

Minutes of a meeting of the
Worthing Council
18 October 2022
at 6.30 pm

The Mayor, Councillor Henna Chowdhury

Councillor Noel Atkins	Councillor Nigel Morgan
Councillor Roy Barraclough	Councillor Richard Mulholland
*Councillor Mike Barrett	Councillor Richard Nowak
Councillor Ibsha Choudhury	Councillor Dale Overton
Councillor Russ Cochran	Councillor Jon Roser
Councillor Dr Beccy Cooper	Councillor Helen Silman
Councillor Dan Coxhill	Councillor Dawn Smith
Councillor Jim Deen	Councillor Sally Smith
Councillor Rita Garner	Councillor Elizabeth Sparkes
Councillor Cathy Glynn-Davies	Councillor Emma Taylor
Councillor Lionel Harman	Councillor Samuel Theodoridi
Councillor Dan Hermitage	Councillor Hazel Thorpe
*Councillor Margaret Howard	Councillor John Turley
Councillor Daniel Humphreys	Councillor Steve Waight
*Councillor Charles James	Councillor Carl Walker
Councillor Kevin Jenkins	Councillor Vicki Wells
Councillor Martin McCabe	Councillor Andy Whight
Councillor Dr Heather Mercer	Councillor Rosey Whorlow

***=Absent**

C/25/22-23 Apologies for Absence

The Mayor received apologies for absence from Councillors Mike Barrett, Margaret Howard and Charles James.

C/26/22-23 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

C/27/22-23 Confirmation of Minutes

A Member raised a point of accuracy in regards to the minutes from the Full Council meeting held on the 19th July 2022.

It was suggested that the responses provided to questions asked in relation to PSPOs under the Leaders Report had been omitted and therefore the minutes were not an accurate record of that meeting.

Following a vote on the accuracy of the minutes (19 in Favour, 12 Against & 3 Abstentions)

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 19th July 2022 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Mayor.

C/28/22-23 Questions from the Public

The Mayor advised that 2 questions had been received in advance of the meeting.

1. Question submitted by Mr Connell Loggenberg, a Worthing Resident

Central to every function of Council, is and must be Equality — it's an accepted constitutional and statutory duty.

In June 2020, I wrote to Council about my concern for the Council's poor, if not lack of, practical Promotion of Racial Equality.

At the time, I referenced the monument at Steyne Gardens, erected in 1902, a period in which any emphasis of importance pertaining to the lives of people of so-called Black or Coloured Ethnicity was brazenly dismissed.

The real history represented by the monument, is a painful reminder of lives lost — in that they were, in the words of Council, "...lions led by donkeys", and that "Those who led the charge for war in South Africa were not doing so with virtuous aims..."

Soldiers and others fighting on the British side, were made to believe that they were fighting a noble cause, but they were misled — it was for commercial gain for a very small minority.

In addition, in this ruthless pursuit for commercial gain, was the careless loss of life of a people down rightly dismissed as unimportant — People who were labelled as Black and Coloured...because of the colour of their skin.

So unimportant they were, that many monuments erected in remembering the fallen, does not even mention them. The monument in Steyne Gardens is a prime example.

*Council further told me in reply,
"...I support the campaigns to promote a more inclusive and fairer society in which race and skin colour should never be a basis for discrimination."*

"I will work with colleagues and approach the management of Worthing Museum to assess the public facing displays relating to this time and explore options for adding to the information provided in Worthing that gives the proper context. An information board explaining the history of the war near the memorial or in the museum or Town Hall may be appropriate."

I followed up this matter in subsequent Council meetings and asked the question as to who exactly the colleagues in Council are that are working on this, when and how the museum were contacted and what progress had been made.

To date, the awkward silence from Council on this point, stirs a bitter reminder of how people who look like me, should remember our place...that we are unimportant and do not deserve a mention on or by monument display — we are to be seen, but not heard. And where we are heard, not to be understood.

And where there's understanding, that's as far as it goes.

Question:

Does Council consider the lives, or at least, the story of the lives of the People labelled as black and coloured, who also fought alongside the British, were also misled and also died, important enough to be visibly and permanently inscribed on, next to or near the monument at Steyne Gardens as a real and tangible display of equal consideration for the lives of such?

If yes, who will finally lead the charge on this project and when?

If no, and nobody will lead the charge on this matter, please explain.

The Cabinet Member for Culture & Leisure replied that she understood Mr Loggenberg had raised a similar question in the past. This administration was committed to being a listening, community-first council. As part of this the Council wanted to support and celebrate the cultural diversity of Worthing. The community cohesion group would be re-started after November 2022. This allowed for good data to be gathered including the census data expected to be available from November. The Cabinet Member would ensure that this issue was part of the working group's scope and that it seeks local and expert views on how to respectfully acknowledge all those who served in conflicts of the past.

You may be interested to know that Worthing Museum had been accepted as one of just fourteen museums in the UK to work on a project with the Museum Association focused on decolonising museum collections. Whilst this was focused on accessioned artefacts within the museum collection and not public monuments, this did put Worthing at the forefront of this crucial area of work and showed a commitment and openness to change.

2. Question submitted by Mr Connell Loggenberg, a Worthing Resident

The global story of Covid-19, is by the day unravelling with great cause for concern.

Much of the information the public is expected to rely on, is that of the National Government's narrative and that which the BBC and other Corporate Media disseminates.

Measures touted by government and adhered to by local Councils to combat Covid-19 proves controversial.

Evidence emerged that the former Prime Minister wasn't adhering to the rules repeatedly block-chained through television and leaflets pushed through our doors.

People were told to wear masks, to social distance— the evidence of effectiveness in reducing spread is proven to be negligent. The scientific studies relied on by government

for touting this measure remains wanting...and yet, people are still left to believe it prevents Covid.

We were told that a Vaccine, containing a mRNA and other undisclosed lipid nanoparticles is the solution to preventing anyone from dying or developing serious illness due to Covid.

The reality is something else. People are developing serious adverse reactions to these injections. Many of these were foreseeable adverse reactions that the public had not been told about. Listed on the government website, is less than a page's worth of information on possible side effects.

The number of people having died subsequent to receiving these injections is going up by the week — the UKMRA website proves it.

A Freedom of Information request and court action against Pfizer, one of the pharmaceutical companies' product rolled out amongst the public, proves that there is in fact over 1290 side effects which includes death — information Pfizer did not disclose to the public, information the government ought to have known, given that it went into contract with Pfizer, and ought to have shared with local governments and Councils.

The full contract itself, to my knowledge, remains undisclosed.

More people are suffering from these injections and are doing so in silence, and the media won't talk about it.

I have the supporting documents pertaining to this matter.

Question:

Is the Council prepared to see the data, to meet with experts in their field who are being sidelined by the national government, and share this data with the public it serves for the advancing of the public's right to informed consent, and the public's protection from proven risks.

If yes, who in Council can I share the data with?

The Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing replied that the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI) was an independent expert advisory committee that advised United Kingdom health departments on immunisation. It made recommendations on vaccination schedules and vaccine safety and had a responsibility to provide high quality advice and recommendations.

The Council recommended that any data held should be shared with the JCVI as the country's independent expert advisory committee so that it could be assessed. The Council encouraged the public to continue to make informed decisions based upon the information available.

Currently both the JCVI and the Government encouraged the uptake of vaccinations due to the wide benefits on public health. The Council encouraged everyone who was eligible to take up the offer of vaccination, especially vulnerable groups, to improve the public health of its communities and reduce the risk of Covid-19.

However, the Council respected the informed decisions of those who chose not to.

3. Question asked by Penelope Joyce, a Worthing Resident

"In its role as council for the community, what kind of measures and restrictions will the council put in place to start protecting stretched communities such as Selden Ward in East Worthing, where there is already an over concentration of HMOs and temporary emergency accommodation that has led to a dire situation of anti social behaviour for all the community, including local businesses and amenities to contend with day in and day out?"

The Cabinet Member for Citizen Services replied that a similar question had been asked by Councillor Roser at a previous meeting.

As a Council, the priority is the housing crisis and the situation was desperate with many people trapped in unsuitable, emergency accommodation. Evidence shows that mixed communities are required to enable everyone to do better and everyone can thrive.

Therefore, as a strategy, the Council wants to start buying more of its own, or, building more of its own accommodation and that accommodation will not only be located in one place. It does need to be kept relatively central, but it does not need to be centred in one ward.

The Council needs to end its reliance on private provision because it's incredibly expensive and new provision needs to be more evenly spread. Once details of future proposals are available they will be shared with you.

4. Question asked by Mary Day, a Worthing Resident

What was the Council doing to support disabled people across the Borough?

The Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing thanked Mrs Day for the question and for raising this issue with the Council, acknowledging that this was an issue that needed to be addressed. Partnership work with various disability groups was due to commence early in the new year and the Cabinet Member would speak to Mrs Day following the meeting to provide more information about this work.

C/29/22-23 Announcements by the Mayor, Leader of the Council, Executive Members or the Head of Paid Service

The Mayor provided a summary of the events that she had attended and supported since the last Full Council meeting and details of the upcoming Mayor's charity events.

The Cabinet Member for the Environment announced the follow

- (i) Bathing Designation at Beach House - the beach surveys required for the DEFRA application had now been completed. The Cabinet Member wished to publicly thank the citizen scientists who took part. Collectively, the volunteers

completed 20 hours of observations which were recorded on 43 individual beach survey sheets. The complete application would be submitted by the Councilors Environmental Health Protection Officers by the 30th October.

(ii) Launch of Waste Electronic and Electrical Equipment - the new service, to collect small electrical items from the curbside launched across the Borough on the 3rd October. The Wte Team had reported great uptake of the service with approximately 2.5 tonnes of material collected in the first week alone.

(ii) The Cabinet Member for Resources advised that a new round of funding had been launched in October for small business and apprenticeship grants across both Worthing and Adur. The grants had been very successful in the past and aimed to help micro and small businesses. This time, the Council was prioritising applications with a strong green or sustainable element and from businesses that had not previously accessed funding. This was part of the Council's drive to encourage green growth of the local economy and stimulate new employment opportunities.

The Cabinet Member for Culture and Leisure announced that the Worthing Festival would be held in 2023 from the 10th to 18th June. This followed discussions with both the artists and the creative sector and many of the major businesses and venues within the town.

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration announced that the next instalment of the Big Clean was taking place on Sunday 23rd October. All were welcome with equipment supplied. There would be a beach clean from 10.00am until 12 noon (meeting at the coast office) followed by a community litter pick at Victoria Park (equipment available by the play park).

The Deputy Leader announced that the first phase of the Big Listening campaign had concluded, the second phase was currently under development and he thanked all those who had taken part.

There were no announcements from the Leader or the Chief Executive.

C/30/22-23 Items raised under Urgency Provisions

There were no urgent items raised under the urgency provisions.

C/31/22-23 Recommendations from the Cabinet and Committees to Council

Council had, before it, recommendations from the Joint Governance Committee, the Joint Strategic Committee and the Worthing Joint Strategic Sub-Committee.

Extracts of these minutes had been circulated as items 7A(i) & (ii), 7B, 7C(i) & (ii) and 7D.

Item 7A(i) Joint Governance Committee - 28 July 2022

Audit Committee with Independent Non-Voting Members

The Vice-Chair of the Joint Governance Committee, Cllr Hermitage, proposed the recommendations from the meeting held on 28 July 2022. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Dr Beccy Cooper and following a vote (For 34, Against 0, Abstentions 0):

Resolved: That Worthing Borough Council

1. Approved the change of the name of the Councils' Joint Governance Committee to the Joint Audit and Governance Committee;
2. Approved the appointment of two Independent co-opted Persons to the Committee to assist with the Councils' with the audit function.

Item 7A(ii) Joint Governance Committee - 28 July 2022

Conferment of Honorary Alderman - Sean McDonald and Robert Smytherman

The Vice-Chair of the Joint Governance Committee, Cllr Dan Hermitage, proposed the recommendation from the Joint Governance Committee meeting held on 28 July 2022.

It was noted that the Joint Governance Committee had approved the nominations (rather than approved the granting) for Honorary Aldermanship of the Borough of Worthing to former Mayors Sean McDonold and Robert Smytherman and that the vote on this item was 5 in favour, 0 against and 11 abstentions.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Kevin Jenkins and following a vote (For 28, Against 0, Abstentions 6):

Resolved: That Worthing Borough Council approved that a special meeting of the Council be arranged under section 249(1) of the Local Government Act for the specific purpose of conferring the title of 'Honorary Alderman' to Sean McDonald and Robert Smytherman.

Item 7B Joint Governance Committee - 27 September 2022

Modernising and Updating the Councils' Constitutions

The Vice-Chair of the Joint Governance Committee, Cllr Dan Hermitage, proposed the that the recommendations from the Joint Governance Committee meeting held on 27 September 2022 be amended to include the following additional wording:-

'that the new constitution be implemented from the 1st November 2022 to allow for the constitution to be checked, formatted and published on the Councils' website'.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Dr Beccy Cooper.

Cllr Jenkins proposed an amendment in relation to Council Procedure Rule 12.1(d), *'that Council invites the Monitoring Officer to review CPR 12.1(d) to find parity in regards to the rotation of questions and bring back a proposal in relation to it'.*

The proposed amendment was seconded by Cllr Steve Waight and unanimously supported by Council.

Councillors thanked the Monitoring Officer and the Working Group for all of their work over the summer drafting the revised constitution.

The proposal, as amended, was supported following a vote (For 33, Against 0, Abstentions 1).

Resolved: That Worthing Borough Council approved the revised Constitution and that it be implemented from the 1st November 2022.

Item 7C(i) Joint Strategic Committee - 11 October 2022

Our Plan - The new corporate plan for Adur & Worthing Councils

The Leader proposed the recommendations from the Joint Strategic Committee meeting held on 11 October 2022.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Sam Theodoridi and supported following debate and a vote (For 25, Against 0, Abstentions 9):

Resolved: That Worthing Borough Council approved 'Our Plan' as the core strategic document for the next three years.

Item 7C(ii) Joint Strategic Committee - 11 October 2022

Investing for our future - Capital Strategy 2023/26

The Leader proposed the recommendations from the Joint Strategic Committee meeting held on 11 October 2022.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor John Turley and supported following debate and a vote (For 25, Against 0, Abstentions 9):

Resolved: That Worthing Borough Council approved the Capital Strategy for 2023/26.

Item 7D Worthing Joint Strategic Sub-Committee - 11 October 2022

Public Space Protection Orders - Dog Control

The Leader proposed the recommendations from the Worthing Joint Strategic Sub-Committee meeting held on 11 October 2022.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Vicki Wells and supported following debate and a vote (For 31, Against 0, Abstentions 3):

Resolved: That Worthing Borough Council approved the amendments to the PSPO as detailed in section 6.1 through to 6.6.

The Leader of the Council presented their report on decisions taken by the Cabinet since the last meeting of the Council, which were detailed in Item 8.

Members raised an enquiry on the entitlement to pink papers in order to ask questions under the Leader's Report. The MO confirmed there was a restriction on the papers as they contained exempt information, the statement confirming that the papers had been shared with all Members was erroneously included in the Leader's Report. The Leader was willing to share the papers subject to advice from the Monitoring Officer.

Questions were received in relation to the Council Tax Support Scheme for Worthing Borough Council in 2023/24, Investing for our future - Capital Strategy 2023/26 and a commitment to maintain all frontline services and service capacity made at the July meeting of the Joint Strategic Committee.

A Member sought clarification in regards to who could reply to questions asked in under the Leaders Report. The Monitoring Officer advised Council that the constitution did state who could be asked a question but did not stipulate who should answer.

C/33/22-23 Designation of Monitoring Officer

Before the Council was a report by the Director for Digital, Sustainability & Resources, a copy of which was circulated to all members, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of these minutes as item 9.

The purpose of the report was to formally designate the Council's Monitoring Officer.

The Leader of the Council wished to place on record her thanks to the outgoing Monitoring Officer, Geoff Wild, for all of his work in supporting the Council and proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Councillor Samuel Theodoridi and was unanimously supported.

Resolved,

The Council designated Joanne Lee as the Council's Monitoring Officer with effect from 28th October 2022.

*** The meeting was adjourned at 8.45pm, reconvening at 8.57pm.**

C/34/22-23 Members Questions under Council Procedure Rule 12

The Mayor announced that the Proper Officer had received 14 questions from Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12. She advised that one supplementary question could be asked which must arise out of the original question, or, the reply.

Questions would be asked in rotation of the Groups represented in the Chamber and there were 30 minutes allowed for questions with 10 rotations of speakers possible. The Mayor announced that the following Councillors had submitted questions:

Councillors Barraclough, Cochran, Jenkins, Mercer, Nowak, Sparkes and Thorpe.

First rotation

Question 1 from Councillor Richard Nowak to the Leader

Cllr Cooper to your knowledge, are Persimmon Homes pursuing its Court of Appeal challenge to the High Court decision that granted the successful appeal by Worthing Council against the Planning Inspectorate's decision to allow development of the land at Chatsmore Farm?

The Leader replied that yes, she could acknowledge that Persimmon Homes were pursuing the Court of Appeal challenge to the High Court decision that granted the successful appeal by Worthing Borough Council against the Planning Inspector's decision to allow development of the land at Chatsmore Farm. The Council had recently been informed that Persimmon Homes had been granted leave to appeal the High Court decision.

Question 2 from Councillor Hazel Thorpe to the Cabinet Member for Citizen Services

"The Household Support Fund", a pot of money which Councils can dish out at their discretion to alleviate residents' hardship is mentioned in the Borough's hardship Road Map. This fund is currently £500m nationally - how much is Worthing Borough being allocated?

The Cabinet Member replied that the overall Household Support Fund (round 3) for West Sussex was £4,870,362. It was noted that a request for the value of the apportioned amount for Worthing had been made to colleagues at County. The Council was informed that this was not available and not how the funding formula is reported on.

Second rotation

Question 3 from Councillor Elizabeth Sparkes to the Cabinet Member for Resources

Cllr Turley, do you agree with me that the Strategic Property Investment Fund set up and developed by the previous administration forms an integral part of this Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy? A comprehensive and varied portfolio has secured the Council's financial future for the past 5 years and I wonder therefore now that the property investment rules have been changed by CIPFA (Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy) whether you are intending to continue to expand the portfolio locally by building on the previous administration's investments within the Borough?

The Cabinet Member replied that ideally, the Council should never have had to set up a Strategic Property Investment Fund (SPIF). Councils had been forced to look for other sources of income due to the Government's squeeze on local authority funding which had already been referenced earlier in the meeting.

The income from the SPIF had certainly played an important role in helping to manage the Council's finances. However, the Council shouldn't have had to rely on rental income from properties in Glasgow, Swindon and elsewhere.

The Council welcomed the change in the rules which incidentally were changed by the Public Works Loan Board rather than by CIPFA.

The fundamental approach to risk management in the strategy remained prudent, and therefore it seemed sensible to continue developing the fund to its mature fund size of £125m. Given the revised rules, this would be focused within Worthing Borough and would have a housing, or regeneration angle, rather than just be investment for financial reasons alone.

The portfolio already included properties in Worthing, in both Montague Street and Dominion Way. The Worthing Integrated Care Centre and Decoy Farm were allocated as future assets that would be added in time. There would very much be a local flavour to investment moving forward.

Question 4 from Councillor Hazel Thorpe to the Cabinet Member for the Environment

When and what kind of investment return can the public expect from the £3 million plus of public money spent on Brooklands?

The Cabinet Member replied that the total investment for Brooklands amounted to £2.387m, which was a significant investment for a single park. The development of the space was a legacy issue from the previous administration, with the ambition to deliver a destination park and public open space.

When the new administration came in, the final scheme and contracts for the works had been signed off. As a responsible administration, contracts would not be broken and every endeavour would be made to make Brooklands a successful destination for local residents and visitors.

The investment return could not be measured financially, however, the benefits to families with young children and visitors who require accessible facilities, such as inclusive play equipment and the addition of a changing places public toilet for those with greater accessibility needs, would be significant.

Third rotation

Question 5 from Councillor Heather Mercer to the Cabinet Member for Citizen Services

Will Cllr Taylor, with her responsibility for the Council's housing strategy, development and enabling, tell us if she is content with the delay in progressing the Teville Gate development site.

This council invested £7m with a three year plan to unlock this site with a key Homes England provider, which would deliver 343 residential units of 100% affordable housing - 40% of which would be at social rent, with nomination rights for those waiting on the Council waiting list and 60% shared ownership. Can Cllr Taylor explain to 137 families on the council's waiting list why she is prevaricating and denying them access to a home and a roof over their head?

The Cabinet Member replied that life experience and community involvement had taught her a lot about what it was like to exist and be trapped in unsuitable accommodation.

Within the Council was a small but dedicated team of Officers who were producing miracles with the limited resources that were available to them. Their work had been commended over a number of years but made increasingly difficult as a result of Local Government being starved of funding by the central government.

Teville Gate had been a vacant eyesore in Worthing for decades and yet after 6 months in office you ask why the lack of progress:-

The proposed agreement with Hyde Housing group was discussed as part of the March 2022 JSC meeting. The committee report set out project milestones highlighting that the first step was to undertake due diligence on the deal.

In undertaking this due diligence a key weakness was identified in that the site had not been marketed openly and that it could potentially be challenged by another party who felt that they had been denied an opportunity. Furthermore, the Council had not undertaken any significant engagement with local residents, or stakeholders and members were unable to assess whether the proposed development as set out in the report accurately reflected our communities priorities for the site.

As such, over the summer months, Council officers have actively engaged with other potential registered providers who might be able to deliver a similar level of affordable housing on the site while continuing to work with Hyde Housing on their proposals. Through the Big Listen Campaign, we have identified, through listening closely to our residents interests and concerns, the need to work with a provider who shares our values - fair, green and local.

Since the March JSC with inflation continuing to impact significantly on development, viability is increasingly challenging as a result, and it remains to be seen whether the scheme as proposed by Hyde would be viable.

In the current financial context, the requirement to recover the Council's full cost of acquiring the site was of greater importance than ever before. Aside from the price, the Council had an absolute obligation to consider other objectives, not putting residents into concrete boxes but building homes where people could thrive not just survive. Where their outlook is green and hopeful and they can live a sustainable existence in harmony with nature. It was important to see Worthing residents housed in stock the Council could be proud of.

Question 6 from Councillor Hazel Thorpe to the Leader (passed to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration who held portfolio responsibility)

Your administration has often promoted the benefits of cross Council working with the County, and the Portland Road street scene project is one such example.

When will you be taking action to address the trip hazard of the raised kerbs in the pedestrianised area, as many residents, both visually impaired and sighted people, have been observed to trip up, and this issue is still ongoing?

The Cabinet Member replied that issues had been raised in relation to this inherited scheme, implemented by the previous administration, which had been completed shortly after the Labour administration took control.

Portland Road was now complete but the Council, with West Sussex County Council, were currently monitoring the usage of the new pedestrianised space in accordance with the 12 month defect period.

Whilst the scheme had been signed off as a 'safe' scheme throughout each stage of the governance processes (such as the Traffic Regulation Order) the Council was aware of the concerns raised regarding trips and falls. In addition, we're also aware of the continuation of traffic throughout the day where the new Traffic Regulation Order restricts vehicle movements from 10am - 10pm.

The Council did liaise with a number of access groups as part of the early design process, however, if it had been this administration, the scheme would have looked quite different.

The risks would be managed as best they can and the Council would continue to monitor this. The Council had been gathering data, which included observational information as well as residents feedback, in order to identify whether a solution was required to minimise trips and falls over the next few months.

In terms of future schemes, the Council is committed to looking at an agreed design code that ensured fundamental principles were agreed ahead of any design.

Fourth rotation

Question 7 from Councillor Russ Cochran to the Leader

In your manifesto, it stated that you would 'work with West Sussex County Council to develop a car-free town centre and seafront', can you tell me who you have been in contact with at the County Council regarding this and what their response was to your manifesto pledge?

The Leader replied that working with the County Council was a journey in itself, thanking those Members who sat on both the Borough and County Councils for facilitating that journey on behalf of the Council.

We're currently in dialogue regarding the refreshing of the Growth Deal and we have asked that sustainable travel will be at the heart of the revised 'Deal'.

Growth deals were not a given, they didn't come with a set amount of funding. It was very much a partnership and a development. It would be led by Worthing Borough Council and based on the data the Council had gathered and the communities the Council had worked with.

The Council had a local cycling and walking implementation plan which would be really useful as the Councils moved forwards together.

The Council had also revived the Sustainable Travel Steering Group - to work in parallel with the ongoing Officer Active Travel Group, which is a joint Officer Group between WSCC and the Borough.

The Leader was also aware that along the seafront, in particular Montague Place, there had been issues around accessibility and disabled parking spaces. There had been ongoing conversations with local residents about what was needed, particularly in that group.

C/35/22-23 Motions on Notice

Members had a motion before them proposed by Councillor Jon Roser and seconded by Councillor Helen Silman.

Resolved:

In accordance with the Constitution, the Motion was noted and immediately referred to the Joint Strategic Committee.

The meeting ended at 9.35 pm