

**Minutes of a Meeting of the  
Joint Overview & Scrutiny Committee of  
Adur District and Worthing Borough Councils**

**Gordon Room, Worthing Town Hall**

**16 March 2017**

Roy Barraclough (Chairman)  
Keith Bickers (Vice Chairman)

**Adur District Council:**

Carol Albury  
\*George Barton  
Kevin Boram  
\*Clive Burghard  
\*James Butcher  
Stephen Chipp  
Joss Loader  
Robin Monk

**Worthing Borough Council:**

Nigel Morgan  
Louise Murphy  
Luke Proudfoot  
Bob Smytherman  
Jane Sim  
Steve Waight

\*Absent

**JOSC/16-17/52    Declarations of Interest/Substitutions**

Councillor Smytherman declared a non pecuniary interest as a Member of West Sussex County Council and a non pecuniary interest as Worthing Town Crier working with the Worthing Town Centre Initiative.

**JOSC/16-17/53    Minutes**

**Resolved** that the Minutes of the Committee held on 26 January 2017 be approved as the correct record and signed by the Chairman

**JOSC/16-17/54    Public Question Time**

There were no questions from members of the public

**JOSC/16-17/55    Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions**

There were no urgent items.

**JOSC/16-17/56    Consideration of any matter referred to the Committee in relation to a call-in of a decision**

There were no items.

**JOSC/16-17/57      Review of the Implementation of Public Space Protection Orders**

**Resolved:** that the Committees notes that there have been no further developments since the last report to the Committee in November 2017

**JOSC/16-17/58      Conclusion of the 'Surf's Up' Programme and the implementation of 'Platforms for our Places'**

Before the Committee was a report by the Director for Digital and Resources, a copy of which was sent to all Members, a copy of which was attached to the signed copy of these minutes as item 7. As part of its Work Programme for 2016/17 the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JOSC) had requested that it receive a further report on the outcomes from the 'Surf's Up' Programme and the detail of the implementation of the new Platforms for Our Places strategic vision. This request followed on from an earlier update on the *Surf's Up Programme* which was presented to JOSC by the Chief Executive and Leaders on 20 October 2016.

A Member asked the Chief Executive to outline the roles, responsibilities, input and relationships of the senior management team and elected members in producing Platforms for our Places. *The Chief Executive told Members the process had been evolutionary and that some commitments had remained from Surf's Up. Ideas and thought had been sought from community groups, individual politicians, businesses and regional bodies.*

A Member asked the following question: Commitment 5.1 relates to the future "better design for wider consumption". Is it possible to outline the key messages that will be presented (subject to agreement by the JSC and Councils) to elected Members, staff and stakeholders. *The Chief Executive explained that the document had been to both Councils and Members had been the given the opportunity to discuss and debate. Senior Staff were being worked with and over the next three to four weeks there were sessions for the rest of the staff. The briefings were for staff to understand the platforms they contributed to as part of their work. In terms of stakeholders there had been conversations within strategic partnerships, in relation to the public a softer approach was being used and platforms for our places would be quietly referenced. Key messages to staff included introducing the idea of creating platforms which some service areas were not used to doing.*

A Member noted that there had been mention of a re-branding exercise - and new logos were featured on council tax bills. Details were sought regarding the cost of the rebranding, the cost of the previous rebranding exercise and what were the future projected costs of replacing signage, council badges, stationery, uniforms, vehicles etc. Would these be updated immediately or as and when items require replacement on a rolling basis? *Members were told that the cost was £3,500 and a small Worthing graphic design company had been used, that money included other design features and guidance. There wasn't information concerning the cost of the*

*previous rebranding exercise and the plan was to replace signage etc as and when required.*

A Member asked the following question of the Adur Leader: Paragraph 4.7 discusses the lack of affordable housing and the increasing issue of homelessness as a result of temporary housing and the fact that Adur does not have a good record of providing sufficient accommodation for this sector of the market. Given the Executive's enthusiasm for IKEA to open a store in Adur, the expansion of Higgidy Pies and the transfer of Target homes could they explain how Adur is going to provide a sufficient number of good quality homes that families can afford on the Living Wage? *The Adur Leader told Members that a number of the jobs would go to people who lived locally or from the surrounding areas and he didn't anticipate a large influx of people moving to the area consequently. The Council had moved forward with building Council houses however there was no current intention to build homes for the living wage. The Councils were developing a housing strategy, the committee was told that there would be a requirement for 30% affordable housing on major developments which would include the potential development next to IKEA.*

A Member noted that Clause 6.2 stated that decisions were made in an open way and debating them when they were open. He asked whether this was consistent with the fact that the last Joint Strategic Committee lasted 25 minutes? *The Leader of Adur DC told members that there were only two items on the previous agenda and the meeting prior to that had been 65 minutes in length. The Worthing Leader remarked that items received a good deal of discussion and debate, Executive Members could be questioned about these decisions at Full Council.*

The questioning Member continued that clause 6.2 reflected Adur's residents' real ownership of their environment which is highly laudable he asked how did the Executive intend to ensure developers have the same regard? *The Adur Leader told the Committee that the Council required developers to have an early and meaningful public consultation. The Council was also keen to encourage Developers to meet with local Members and the Major Projects Board so that the Council could seek to ensure that developments fit into the local environment.*

A Member asked the following question: The report notes difficulties in undertaking projects with third parties. This is an issue identified by the Major Projects Scrutiny Working Party. How does the Executive intend to resolve this issue? *The Adur Leader explained that the Council was involved with a number of successful projects with third parties including the Adur tidal walls scheme. There were, however, instances where things had not gone quite so well. The Leader of Worthing told Members that the Councils had improved by communicating earlier.*

A Member asked the following question: With ref to para 3.6 or the report on Surf's Up, can he advise who are the businesses that consider themselves as 'trusted partners'? Do they advertise themselves and associate themselves as such and are we getting this message widely enough to other businesses in the area that we are 'trusted partners'? *The Chief Executive detailed the good relationships that had been built with local groups and the way in which the Councils had established themselves as trusted partners.*

A Member asked the following question: Following a meeting on Tuesday with Members, members of the Youth Council and officers I would like to know what platforms are considered for the younger people of Adur and Worthing in 'Platforms for our places'? *The Chief Executive told the Committee that all platforms were for young people and the development of the plan was a place based approach for example young people would benefit from knowing that in their would be interesting jobs and opportunities available when they left school. Some of the social economy commitments sought to provide important affordable housing for young people in their future. The Leader of Worthing explained to the Committee that youth services were the responsibility of the County Council. Nothing in the Platform's for our Places was targeted at a specific age group but everything was relevant to young people. The Leader of Adur commented that the document talked about making Adur and Worthing an attractive, safer and better place to be, he was a Councillor to make this happen so that it was an attractive, safer and better place for his children.*

A Member asked for an update as to any A27 developments and what lobbying the Councils have carried out with Highways England, the County Council and any other stakeholders in regards to the vital improvements necessary to assist Adur and Worthing long term prosperity? *The Worthing Leader told Members of the lobbying in relation to the A27. The Committee was told by the Adur Leader of the funding secured for improvements to the A27.*

A Member asked the following question: Does the Worthing Leader agree with me that using a small proportion of the Growth Bid received to demolish Teville Gate will make the site more attractive to commercial developers as demolishing won't be required and in addition in the short term could provide additional revenue from a short term additional surface car parking ? *The Leader said that spending a large amount of money to demolish Teville Gate would make it more attractive to developers but he said that it was not a good use of taxpayers money as the site was already owned by developers. Money had been received from the LEP which was for dealing with the development of Teville Gate House.*

A Member asked the following question: What support will the Council be providing to those important Town-wide events not provided by the Council but still of massive importance to the life of Worthing , such as Tide of Light, Rotary Carnival , Lions Festival and will the Council consider providing assistance to attract Birdman back to Worthing? *The Worthing Leader told the Committee that the Councils were proud to support the tide of light, rotary carnival and the lion's festival. The authority provided the platform for such events to take place and had been working hard to bring events such as the velodrome to Worthing. There was a feeling that the Birdman had run its course and businesses in the town felt that it was bad for business because it drew custom away from the shops.*

A Member asked if the Councils be formally signing up as a partner in Dementia Friendly Worthing Action Alliance and what measures will be undertaken to ensure the Councils lead by example. *The Worthing Leader confirmed that the Council would be signing up.*

A Member asked What measures would the Council be taking to tackle the lack of affordable housing and will consideration be given to adopting the same approach as Adur by building homes ourselves rather than relying on RSLs? *The Leader of Worthing told the Committee that of a loan of £10m had been made to Worthing Homes for that purpose.*

A Member asked the following question: To assist business partners to assist our overall objectives will there be any financial provision to assist those businesses disadvantaged from the revaluation of business rates such as hoteliers and the hospitality sector? *The Leader of Worthing explained to the Committee that the understanding was that local businesses was that they were generally better off and that unhappy Businesses would be able to appeal and comment on the consultation. The Leader told Members that he didn't feel that it was the Council's role to subsidise rates.*

A Member asked about ('Gross Value Added') and why it was lower than the US, the South East and that GVA had fallen in the south of West Sussex. *The Worthing Leader that it was a developing issue and asked Members to bear in mind the older populations of southern West Sussex Districts and the fact that those Districts in the northern part of West Sussex were closer geographically to London and Gatwick. With regards to Platforms for our Places the Leader discussed the importance of the financial economy and the aim to achieve better value jobs.*

**Resolved:** That the reports be noted

## **JOSC/16-17/59 Report of the Major Projects Scrutiny Working Group**

Before the Committee was a report by the Director for Digital and Resources, a copy of which had been circulated to all members, a copy of which is attached to a signed copy of these minutes as item 8. The report before members set out the findings and recommendations from the Major Projects Working Group set up by the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JOSC).

The Chairman of the Working Group introduced the report to the Committee and discussed with Members skills gaps concerning project management. Members discussed the recommendations within the report and agreed to add reference to Ward Members in recommendation nine after the word '*Leaders*,'.

**Resolved:** that the report be noted

**Recommendation:** that it be recommended that the findings/recommendations (as amended) be approved by the Adur and Worthing Joint Strategic Committee and appropriate Executives at West Sussex County Council.

## **JOSC/16-17/60 Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JOSC) - Review of New Ways of Working and revised JOSC Procedure Rules**

Before the Committee was a report by the Director for Digital and Resources, a copy of which was sent to all members, a copy of which was attached to the signed copy of these minutes as item 9. The report before member reviewed the New Ways of Working discussions held by the Committee at the previous meeting and sets out proposed changes to the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JOSC) Procedure Rules which will help improve the framework for managing the work of JOSC.

Members discussed the report and sought clarification to ensure previous discussions had been included within the draft procedure rules. The Policy Officer went through the outcomes of the previous meeting and explained where they had been included within the draft procedure rules.

Member asked that 2.1 of the draft procedure rules be amended to make the terms of the paragraph clearer.

**Resolved:** That the report be noted;

**Recommendation:** That it be recommended to the Joint Governance Committee that the revised Joint Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules be recommended for approval and incorporated into the Councils' Constitutions.

## **JOSC/16-17/61      Adur and Worthing Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme – 2016/17**

Before the Committee was a report by the Director for Digital and Resources, a copy of which was sent to all Members and a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of these minutes as item 10. The report outlined progress on the work contained in the 2016/17 Work Programme and proposals for the Committee's work programme for 2017/18

The Policy Officer introduced the report to the Committee and set out Scrutiny requests that had been received along with recommendations made by the Joint Chairs.

In relation to a proposal to set up a review to look at the Worthing Theatres budgets the Committee noted that a Theatres Working Group had been set up previously but were concerned that its recommendations had not been carried out. The Committee agree to set up a working group to investigate the progression of previous recommendations in preparation to present and question the Executive Member for Customer Services with their findings at the meeting in November. The Working Group was set up to consist of Keith Bickers, Luke Proudfoot, Bob Smytherman and Joss Loader.

With regards to a request to review the dredging of Brooklands Lake and the condition of the play area, Members agreed to add to the work programme an item on a review of Adur and Worthing play areas and review the situation relating to the dredging of Brooklands Lake following the Joint Strategic Committee meeting taking place in July 2017.

Members agreed to look at a report on solar panels at its meeting in June 2017.

**Resolved:** that progress on the work programme be noted

**Recommendations:** that the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme for 2017/18 be recommended to Full Councils for approval

## **JOSC/16-17-62      Worthing Local Plan - Update and Proposed Spatial Strategy**

Before the Committee was a report by the Director for Digital and Resources, a copy of which was sent to all Members and a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of these minutes as item 11. The report before Members indicated an emerging Spatial Strategy that would form the cornerstone of the Draft Local Plan that will be prepared for consultation later this year. It also proposes an approach to the allocation of sites for development and the protection of other areas.

Answering a question the principal planning officer clarified how members comments from a previous workshop would give officers 'a steer' on the use of certain sites.

A Member asked if the new local plan would protect current hotel and guest houses and attract new investment in Hotels and guest houses. The Executive Member for regeneration told members that the current strategy sought to retain tourism assets and there was a sustainable economy SPD that advised on change of use which could be used to protect some premises. The Executive Member told the Committee that there was potential for further hotels within the Borough.

A Member asked if the Local plan would deliver more affordable homes than under the current policies. The Executive Member for Regeneration told the Committee that the current policy stipulated that 30% of affordable housing on major developments (15 dwellings or over, and a financial contribution for under 15 dwellings). Figures for the new plan would be reviewed in light of all of the evidence and the Government's planning guidance.

A Member asked what challenges Worthing would face in delivering a legitimate local plan, referencing housing numbers in particular. The Head of Economic Growth told Members that the introduction of CIL had the potential to provide a barrier to the construction of affordable housing. There were problems around the 'duty to cooperate' on the provision of housing and there was more clarity needed on how this could be achieved.

A Member noted that developing brownfield sites alone would not be sufficient to meet the area's housing needs and that some edge of town greenfield sites would need to be considered as suitable sites for development. He opined that if brownfield sites failed to be developed then the subsequent building on greenfield sites was worrying. The Principal Planning Officer told the Committee that the housing need was so great that the Planning Inspector would need to see how that need was being met within the Local Plan, The edge of town greenfield sites identified contributed only a small element of the potential overall housing numbers.

A Member noted that there would be a test to check the potential for development on the Southwest part of Chatsmore Farm and opined that it could be detrimental to develop on part of a greenfield site because it could lead to development of the rest of the site. The Members asked that consideration be given to a recommendation that the Council do not test the Southwest part of Chatsmore Farm for potential development. The Head of Economic Growth explained to the Committee that inspector would be asking the Council to provide evidence about the viability of sites and without it would be in a weak position. The recommendation was put to a vote and not carried.

**Resolved:** that the report be noted

The meeting was declared closed by the Chairman at 9.30pm it having commenced at 6.30pm.



**Chairman**