

# 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.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Town or Parish Council or West Sussex County Council [WSSC]</b>
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 Pagham 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