however there were concerns about spilling onto the Place St Maur as it was accurate to say that the Place was more of a tight space than it was expected it to be following its redevelopment and so there were Councillors who wanted to understand more of the impact this might have in using the Place as an events space which was its intention. It was important for Councillors to understand the full support package for Arun Arts to ensure their sustainability throughout and after the project.

Other Councillors confirmed that they liked the Wave and Refined options and preferred the lightening of the colour of the building which fitted in more with the marine seaside environment replacing the previous heavy dark brick. A concern was that Councillors were being presented with an all or nothing option on extra seats either to consider the whole 450 but with little or any options of somewhere in between at a lower cost. How much would it cost to use side aisles? There was no issue with partially obscured sight lines from the positions shown in the presentation and seat prices always reflect this and was not an issue for the public. Various questions were asked about how many seats could be added in and whether it would be possible to cantilever out over the pavement rather than take the whole of the back out extending the building out which would be less costly. What were the options and what were the costs?

The Regeneration Consultant confirmed that the Architects had been asked to look at potentials to just put some seats down the side aisles and so he would come back with some discussion on this for the next meeting. If this was possible to fit in, then it would be done. Cantilevering over the pavement over disabled parking spaces would be very expensive as a structural slab would be required and the walkway was needed underneath to get from one side to the other for escape purposes. Discussion also took place over the location of the control box and if this was moved could extra seating be placed.

Following more detailed discussion, many Members of the Committee confirmed that they liked the revised options presented and questions were asked about the maintenance costs for the brick and rendered options and how regularly maintenance work would need to be undertaken. Members also confirmed that they were happy with the roof specification reconfirming that this needed to be a statement building. Questions were asked about the size of the canopy and the café and bar area.

A request was made for the PowerPoint presentation to be sent to all Members of the Council.

Following further discussion, the Chair reflected on the debate that had taken place confirming that the Committee preferred the Wave and Refined options. He outlined that he would like to see more flair injected into the project in terms of materials, but accepted that this would be for the Planning Committee to agree. It was confirmed that the project would continue to proceed with its development going to the next stage based on the 386 seat option and wave design.

529. LITTLEHAMPTON SEAFRONT PROJECT - UPDATE REPORT

The Principal Landscape and Project Officer reminded Members that at the last meeting of the Committee plans were in place to launch the public consultation exercise for this project and so her report provided the results of this exercise.

Members were advised that the consultation had included opportunities for online and face to face feedback which had been useful in understanding peoples' views. The response from the collated surveys had been very positive with a high percentage of those taking part welcoming all elements of the proposals. The detail of the responses received had been broken down within the report with more detail being set out in the appendix provided.

The focus for the project team from now was to proceed with the tender for the design and build contractor so that the results could be reviewed by them. The Principal Landscape Officer added that the economic climate continued to present challenges and so the officer team would be working with the contractor to mitigate these where possible.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee. Various observations were made. One related to the suggested provision of trees across The Green as there was concern that The Green's major redeeming feature was its provision of major open public space which was also used for large events. It was felt that the provision of trees could obstruct some of this valuable space. It was felt that the Stage by the Sea needed to be more user friendly with a stage extension being provided to enhance performance space and improving useability. A request was made for Officers to think carefully about the number and positioning of electric charging points for vehicles to not exclude people who would increasingly use these points and to also provide this facility to nearby residents. These observations were noted by the Officer team.

Policy and Finance Committee - 13.12.22

Other Councillors spoke in support of the project and the results received confirming that the proposals would greatly benefit the area. The use of the containers for retail usage was applauded and it was hoped that this could be extended out to other areas in the district. In response to some questions asked about the risk assessment provided, it was explained that all risks were continually reviewed and that some would be challenging in terms of cost and programme timelines. In responding to questions asked about solar panels in car parks and the provision of a storage facility for the Park Run, it was confirmed that these issues would be up for discussion at the next stage of the design and as the project was still at the concept design stage. Stage 3 of the project would be brought back to the Committee for sign off prior to the planning application stage.

Another question was asked in terms of the frontage of The Windmill Theatre and whether enhancements could be made to the entrance from the car park. It was explained that although this was a good point to raise, there was no funding allocated as part of this project to meet this request.

Finally, Members in concluding their debate, praised the Officer Team for undertaking a thorough and successful consultation. A final request was made to see if activities for mid-teens could include volleyball or basketball if there was opportunity to accommodate this.

At the end of the discussion, the Committee noted the report with the Chair thanking Officers for their work.

530. BUDGET MONITORING REPORT TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2022

The Interim Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer presented her report stating that although there were no recommendations to consider, it was important for Members to be kept informed about performance against budget at regular intervals during the year.

This report was the monitoring report for the second quarter of 2022/23. It detailed the Capital, Housing Revenue Account and General Fund Reserve budget performance to the end of September 2022.

The table of General Fund variations showed a favourable variation of £13k at the end of Quarter 2. Turning to the HRA variations, it was explained that this formed part of another report that the Committee would consider later on in the agenda. The variance had been highlighted as part of the Budget Monitoring Report provided covering Quarter 1, presented to this Committee on 6 September 2022, which had resulted in the additional work being undertaken. The capital and projects budget summary illustrated that there was a considerable balance to still be spent, this was mainly due to Levelling-Up Fund projects that were not scheduled for the current financial year and so this would be reprofiled for the Quarter 3 report which would be considered by the Committee at its meeting on 9 February 2023.

The content of the report was noted by the Committee with no questions being asked.

531. FINANCIAL PROSPECTS (MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL PROSPECTS) 2022-23 TO 2026-27

The Interim Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer presented her report updating Members on the current financial and economic prospects for the Council for the period 2022/23 to 2026/27. The report forecasted a significant budget gap from 2023/24 and the forecast did not include an allowance for inflation on income. The council had balances to help mitigate against these cost increases allowing for budget correction to be undertaken in a measured and planned manner. It was stressed that this would form part of the Budget 2023-24 and future years and so the purpose of this report was to show Members the forecast with the Budget for 2023/24 being considered by this Committee at its next meeting on 9 February 2023.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee. Various points were made with some Members confirming that they were becoming increasingly worried about the financial position of local government, especially within Arun as the council was now seeing the effects of chronic central government reductions over the last 10 years creating a huge deficit which the council was expected to cover with council tax increases. This was the direction of travel and at a time of high inflation and economic hardship. It was felt necessary for the council to undertake lobbying through the Local Government Association (LGA) and its Members of Parliament to ensure that the increasingly difficult state of local government financing would be addressed by Government.

The Committee thanked the Interim Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer for an 'honest' report highlighting the issues that urgently needed to be addressed, especially as central government funding was not adequate. It would be important to reflect the current situation in the 2023/24 budget. It was felt important to develop a Commercial Strategy to develop income streams and to act quickly to find other ways of raising money.

Following further discussion and having had the recommendations proposed by Councillor Cooper and seconded by Councillor Chace,

The Committee

Policy and Finance Committee - 13.12.22

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL

- (1) To approve the medium-term budget plan for the period 2023/24 to 2026/27 and to;
- (2) Agree the core assumptions set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy contained in Section 4 of the report;
- (3) Note that there are uncertainties around Government Funding prior to the local government settlement in December 2022 and the delay in the Local Government Funding reforms such as business rates retention and the future of the New Homes Bonus; and
- (4) Agree the maximising of income including fees and charges, where possible, as part of the 2023/24 budget process.

532. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2022-2026 - QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD 1 APRIL TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2022

The Group Head of Organisational Excellence presented her report and provided an update on the council's key performance indicators up to Quarter 2 covering the period 1 April 2022 to 30 September 2022

The covering report explained the structure of the council's performance reporting and at Appendix A set out the actual performance for each indicator that had been measured at the end of Quarter 2.

The Group Head of Organisational Excellence reminded Members that they had seen the first of these reports earlier in the year which reported on Q1 performance. The difference in the Quarter 2 report was starting to show trends in performance with an additional three columns at the end of the table showing commentary, Quarter 2 status (colour coded) and the final column which showed the % change from Quarter 1. This had been indicated numerically and as an arrow and had been included to give Members more detail than the simple colour coding.

It was confirmed that the indicators for Quarter 2 had been provided to the relevant committees and that although there have been discussions and questions to officers at those meetings, no items have been referred to this Committee for this quarter.

The Chair then invited questions. Discussion focused on the many under achievements which were largely due to staffing numbers being considerably low in certain departments. Members were interested to hear about the active steps being taken to fill vacancies with full time staff rather than agency staff and whether there were plans to increase the use of apprentices wherever the council was under achieving. Although it was accepted that these were relatively small in number, they were still significant for those affected by it and so needed to be addressed.

Other Members asked specific questions on the following indicators:

- CP26 – [Major Applications determined in 13 weeks or agreed extension of time]. The Director of Growth was asked to explain the background to this under performance. It was highlighted that these applications related to major planning applications representing 10 units or greater. For Arun the majority of the applications were substantially greater than that often being into the 100s. This often meant that if the council was seeking to negotiate a better scheme, planners had to undertake that negotiation and revised plans were then submitted and a further consultation process then had to be undertaken. That was additional significant work that was often impossible to conclude within the 13 week period. Also, many of these had to be presented to committee and further delays could be experienced depending upon the committee cycle of meetings. The preparation of Section 106 agreements also took a substantial amount of time to prepare. Case management was important in monitoring what was going on and ensuring that proactive action was taken. The Director of Growth reassured Members that he would continue to try and improve on the staffing situation and would provide a further update on staffing.
- CP42 – [Occupied Retain Units in Bognor Regis] – an explanation was sought and provided by the Director of Growth to the commentary provided.

533. ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL RESIDENTS' SURVEY 2022

The Group Head of Organisational Excellence presented the Arun District Council Residents' Satisfaction Survey results for 2022 which had been undertaken during July and August 2022 by BMG Research Ltd. A copy of the survey questions and their final report could be found within Appendix A of the report.

The report outlined the findings from the research into the experiences of people living in Arun and perceptions of the Council and its services. There were comparisons made with the national Local Government Association survey and the results from the council's survey undertaken last year. The report covered the detail of the methodology used and Members were advised that there were two data collection methods used.

A postal survey (which could be completed online) had been undertaken and sent to randomly selected households across the district to ensure full geographical cover (closed survey) and most of the commentary within the report had been based on this data because that was how this exercise had been carried out in the past and it was important to be able to make comparisons. The same survey was made available as a link on the council's website for any Arun resident (open survey) and the comparison tables could be found within the report.

Policy and Finance Committee - 13.12.22

The responses showed a similar pattern but also in the majority of questions residents in the closed survey had more positive perceptions than the open survey, suggesting that some residents had responded to the open survey because in some instances they were unhappy with a certain issue or service.

The results of each question had been summarised in a table on page 72. This showed the % change in performance from 2021 for each question, but essentially it had been colour coded into better than, the same as or worse than last year and by how much.

In summary the overall responses to five of the questions showed perceptions that were worse than last year whilst for seventeen questions the experiences of people living in Arun and perceptions of the Council and its services were the same as or better than last year.

The Vice-Chair then took the position of Chair for part of this item and invited questions. Members found it interesting to see the comparison between the open and closed surveys and were generally satisfied to accept that the council was in roughly the same position as it was in last year with the results. It was clear to see that the issue on top of many residents' concern list was that of problem behaviours such as drunk and rowdy behaviour in places and issues of vandalism with Station Square in Bognor Regis being confirmed as a hot spot location. It was felt that this needed to be addressed. The Director of Environment and Communities responded stating that she was aware of the issues and that several interventions had been undertaken to attempt to alleviate the issue and so could not comment further.

Other Councillors also commented upon the issue of areas of vandalism, drugs and disorderly behaviour highlighting that the responsibility for dealing with this was the police and not this council. Complaints about anti-social behaviour and acts of vandalism were increasing and caused some of the biggest problems around the district because the culprits were not being caught and were not being dealt with; the result of this lack of action was that the problem just continued to grow. The council needed to find a way to ensure that the police were reacting to it. Suggestions were made to invite the police to attend a meeting of the appropriate Committee or to organise an annual meeting to make the police aware of the growing concerns in the district.

Other observations made were that there were considerable differences between the east and west of the district in terms of satisfaction with cleanliness and that this seemed to be very consistent. It was highlighted that the survey provided the council with triggers to have a look at and trends so that officers could then establish what was real and what was perception – the appropriate action could then be taken. The Director of Environment & Communities undertook to look at figures on cleanliness and differences across the district so that a response could be provided to the Committee.

Councillor Mrs Cooper then spoke as a non-member of the Committee and provided an update focusing on her involvement with the Safer Arun Partnership and how the issues raised on drunk and disorderly behaviour and vandalism were tackled. A big problem was that of public perception with the public feeling that the police were not acting on reported incidents. This was often because the public was using social media as a platform to report incidents rather than calling the police and she urged Councillors to ensure that when they responded to constituents, they made sure that the public were reporting incidents in the correct way and directly to the police. This was the only way of ensuring that hot spot areas were identified, and the right interventions could then take place. Councillor Mrs Cooper confirmed that the police would intervene if they knew about issues and that some excellent interactions had also taken place with the council's anti-social behaviour team.

At the end of the discussion, the Committee noted the report and the Chair thanked the Officers involved.

534. ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD FROM SERVICE COMMITTEES - HOUSING & WELLBEING COMMITTEE - 6 DECEMBER 2022 - HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) REVISED BUDGET - 2022-2023

The Chair confirmed that at the meeting of the Housing & Wellbeing Committee held on 6 December 2022, there were two sets of recommendations put forward for this Committee to consider.

The first recommendation was at Minute 494 [HRA Business Plan Update] with the minutes from that meeting being circulated to Members separately and uploaded to the Council's web pages on 12 December 2022. A report from the Interim Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer also accompanied the minutes and she presented this report to the Committee.

It was highlighted that there were recommendations for the Committee to consider that needed to be forwarded onto Full Council on 18 January 2023 to approve. Appendix 1 to this report, which had been provided to Members in the supplement pack, provided the detail already considered by the Housing & Wellbeing Committee. The recommendation was asking this Committee to agree the revision to the HRA Revenue Budget set out in that Appendix and for the Committee to review the changes to the HRA budget prior to approval by Full Council. The report provided a more up to date forecast for the repairs, supervision and management budget for 2022/23 and it recommended that the Council changed its policy in relation to the financing of capital expenditure to include borrowing to ensure an outturn balance on HRA of around £600k. Work was continuing to identify other areas of expenditure that could be capitalised with Members being asked to note that by capitalising this expenditure this would result in additional cost pressures in future years. Any borrowing had to be affordable under the prudential framework.

Policy and Finance Committee - 13.12.22

The Chair then invited questions and debate. In looking at the comments made by Councillors at the Housing & Wellbeing Committee on 6 December 2022, there had been and could still be a systemic problem within housing partly to do with staffing and management changes on a permanent, interim and other basis. In reaction to this, it was members' view that what was needed was more than just a financial adjustment but that the council, with the Chief Executive, should prepare a report to committee on these problems and how these would be addressed. This report needed to be factually based on what had and what was going wrong so that vigorous action to investigate and report a solution to fix the problems could be seen by all Members.

The Director of Environment & Communities responded explaining that the situation was enormously challenging within the housing department and so she had agreed with the Chair of the Housing & Wellbeing Committee to bring forward the HRA business plan being remodelled and that additional consultancy advice was also being sought so that the Chair and Vice-Chair of that Committee could be briefed to explain some of the assumptions around some of the concerns expressed. Members were reassured that this work was underway now. The way forward planned was for the HRA Business Plan to be presented based on a range of assumptions and the budget was part of that. This way forward had been agreed with the chair of the Housing & Wellbeing Committee, Councillor Pendleton.

In response, the Committee requested that this report be sent to all Members of the Council or that a wider briefing for all Members also be organised as it was imperative for all Members to have access to this update as it was about performance and how this affected tenants and others in the district. In response, Councillor Pendleton agreed that this was a very important issue and that a confidential briefing for all Councillors would take place and she asked the Director of Environment & Communities to ensure that this was organised.

Councillor Cooper then proposed the recommendations which were then seconded by Councillor Pendleton.

The Committee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL – That

- (1) Having reviewed the changes to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget, the revised HRA Budget set out in Appendix 1 to the report is approved; and
- (2) Any required changes to the financing of HRA capital expenditure including potential borrowing are agreed.

The Chair then referred Members to the next Minute for the Committee to consider at Minute 499 [Leisure Report] and he reminded Members that the accompanying report provided and the discussion undertaken at the Housing & Wellbeing Committee had been undertaken in Exempt Business and so if this Committee wished to have detailed discussion, moving into Exempt Business might be necessary.

The Group Head of Community Wellbeing then provided a brief introduction to this item reminding Members of the challenging trading conditions experienced by Freedom Leisure and other operators around the country. However, working with Freedom Leisure the council had returned to its contractual position in April 2022 and were currently receiving the full operating fee for the contract unlike many other local authorities. The impact of the rising utility costs had now placed an additional burden on the contract and was potentially threatening the viability of the contract. The projected increase in energy costs were quite staggering as detailed in the Exempt report.

The Chair then invited questions and debate. Councillor Stanley spoke first stating that he wished to make a slight amendment but was not sure to which recommendation. His amendment was to ask the council to make a representation to Government supporting 'Swim England's' campaign to extend the Energy Bill Relief scheme and seek additional support for leisure centre's providing swimming pools.

The Chief Executive responded confirming that this request did not need to become an amendment to the recommendations before the Committee as he would be willing to undertake this action on behalf of the committee if approved. This was agreed.

Following discussion, the Committee confirmed that it was happy to support these recommendations.

Having been proposed by Councillor Pendleton and seconded by Councillor Walsh, the Committee

RESOLVED - That

- (1) A sum up to £265,000 is transferred from the Inflation Contingency Reserve in 2022/23 to support the additional cost of energy required for the Council's leisure centres;
- (2) It notes the contents of this report in relation to the increased costs faced by leisure operators across the UK linked to the energy supply crisis.
- (3) It agrees that it is necessary to support Freedom Leisure to ensure their continued viability and the delivery of the Leisure Operating Contract;

Policy and Finance Committee - 13.12.22

(4) It authorises a sum up to £265,000 is transferred from Inflation Contingency Reserve in 2022/23 to support the additional cost of energy required for the Council's leisure centres; and

(5) It notes that the Director of Environment and Communities and the Interim Group Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer is authorised to implement mitigating measure and make revisions and changes to the leisure operating contract based on energy matters affecting the facilities for the remainder of this financial year 2022/23.

535. OUTSIDE BODIES - FEEDBACK FROM MEETINGS

The Chair confirmed that there were no items to report into this meeting.

536. WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee received and noted its Work Programme for the remainder of the Municipal Year having added an additional item for its meeting on 9 February 2022. This was a report from the Group Head of Environment and Climate Change entitled Palmer Road Sports Hub Project, Angmering. This was being presented to the Committee to approve the drawdown and expenditure of Section 106 funding received and allocated to the project.

(The meeting concluded at 8.35 pm)