

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Council
held in the Queen Elizabeth II Room
at the Shoreham Centre, Pond Road, Shoreham-by-Sea**

15 December 2016

Councillor Ann Bridges, Chairman
Councillor James Butcher, Vice-Chairman

Councillor Carol Albury	Councillor Paul Graysmark
Councillor Carson Albury	*Councillor Liz Haywood
Councillor Les Alden	Councillor Emily Hilditch
Councillor George Barton	Councillor David Lambourne
Councillor Ken Bishop	Councillor Joss Loader
*Councillor Brian Boggis	*Councillor Barry Mear
Councillor Kevin Boram	Councillor Peter Metcalfe
Councillor Clive Burghard	Councillor Robin Monk
Councillor Stephen Chipp	Councillor Neil Parkin
Councillor Brian Coomber	Councillor Geoff Patmore
Councillor Angus Dunn	Councillor Lyn Phillips
Councillor Emma Evans	Councillor David Simmons
Councillor Jim Funnell	*Councillor Ben Stride
	*Councillor Sami Zeglam

* = Absent

C/035/16-17 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Haywood, Mear, Zeglam and Boggis.

C/036/16-17 Declarations of Interest

Members were invited to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests, none were declared.

C/037/16-17 Confirmation of Minutes

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Council on 24 October 2016 be approved as a correct record and they be signed by the Chairman.

C/038/16-17 Questions from the Public

The Chairman announced that there were 4 registered questions from two people, Mr Reid and Mr Coughlin.

Questions from Alastair Reid Resident of Victoria Road

1) I represent Future Adur Schools Team, a group representing 250 parents who welcome new housing developments in Adur, but are concerned that not enough is being done to meet the resulting education need. With 500 new dwellings in development at this time in Shoreham alone, and several thousand more in Adur planned, as well as population drift from Brighton and London, we are seeing extreme pressure being put on our schools and their infrastructure. Whilst West Sussex County Council has the lead responsibility for the planning and provision of school places, we believe the Adur as the local planning authority can have a major part to play helping reduce the impact of new developments on education. For example in the design of the Adur Local Plan, the use of ALL the levers of the planning process, and in its working relationship with WSCC.

Can you tell us how you will use all your powers and influence to secure timely, and appropriate investment in school infrastructure to meet the demand?

The Leader responded :

Adur District Council has worked closely with WSCC in preparing the Adur Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which sets out the key infrastructure requirements to support the planned increase in housing across the District. On this basis a new school site is included within the strategic housing allocation at New Monks Farm and a need for a new school site serving Shoreham Town Centre has been identified.

As the development at the Western Harbour Arm would not generate sufficient demand for a new school site to be allocated at the Harbour (and there would be viability concerns about such provision) the Council is working with WSCC to look at the options to meet future demand. This may be delivered through a new school site or extending existing schools.

To assist the Local Plan Examination in Public, which starts on the 31st January 2017, WSCC and Adur District Council are likely to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) prior to the Examination starting. This will set out how both authorities will work in partnership to meet future school provision.

It is worth noting that the Department for Education (DfE) is currently considering a Free School proposal for Shoreham and if the need is accepted the DfE may provide direct funding to deliver a new school site (potentially purchasing an existing site within the Town Centre).

To the supplementary question, the Leader responded that in the Adur Local Plan, the site of the New Monks Farm development had been designated for a new school.

Question 2

2) In Shoreham there is a need for additional infrastructure at Swiss Gardens school, not least directly because of the new development at Ropetackle North, as it is the closest school in the catchment area. Can section 106 money earmarked for education from a particular large development of houses be ring-fenced to provide additional facilities at the most local school to the development?

The Leader responded:

It is understood that WSCC has not identified any specific project for the use of the Ropetackle North education contribution and has indicated that it would prefer flexibility in the use of s106 education contributions for the reasons set out in Question 1. However, the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations restrict the pooling of s106 contributions (to no more than 5 development sites) and as there is a need to accommodate a temporary expansion of Swiss Gardens School a request to WSCC to ringfence this contribution to this school would seem to be reasonable.

The Leader further commented that as Ward Councillor for St Nicolas he was aware of the rapid expansion of the school and had sympathy with the S106 monies being ring fenced for education needs.

On a supplemental question the Leader noted that the planning committee had specified that the S106 could be used for transport matters therefore he believed that it was possible that it could be earmarked for education when the terms were negotiated with WSCC.

Question 3

Questions from Mr Coughlin, Head of Swiss Gardens Primary School

1) As you know, schools expansion has greatly affected our school, Swiss Gardens. We have a unique set of issues to deal with. High demand and the smallest footprint of any primary school in Shoreham. We have a site that was built for 1 form entry, now having three classes at reception. The new 'temporary classrooms' built this summer to accommodate demand will be there for at least six years. And as a result we have lost precious play areas, an environmental learning area, and parking spaces.

All this in practice means :

- No owned green play/sports area (we have use of some of the Meads, but this is often flooded in winter)
- No school hall large enough - which means : ○ multiple sittings for lunch, meaning less time to eat and stressed kids not eating ○ Difficulty in building school culture as we can't all fit in one hall for assemblies and events
- Library having to double up as a music room ● Year five year group separated from rest of the school
- Reduction of staff car parking, and increased traffic causing chaos around school
- 90 reception class 4 and 5 year olds having play time in a space roughly 200m², leaving an armspan (1.5m²) width of personal space per child

The best thing we could do would be to convert 'our part' of the Meads into an all year round, all weather sports facility. This would be of major benefit to the school not only for facilities but also for play space and could also work as a community facility. It would require significant works and monies and the drainage would need to be resolved before anything else could proceed.

Will the council support the school and help make this happen? Specifically by:

- a) trying either to ring fence the £247k of 106 money from Ropetackle North in the planning process, through writing it into the deeds of variance?
- b) and/or help us lobby WSCC to secure that money for such improvements?
- c) Work with us to improve facilities at the The Meads for school use?

The Leader responded:

As indicated in previous answers the Council is keen to work closely with WSCC to meet the future educational needs of an expanding population. To this end the Council is happy to commit to work with the school and WSCC to improve the facilities at the school. The loss of public open space would be a policy issue and concern that would have to be addressed in any planning application if this was the best option available to improve Swiss Gardens as an important local school.

The Leader also commented that lobbying WSCC was a way forward and encouraged lobbying of the county councillors. Regarding The Meads, the Leader stated that the District Council would do all it could to support the School including investigating dual or extended use of the Meads.

In responding to the supplementary question, the Leader suggested lobbying the local MP, County Councillors and ward councillors (including himself).

Question 4

Beyond the play space, we have immediate priorities for the school that include :-
- Environmental area - Hall space/ facility - Dedicated music room/meeting room - Kitchen

Will the council support the school in trying either to ring fence the 106 money from Ropetackle North in the planning process, through writing it into the deeds of variance, and/or help us lobby WSCC to secure that money for such improvements?

The Leader responded : Yes as stated in previous questions.

The supplementary question was on whether it was in the District Council's power to specify how the s106 money was spent, the Leader indicated he would seek advice from the Planning Officers and respond direct.

Mr Hillman mentioned that the flooding of the Meads, which held the underground river from Overmead into the Lake at the Swiss Gardens, had been investigated in the past and found to be an issue with Southern Water with an incorrect valve to regulate the waterflow. Regarding the dog notices at The Meads, perhaps these were on the wrong gate, the correct gate(s) being the one(s) to the allotment area.

C/039/16-17 Announcements by the Chairman, Leader, Executive Members and / or Head of Paid Service

The Chairman informed Council that she had attended several 90th and 95th birthdays in residential homes for the elderly. She had also attended the AGM of the NSPCC in Arundel Castle. On Remembrance Sunday, she had laid a wreath at the war memorial in

East Street, Shoreham after attending the service in St.Mary de Haura church; during the afternoon she had laid a wreath at the war memorial in Lancing and attended the service in St. Michaels Church.

At the Adur and Worthing Business Awards evening at the Pavilion theatre in Worthing she had met nominees and their guests, The Perch restaurant on Lancing Beach won an award. She had also attended the graduation ceremony for the Concordia organisation at Sussex Yacht club.

Joining the Mayor of Worthing for Children In Need day, they visited the offices and sites of Adur and Worthing Councils, where they judged members of staff who were wearing fancy dress and raising funds for Pudsey a total of £1,232.88 was raised.

The Chairman's Christmas card entries from various primary schools were on display at the Centre with the selected work produced on her card. Prizes had been presented to the winning pupils this week.

The Sea of Lights festival in Lancing had been a great success where she had helped children make lanterns then acted as a marshal for the procession. The Chairman had also attended a Guild Care charity event in St.Pauls Art centre, Worthing and numerous carol services representing the Council, in Arundel, Chichester and Crawley. Her own Civic Carol service was very well attended with the orchestra of the Sir Robert Woodard Academy, Il Voci singers and the Boundstone Chorus.

The Chairman announced that Friday 27 January 2017 was Holocaust Memorial Day with the theme will be "How Can Life Go On". Further details would be circulated nearer the time.

Finally the Chairman announced that prior to the meeting she had welcomed the winners of the inaugural Adur District Council's Distinction in Buildings Awards scheme. The award scheme had been introduced with the aim of encouraging high standards of design and workmanship in developments in Adur, and giving public recognition to excellence in building. The Awarding Panel was made up of representatives from the Shoreham Society, Adur District Conservation Advisory Group as well as Members and Officers of the Council. In the six categories in which awards could be made, seven awards were given, highlighting the high standards of design currently being achieved within Adur District, and giving encouragement for standards in future developments.

The awards were given to the following developments: 16-22 Ship Street, Shoreham, 3-7 Shopsdam Road, Lancing, Reception Area, Lancing College, Adur Ferry Foot Bridge, Shoreham, American Express Elite Football Performance Centre, Lancing; The Perch, 28 Brighton Road, Lancing; Shoreham Academy, Kingston Lane, Shoreham

Leader announced that he would have welcomed Mary D'Arcy the Director for Communities however Mary had been struck with a virus being unable to attend the meeting that evening.

Neither the Executive Members nor the Chief Executive had any announcements for Council.

C/040/16-17 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items under the urgency provisions.

C/041/16-17 Recommendations from the Executive and Committees to Council

(A) Joint Strategic Committee - 6 December 2016

The Leader presented and proposed the recommendations from the meeting of the Committee on 6 December as item 7A circulated to Members separate from the agenda and is attached to the minutes as updated 7A(i) and 7A(ii).

(i) “Platforms for our Places” - Unlocking the power of people, communities and our local geographies

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Carson Albury.

The Leader explained that the document built on the achievements of *Surf's Up*. It was a statement of ambition for Adur, demonstrated our ability in continue, in many cases improve, service to our community - despite the financial constraints. The Council wanted to work with its partners in the community to build on our successes and allow our communities to thrive. The Council were looking to develop our economy, our social enterprises, stewarding our natural resources and developing our service, solution and leadership of our places. Officers will regularly report on our progress to Joint Strategic.

On a vote - For 24 Against 0 Abstain 0

Resolved Council considered the draft *Platforms for our Places* document and endorsed the approach as one of Adur District Council's strategic documents for the next 3 years;

(ii) Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 - 2019/20 Adur District Council, Worthing Borough Council and Joint Committee

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Evans.

The Leader explained that the Executive had looked at the programme and bids put before it - changing the priority of enhancements to the street scene to put these above improvements to disabled facilities at the Shoreham Centre; this being due to the recent substantial investment in the Centre.

On a vote - For 24 Against 0 Abstain 0

Resolved that the 3 Year Programmes be approved.

C/042/16-17 Report of the Leader on decisions taken by the Executive

The Leader of the Council presented his report on decisions taken by the Executive since the last ordinary meeting of the Council; which were detailed in Item 8. An amended

version of the report was circulated before the meeting with an update on the decisions of the Joint Strategic Committee on 6 December.

The Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing updated on the discussion at the Joint Strategic Committee meeting on the Motion on Notice presented to the last Council meeting. He mentioned that the Committee had considered the content of the Motion but the figures obtained by the Council did not match those presented in the supporting information with the Motion. Using the Council's figures there would be a burden on the local residents in an increase in the Council Tax with a possibility that the increase would trigger the need for a referendum, for the increase, which would also be a cost to the Council.

C/043/16-17 Members Questions under Council Procedure Rule 12

The Proper Officer had received questions from Members under CPR 12, from Councillors Alden, Bishop and Barton.

(i) Question from Cllr Ken Bishop to the Executive Member for the Environment

'I have been approached by many members of the public wanting to know what happened to the Shoreham supposed Late Night Shopping on 26 November. The event was advertised in many local publications as being a 'fun night for all the family with children's fairground rides' etc

In fact the so called fun night event was a complete washout, no rides, as in previous years, not even the Christmas tree had been put in place, no lamppost decorations and shopkeepers wondering what, if anything was going on.

I understand that a certain Councillor was rushed off his feet at the Marlipins Museum dressed as Father Christmas, as this was the only visible event for the children.

Whilst I am aware that the sacking of the Town Centre co-ordinator may have had an effect, but who was responsible for failing to ensure that the event went ahead as planned. I have been told that it is down to the dreaded Health and Safety laws, which I do not believe as this event has been successful for many years.

Can we be assured that this annual event will continue in the future and that responsibility for the organisation should not be left in the hands of one person, and that departmental responsibility be assured in future.

Perhaps a December date would be more appropriate, and once the decorations and tree are in place.'

Response:

Following the departure of the Town Centre Coordinator, colleagues in Place & Investment stepped in at short notice to deliver an annual Artisans Christmas market event over the weekend of 25-27th November. Previous trouble with fairground rides had created a

reluctance for local shops to remain open for a late night event. Christmas lighting arrangements were actioned at short notice, lamp column structural tests required by SSE identified a number of lamp column failures in the High Street which could not be addressed prior to Christmas. As a consequence the lighting displays were limited to those posts that were considered structurally sound.

The team was pleased to support the promotion of the Marlipins museum event as part of the festivities. For 2017 a group of 20 residents have set up a working group to deliver the event, plans are already being made with the event agreed for the weekend of the 8th to 10th December. The group is working with the Council and gaining support with local communities and business to support the weekend.

Thanks were due to key people in the Place and Investment team for running the event at short notice.

(ii) Question from Councillor Alden to the Executive Member for Customer Services

“Following my public question to the Executive member in October 2015, the following answers were given:

- ‘The number of LTE properties in Adur in 2014 was reported as 112. The number of LTE properties in Adur in 2015 was reported as 98, which is a reduction of 14.
- ‘There are currently 1,313 households on the Adur Housing Register. Out of these, 670 households require a one bedroom property which means they are single people or couples without children. The remaining 643 households require family size accommodation (i.e. 2 bed, 3 bed and 4 bed).
- ‘The average waiting time for housing (across all Bands and bedroom sizes) via the Housing Register is 2.5 to 3 years.
- ‘The number of households in temporary accommodation in Adur has reduced since 2012. This is illustrated by the figures in table 1, recorded on the 31 March each year. As of 20 October 2015 there were 63 households in Temporary Accommodation
- 31 March 2012 87
- 31 March 2013 81
- 31 March 2014 70
- 31 March 2015 63
- ‘The number of affordable homes completed in Adur during the first three years of the housing strategy was 67. Of these 19 were at social ‘target rent’, 35 were affordable market rent and 13 shared ownership.

Will the executive member please take the opportunity to update these figures.

Councillor Carson Albury responded with verbal figures, the full figures were to be emailed to the questioner:

The updated figures are as follows:

The number of LTE properties in Adur in 2015 was reported as 98. The number of LTE properties in Adur in 2016 was reported as 118, which is an increase of 20. The Council is still examining the reasons for this increase.

We have recently reviewed the Housing Register and contacted households where they were not actively bidding for properties to see if they still wanted to remain on the Register. Many did not so the overall number on the Register has fallen, but we can be confident these people are those in genuine housing need and who are actively looking for social housing.

There are currently 695 households on the Adur Housing Register. Out of these, 302 households require a one bedroom property which means they are single people or couples without children. The remaining 393 households require family size accommodation (i.e. 2 bed, 3 bed and 4 bed).

The average waiting time to be rehoused via the Housing Register is :

Band A 10-12 months

Band B 14 months

Band C 14 months (sheltered), 23 months for 2 or 3 bed flats, 3 years for 3 bed house

There is a large difference between shortest and longest waiting times, of several months to several years, e.g. three bed flat in band C, shortest wait is 3 months, longest wait is 6 years. One reason for this difference is possibly because a few applicant are bidding irregularly or have a specific area and property type they bid on.

'The number of households in temporary accommodation in Adur has reduced since 2012. This is illustrated by the figures in table 1, recorded on the 31 March each year. As of 12 December 2016 there are 53 households in Temporary Accommodation

- 31 March 2012 87
- 31 March 2013 81
- 31 March 2014 70
- 31 March 2015 63
- 31 March 2016 55 ·

There were no new affordable housing units developed in Adur in 2015/16.

We anticipate in 2017 that there will be 68 new units at two schemes, Southlands Hospital and Shoreham Waterside, although the completion dates are yet to be confirmed.

Southlands Hospital - 20 affordable rented and 12 shared ownership
Shoreham Waterside - 36 shared ownership

(iii) Question from Councillor George Barton to the Executive Member for Customer Service

Would the Executive Member for Customer Services please inform Council how many new kitchens and bathrooms have been fitted to Council Properties in the last 6 months.

Councillor Carson Albury responded:

The Capital Improvement Programme has only been running since September 2016 (so for three months), during which time the following were installed:

Kitchens: 34 (plus 3 partial) Bathrooms: 37 (plus 8 partial)

In addition we sometimes install replacement kitchens and bathrooms within our void properties if they are due for replacement, as it is less disruptive to carry out this work when the properties are empty.

The total installation in our Void Properties over the past six months are: Kitchens: 5
Bathrooms: 6

In addition we sometimes install replacement kitchens and bathrooms if a tenant reports a problem, and the problem is so severe it cannot be repaired. Building Services carry out this work.

The total installation by Building Services over the past six months are: Kitchens: 6
Bathrooms: 3

Therefore the total number of installations overall are: Kitchens: 45 Bathrooms: 46

(iv) Question from Councillor Alden to the Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing

“It has been reported that a large quantity of traditional red telephone boxes are likely to become available for purchase in the foreseeable future. Would the Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing consider leading and providing the Capital to assist Community Groups (such as Churches and Community Centres) to purchase, install and adopt these red boxes across Adur as Defibrillator Stations?

An example of this can be seen in Bramber Village.

Would he also support working with these Community Groups to encourage key people to become Community First Responders under the St. John's or NHS schemes?

Councillor Simmons responded:

The adopt a BT telephone kiosk scheme has been in place for around 4 years, with BT identifying a number of phone boxes available for community use. He believes that Adur has only one red box, located in East Street, and which has already been adopted to advertise local events. The majority of the other types of telephone boxes across Adur are in a poor state, are more of a three sided cubicle style and do not lend themselves to the installation of a defibrillator. These type of schemes using red telephone boxes generally require Councils to be the lead organisation - in most areas these have been the Parish Councils. Community uses can be broad, not only placing defibrillators, but also use as lending libraries and tourist information booths.

These types of schemes are in place in West Sussex and there has been some work in Horsham to make the district council area a HeartSafe area.

There is a current consultation in Adur in relation to 8 telephone boxes that BT no longer require, but these are of the newer type, not suited to defibrillator use. As a Council we should be concerned about the cost and extent of such installations, and whether it is in fact our responsibility to provide them rather than the health authority. We must also remember that some voluntary sector bodies such as Southwick Lions raise funds to purchase such items, an example of which is installed in Shoreham Community Centre.

It should be noted that the Ambulance Service seeks to encourage other community groups to lead fundraising efforts for defibrillators and cabinets to place in public areas. This is at a normal cost of around £1,400 for an existing red box. However, where one has to be provided and installed with necessary power supplies as proposed, this rises to around £5,000 per installation. This does not include regular maintenance, cleaning and repair. Due to the lack of red boxes in Adur, all would need to be installed from scratch which would also require planning consent, and more would need to be done to assess the level of community support along with identification of specific locations.

In terms of the support to the promotion of first responder schemes in Sussex (especially West) these schemes are usually led by South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAM) rather than St John Ambulance. The 'first responder' training costs in the region of £600. As Executive Member he would be willing to advertise the scheme to encourage people to come forward for training.

C/044/16-17 Motion on Notice

Before Council was details of a Motion on Notice submitted to the Proper Officer to the Council, details attached to the minutes as item 11. The Motion had been submitted by Councillor Barton and seconded by Councillor Simmons. The Proper Officer advised that once proposed and seconded the Motion would be debated at the meeting according to Council Procedure Rule 14.5.3 (iii) .

Councillor Barton addressed Council to explain the background to his Motion. The Motion was part of a nationwide campaign by the Royal British Legion to support delivery of the aims of the Community Covenant. Specific questions on the Census relating to serving and retired members of the armed forces community, and their families would lead to identification of their location(s) leading to more specific assistance and support.

As the Council's Armed Forces Champion he was pleased to support the campaign by the proposal that Adur endorsed it.

As seconder to the Motion, Councillor Simmons highlighted the stability needs for young people, particularly from service families who travelled frequently leading to specific education needs. Their health and wellbeing was key and could be delivered through the Public Health Plan which would be a huge benefit in the future.

Other Members in the chamber stood to support the Motion, including those who had retired from the armed forces.

On a vote there were For 24 Against 0 Abstain 0

Resolved that the Council calls upon the UK Parliament to include in the final census questionnaire questions concerning our Armed Forces community.

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 8.14 pm, it having commenced at 7pm

Chairman