

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

Gordon Room, Town Hall, Chapel Road, Worthing

7 March 2024

Councillor Dr Heather Mercer (Chair)

Adur District Council:

Councillor Joss Loader
Councillor Mandy Buxton
Councillor Carol Albury
Councillor Lee Cowen
Councillor Andy McGregor
Councillor Sharon Sluman

Worthing Borough Council:

Councillor Cathy Glynn-Davies
Councillor Dan Hermitage
Councillor Margaret Howard
Councillor Daniel Humphreys
Councillor Richard Mulholland
Councillor Hilary Schan

Absent

Councillors Ann Bridges, Paul Mansfield and Elizabeth Sparkes

Substitutes

There were no substitutes

JOSC/73/23-24 Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest made

JOSC/74/23-24 Substitute Members

There were no substitutions

JOSC/75/23-24 Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 30 January 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman

JOSC/76/23-24 Public Question Time

A resident asked the following question; "I welcome the progress made on net zero for the council, even if I understand that you still need to do more to reach your targets for 2030, and that it is only aimed at the council itself. My question is, what are you doing to encourage ordinary citizens to transition away from fossil fuels? After all, it will help with energy costs, energy security, the cost of living crisis and the net zero targets of the UK as a whole."

The resident was informed that Worthing Borough Council was committed to becoming a net zero borough by 2045. The timeframe for achieving this was considerably longer than the deadline they had set for their own emissions - albeit 5 years ahead of the UK as a whole - due to the lack of control the council had over significant areas of the economy, such as power generation and transport that contributed to carbon emissions within the area.

That said, they were already working to improve home energy efficiency, offering financial support to eligible residents through the Warmer Homes scheme, giving residents the opportunity to participate in group-buying of solar panels through Solar Together Sussex and supporting West Sussex County Council in the rollout of electric vehicle charging points for residents and visitors. Worthing Borough Council was also leading on developing the Worthing Heat Network, which would enable all businesses and residences within Worthing town centre and, potentially, a much wider area, to decarbonise their home heating without the need to install a heat pump.

In addition to the points mentioned above, achieving net zero across Worthing would rely on strong collaboration between the council, the community sector, businesses and other stakeholders, including the county council, educational establishments etc.

Work would start to establish this partnership over the next 12 months.

JOSC/77/23-24 Members Questions

A Member asked, “The Carbon Management Plan says that the council can’t produce an action plan to reach the area-wide net zero target of 2045 unless it finds external support or additional budget. The funding and policy support from central Government that we should expect for this is unlikely, even with a change of government. But other councils have produced area-wide action plans, and we’re a member of UK100 who advise and support councils to learn from each other and accelerate action. So can the Committee tell us what progress will be made this year on creating an action plan for net zero across the town, which stakeholders will be involved and what will be the key areas of focus?”

The Member was informed that funding remained a significant challenge for the Councils and the decision had been taken to demonstrate the Councils' ability to 'walk the walk' by focusing on its own estate. This would continue that year, with the development of a fleet strategy that would highlight the importance of decarbonising the fleet.

Work would continue to develop a wider 2045 strategy which would, of course, include identifying appropriate stakeholders.

The Councils had not defined a final list of stakeholders yet. They knew they wanted to work with residents and the community sector, businesses, and other public sector bodies including the county council, the NHS, the Environment Agency and educational establishments.

There would also be organisations and individuals who had an important role to play in this area who the Councils were not aware of yet, but through effective communication they hoped to identify them and engage with them in the process. New groups and organisations were also likely to establish as this agenda became more important locally, regionally and nationally.

It would also build on work previously done by the Climate Assembly and SCATTER analysis in identifying key areas on which more could be done in terms of project delivery, acknowledging that the council would, to a much greater extent, only be able to play a facilitatory role in this.

A number of other questions were submitted by a Member who could not be present, their questions would receive a written response.

JOSC/78/23-24 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no urgent items

JOSC/79/23-24 Consideration of any matter referred to the Committee in relation to a call-in of a decision

There were no call-ins

JOSC/80/23-24 Review of Progress of the Housing Strategy 2020 - 2023

The Committee had a report before it attached as item 8, which had been circulated to all Members and is attached to a signed copy of these minutes. The purpose of the report was to update the Joint Overview & Scrutiny Committee on progress made against the commitments in the Housing Strategy 2020-2023 'Enabling communities to thrive in their own home'

A Member asked, "What data, if any, do we hold on the number of care leavers requiring temporary and emergency accommodation and what support is in place for these young people?"

Members were informed that between 1/1/23 and 31/12/23, 24 care leavers presented as homeless to Worthing Borough Council, 18 of whom were placed in temporary accommodation.

They were supported by WSCC Leaving Care Team and depending on need, may receive further support from support roles within the wider partnerships working with single homeless households.

A Member asked, "The Council's Housing Strategy: Enabling People to Thrive in their Own Homes strives to provide 'secure and appropriate housing for the residents of Adur'. How many of our suite of housing policies are still considerably out of date and what progress has been made?"

Members were informed it was anticipated that 2024 would see the implementation of a new Housing Strategy. This would not stand alone and most of the priorities and actions within it would operate alongside and support existing strategies, delivery plans and policies. In particular it would be guided by and contribute to policies and priorities outlined in both Adur and Worthing Local Plans and the corporate plan, Our Plan.

As part of this implementation, all associated policies would be reviewed and aligned. These included Temporary Accommodation Placement and Procurement Policy and Community Homelessness Strategy. A number of changes within the service and wider council had impacted the ability to implement a revised set of strategies and policies as previously intended. They were now working through consultation planning in respect of the new strategy and associated policies.

This would include extensive participation with key stakeholders, including those that supported priority groups. As part of this approach they would involve tenants and people

with lived experience of homelessness plus other specific groups including: older people, young people, care leavers, carers, minority groups.

A Member asked, "Paragraph 6.0 "The number of individuals sleeping rough is rising. In part this is due to the Homeless Reduction Act." Interested to hear how this change in legislation is causing a rise in homelessness?"

Members were informed the Homeless Reduction Act reinforced a statutory duty on local authorities to take steps to relieve homelessness for all eligible households. The threshold to trigger a homeless application and consideration around priority need was reduced and moved the requirement for a local authority to accommodate if they have reason to believe a household "may " be homeless and "may " be in priority need. The previous threshold was far more evidence based.

The Act added duties to prevent and relieve homelessness and previously many single person households would not have been eligible for this assistance as would not have been in priority need. The Act alongside PRS being both in short supply and unaffordable had resulted in the increase of numbers of people experiencing homelessness.

A Member asked "Paragraph 4.10 "Strong partnerships are essential for the Councils to the wider prevention and relief of homelessness."
Do we have figures on outcomes of the council's partnership work?"

Members were informed this was an area where it was difficult to quantify outcomes as it was contained within general prevention and relief data and the nature of some of this work was around preventing households having to present to the Council in the first instance.

The investment in partnerships had resulted in:

The Council developing and piloting of mental health inpatient housing needs assessment and Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust funded Mental Health Housing Advisor, being collocated and embedded with the Housing Needs Team

Co-location of x2 IDVA's - Independent Domestic Abuse Advisors with the Housing Needs Team.

Hosting of the West Sussex County Council Substance Misuse Service which was a new provision.

Multi agency Rough Sleepers Team working on Personalised Housing Plans for single people rough sleeping, at risk of eviction of for those under Duty to Refer from the Criminal Justice System

Clinical Psychologist Trainee starting with the team on 03.04.23

The Council was part of the Mental Health and Housing Strategic Group to deliver against the Mental Health and Housing Strategy.

The Council convened a strategic housing board and operational homelessness and rough sleeping prevention partnership. Both were made up of a number of statutory and voluntary sector partners involved in tackling homelessness and considering wider housing issues.

A Member asked, "With significant rises across all groups in TA and now over 600 from Worthing, how is workforce capacity organised to ensure the health and wellbeing of these residents is being positively maintained?"

Members were informed that within the housing team structure there was a team of officers that provided both inreach support (to specific accommodation) and wider outreach support for households placed in temporary accommodation. This support covered a range of presenting issues including financial, securing accommodation, mediation and access to health and support networks to name a few. There was currently a vacancy within this team which they were actively recruiting to.

Members also asked about the rise and numbers of rough sleepers and the shortage of support workers at Southdown. Members were informed that there was still a regular count of rough sleepers and that the Councils had no oversight of Southdown but were kept informed and supported partners where possible.

Resolved:

The Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee

- Noted the progress made in the last 12 months and;
- The Department for Levelling Up Communities and Housing (DLUCH) funding update, subject to receiving updated numbers on rough sleeping and information regarding outcomes for working partnerships

JOSC/81/23-24 Annual Feedback Report from HASC

The Committee had a report before it attached as item 9, which had been circulated to all Members and is attached to a signed copy of these minutes.

This report provided the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee with background information on the West Sussex Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee (HASC) and a summary of the recent work undertaken by the HASC. This information would enable JOSC to question the Councils' representatives on the HASC, Councillors Andy McGregor (Adur) and Cathy Glynn-Davies (Worthing), about the work of the HASC and issues affecting Adur and Worthing.

Members asked about stroke services, the implementation of a culture change and virtual wards. Members were informed that a new stroke center was going ahead in Chichester and that a change in emergency service categories would free up ambulances to attend more emergency calls. Members were also informed that the change in culture implementation was to address questions of bullying and harassment as well as offering full time contracts to all staff. Members were also informed that virtual wards were being used as an alternative to residential care/nursing homes.

JOSC/82/23-24 Update on Climate Change Delivery - Carbon Management Plan

The Committee had a report before it attached as item 10, which had been circulated to all Members and is attached to a signed copy of these minutes.

A Member asked, "At paragraph 5.4 of the report, it says that due to resource constraints, no scope 3 analysis has been conducted. What is the timeline on this analysis taking place and how can the council effectively plan for the 2045 target without this information?"

Members were informed that the focus since 2019 had been on scope 1 and scope 2 emissions over which the Council had greater control. They wanted to lead by example and deliver tangible reductions in carbon emissions. They now had plans to address the

vast majority of these emissions through the worthing heat network, the fleet strategy and the Hycrem project which was a significant achievement.

There was no definitive timetable to analyse scope 3 emissions, as this was funding dependent in light of the current financial situation. They had been extremely successful in securing funding for the delivery of the carbon reduction work, and would continue to look for opportunities in the year ahead.

In the absence of that detailed data they were able to make a meaningful start on the approach to the 2045 target, which was a long term piece of work. Whilst they did not have granular detail, they knew from previous high level analysis what the main sources of emissions were - those from residences, transport and businesses.

The first stages were to develop the partnership with stakeholders, and co-create an action plan. The partnership itself may identify further opportunities to help deliver the research and analysis work that would be required over the next 20 years.

A Member asked, "This summer will see the report of developing a fleet strategy that will tackle a large proportion of our emissions. The publication of the Carbon Neutral Plan was in 2019. Considering this is one of the key areas of the plan, what has taken the report five years to be produced, was it always intended to take this time and what barriers were faced during this?"

Members were informed the 2019 Carbon Neutral Plan noted that ultra-low emission HGVs were not expected to become widely commercially available in the next decade and that the councils would need to "undertake a review when the existing fleet is due for renewal". Fortunately, technology was developed more rapidly than anticipated and there were a number of low carbon options to consider.

Given the refuse fleet accounted for 75% of the councils' total emissions from its fleet, the councils had been focused on the delivery of smaller low carbon vehicles in the intervening period, with a number of electric vans already in use across the fleet with more on order. As that low carbon technology existed for heavy vehicles and the councils were beginning to think about the forthcoming replacement of the refuse fleet, it was an appropriate time to develop a full low carbon fleet strategy.

Resolved:

The Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted the progress which the Councils were making in climate change delivery and the new Carbon Management Plan

JOSC/83/23-24 Interview with Worthing Cabinet Member for Climate Emergency

The Committee had a report before it attached as item 11, which had been circulated to all Members and is attached to a signed copy of these minutes. This report set out background information on the Portfolio of the Worthing Cabinet Member for Climate Emergency to enable the Committee to consider and question the Cabinet Member on issues within their portfolio and any other issues which the Cabinet Member was involved in connected with the work of the Council and the Worthing communities.

A Member asked, "What have been the pros and cons of having a dedicated Cabinet post for the Climate Emergency? Do you think it is the most effective way to ensure that the climate is, as you say, a golden thread, through council policy?"

Members were informed that the best parts had been looking at the best practices of other local authorities and working with the rest of the Cabinet to make sure net zero targets and carbon reduction were always priorities. The downside was some inevitable overlap with other Cabinet Members but the Cabinet Member was confident they all worked well as a team.

A Member asked, “In the briefing note of your portfolio you have a section on the challenges. You’ve identified that a lot of this is outside of direct control, reliance on government funding and engaging with external stakeholders. In the expected absence, and evidence of gaps, in funding - who are the external stakeholders this area of work will be reliant on and what engagement strategies are used to ensure year on year achievement towards net zero targets?”

Members were informed that a final list of stakeholders had not been defined yet, establishing that group would be the priority for the next 12 months.

They wanted to work with residents and communities, businesses, and other public sector bodies including the county council, the NHS, the Environment Agency and educational establishments to name a few. There would also be organisations and individuals in the communities that they were not yet aware of who would be able to make a valuable contribution to this work. They also expected new organisations to be created who they would want to engage with as this agenda gained momentum locally and nationally.

The Cabinet Member expected to be using a range of engagement approaches, which would vary depending on the audience, and the nature of the work, which would vary over time as they progressed towards 2045. The key partners, e.g. in the business and community sector would also have meaningful insights as to how to engage with their particular sectors and the Cabinet Member would be building this into the approach.

A Member asked, “If councils like ourselves are to achieve 2045 targets, it requires cultural change across both the organisation and partners but also across our communities too. How do you plan to take the climate emergency discussion to the residents of this borough to activate individual and collective progress in this area?”

Members were informed the cultural and behavioural change to achieve 2045 targets across councils like Adur & Worthing was indeed very significant. The Councils had a key role to play in bringing communities, residents, businesses and other stakeholders together to help drive this change. Discussions and engagement would need to take place at different levels and scales, ranging from individual households, to larger organisations and partnerships who played a key role in the agenda.

To be successful, those involved would need to play to each other's strengths and the Cabinet Member did not anticipate leading all of the conversations. In some cases the partners would be better placed to lead engagement with different groups because of their skills, connections, and relationships. For example it was anticipated to be working closely with business organisations like the BID and the chamber of commerce, who would be best placed to engage with their members on the carbon agenda. The Council would play a key role in enabling conversations and developing partnerships.

Achieving the 2045 target was also dependent on this agenda being driven nationally and regionally, incentivising a transition to net zero. They would continue to lobby for these changes and support any initiatives that would help achieve the target locally.

A Member asked, “On page 55 4.5 ‘Summary of the Carbon Neutral Plan’, it reads ‘Offsetting these residual emissions will be required in order to achieve carbon neutral

status and the Carbon Management Plan recommends that this is achieved through the delivering (in-house and/or with a third-party) of new, renewable electricity generation assets.'

How are Worthing Borough Council working with developers to minimise the carbon footprint of new builds, and how much are we, as a council, able to influence the type of 3 materials used, and the sustainable energy solutions that are incorporated into new builds, such as Air Source Heat Pumps, Solar PVs and also sustainability in respect of travel solutions? At Paragraph 6.3 there is no mention of building and development as organisations included in the plan."

Members were informed the Carbon Neutral Plan focused on the Councils' direct operational emissions from its consumption of gas and electricity within its buildings and fleet. The construction of new buildings and staff travel (excluding pool car usage) fell outside of this scope into 'scope 3' and this is why it was not included in the Carbon Management Plan. It was, however, an important area in which the councils had a greater degree of control and they had been making considerable progress, particularly in the new build housing programme, where they had committed to being wholly gas-free with air-source heat pumps installed in every new-build property. The 11-unit scheme being developed in Victoria Road was designed to passivhaus standards with electric heating and air-to-water heat pumps for domestic hot water.

Members also asked about how climate change used to be a responsibility of the Leader and ideal goals. Members were informed that having a separate post for climate change meant that the Cabinet Member was able to devote more time and room to focus on climate change importance being embedded in all other aspects and committees and that hitting the 2045 goal, while making it as cheap and easy as possible for residents to follow suit would be the ideal.

JOSC/84/23-24 Review of the JOSC Work Programme

The Committee had a report before it attached as item 12, which had been circulated to all Members and is attached to a signed copy of these minutes. This report outlined progress in implementing the work contained in the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JOSC) Work Programme for 2023/24.

Members discussed the various options for holding a workshop to review the findings of the work programme working group.

Resolved:

The Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

- Noted the progress made in delivering the JOSC Work Programme for 2023/24
- Considered and confirmed a draft Work Programme for 2024/25 whilst noting that proposals from the Working Group Report in June may affect further changes to the Work Programme
- Approved the referral of the confirmed draft JOSC Work Programme for 2024/25 for reporting to the Full Council meetings in March 2024 for approval
- Agreed a set of pre-June workshops would be best held over two sessions in the evenings, one in Adur and one in Worthing, to enable the Joint Chairs to ensure

best attendance for the review, the outcomes of which will be reported back to the Committee in June.

JOSC/85/23-24 Interview with Adur Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Planning

The Committee had a report before it attached as item 13, which had been circulated to all Members and is attached to a signed copy of these minutes. This report set out background information on the portfolio of the Adur Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Strategic Planning to enable the Committee to consider and question the Cabinet Member on issues within their portfolio and any other issues which the Cabinet Member was involved in connected with the work of the Council and the Adur communities.

A Member asked “Whilst acknowledging the worthwhile work done in the participation groups and its value both as a collegiate experience and the (now limited) outcomes (even with WSCC Growth Deal funding) we should acknowledge that the outcomes do not match the ambitious outcomes we had hoped for. This is due to a lack of clarity over the third phase of funding. Given the resources spent in officer time; community resources time; council, group and individual research etc is there a way to be clearer about what funding is available to us as a council before we invest this heavily in the future, in order to regulate and redirect our resources with more efficiency?”

Members were informed that when they entered into the ‘Now and into the Future’ work the Council was very clear that this was an exercise of setting up Lancing to be in the frame for future funding but also to instigate local work, through local communities and organisations, to help build Lancing into a place that everyone could be proud of. Funding opportunities came in and out of focus, and did change, therefore as work was started they were under the impression that a Levelling Up bid was realistic and they needed to act to put the Council (as Lancing) in the best possible position to bid for these funds. This didn’t materialise, which was extremely frustrating for the amount of work everyone had put in, however this wouldn’t be lost work as this could be and would be used for future applications, regardless of who the funder might be. They did have an in principle commitment from WSCC regarding the Growth Deal funding and this was the next focus.

The Cabinet Member emphasised that no place was built overnight but what they did achieve through the initial participation process was to build a sense of what local people were most interested in, what the ambitions were (which were important) and how the Council, as a partner in the whole system, could help facilitate some of those aims through the work done. To ensure this local work continued, the Council was going through a reorganisation and the Neighbourhood Model was being established which would mean they could work even closer to the communities, including those in Lancing.

A Member asked “The Old Police Station: Three options have been presented to cabinet and further work will be done on those options. What are these three options and the primary influencing factors and will there be an opportunity for consultation with community groups, residents and others?”

Members were informed they were looking at a number of options for the future of the site that would build upon the recent experience with Fabric that had allowed them to gain a much better understanding of the priorities for the local communities. Access to healthcare; availability of local affordable housing; and community space were all

highlighted from the 200 community responses and structured conversations with nominated stakeholders in the village.

The next stage was to examine the feasibility of options that reflected those priorities and consider how potential partners may wish to participate and how available funding could be used to best effect. The Cabinet Member had asked officers to work up a series of outline proposals for further consideration in the coming months that could be tested further through the preparation of a robust Business Plan.

A Member asked, “Recently you had a meeting with Southern Water and Ofwat via the newly established Southern Water Stakeholder Group.

You raised questions about the cumulative effect of new developments but even before the new developments, the sewage systems were not coping. We know what is happening in Lancing on Grinstead Lane and Manor Close but this is also an issue for the lead flood authority, West Sussex County Council, who have previously failed to carry out recommended drainage enhancement works at the roundabout. They need holding to account too.

What are the outcomes that you are looking for from these meetings and what would be your success criteria?”

Members were informed that that group crossed a couple of different portfolios and was made up of forty different authorities. These authorities shared a lot of similar issues and concerns and the hope was that speaking together, would make Souther Water listen.

A Member asked, “Local Plans are developed to allocate land to deliver community infrastructure and opportunities for employment. This Council identified New Monks farm as a site for residential and employment, yet one part of this remains unfulfilled because the site dedicated for employment (owned by IKEA) is still empty.

What is happening with this site and if IKEA is still sitting on the site, can the Council put pressure on them to sell?”

Members were informed that IKEA had indicated that it would be looking to re-market the site again that year and through its agent, had cited uncertainty in the wider economic outlook as the reason it had not done so successfully to date. Meanwhile, Pannattoni had arrived at its site next door, developed it out successfully and talked confidently about businesses occupying the space. The Cabinet Member was keen to keep the pressure on IKEA to move this site to a position where it could deliver the much needed employment space that would allow existing businesses to grow and new businesses to support the local economy.

A Member asked, “Are you satisfied that the system of signing 106 Agreements is a better alternative to the Community Infrastructure Levy? If so, please give reasons.”

Members were informed that the issue of adopting Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was considered after the Local Plan was adopted. To introduce CIL the Council had to demonstrate that it would not make development coming forward unviable.

The viability review undertaken to support the Local Plan identified that 3 of the key sites for delivering housing and employment (New Monks Farm, Shoreham Airport and the Western Harbour Arm) had viability issues and could not have paid CIL and delivered the significant supporting infrastructure to support the new developments. In fact additional development was required at New Monks Farm and the Airport to ensure viable development would come forward and they had seen at the Western Harbour Arm high density development had been required to meet all infrastructure needs.

In addition, it had been clear that brownfield land had significant viability challenges and it was felt that using s106 provided greater flexibility in deciding priorities between affordable housing, WSCC contribution requirements and open space.

It was also relevant that the recent Levelling Up and Regeneration Act (LURA) signaled a new Infrastructure Levy to replace both s106 and CIL. In this context seeking to introduce CIL with the significant resource implications involved would not have been appropriate at the time.

JOSC/86/23-24 Interview with Worthing Cabinet Member for Regeneration

The Committee had a report before it attached as item 14, which had been circulated to all Members and is attached to a signed copy of these minutes. This report set out background information on the portfolio of the Worthing Cabinet Member for Regeneration to enable the Committee to consider and question the Cabinet Member on issues within their portfolio and any other issues which the Cabinet Member was involved in connected with the work of the Council and the Worthing communities.

A Member asked, “There has been a lot of public concern about the development of Grafton Road car park and uncertainty for local residents and business owners is clearly a factor in that. How do you plan to ensure public engagement in the decisions around development of that site and to secure buy in from those directly affected?”

Members were informed that the Cabinet Member and council officers had a really positive meeting with affected residents and business who were invited into the town hall on 13 February. Engagement would continue with affected parties as they progressed through the development of this critical, town centre site.

Those stakeholders were told it was just the beginning of a long journey to redevelopment and town centre/seafront regeneration at Grafton, and that the council and then the developer would continue to work with partners throughout the process.

This included, for example, through the planning process, where once an application was submitted the planning authority would consult with all residents and businesses giving the opportunity to speak at any Planning Committee considering proposals for the redevelopment of the site.

A Member asked, “What is a consumer led buzz of change?”

Members were informed that it meant consumer driven work. That a lot was being done with the business community, with a large focus on adapting to changing consumer needs.

A Member asked, “As you look to the future, how have you planned to overcome the challenges of Grafton Car Park and are these strategies transferable when analysing other car parks across the borough?”

Members were informed that there were a number of complex issues affecting the Grafton multi-storey car park which were unique to the car park, such as the various rights of way across the site to Marks and Spencers and the car park serving Knightsbridge House. Whilst it was unlikely therefore that there was any particular learning from this site that would be directly applicable to other car parks, clarity over

ownership; rights of access and site constraints were important considerations whenever redevelopment is being considered.

At a wider level, the Cabinet Member wanted to look at parking in the context of a strategic approach for travel in Worthing that looked at making the most of opportunities to promote active travel and public transport, as well as ensuring that the facilities that were provided for parking were to a decent standard. The Cabinet Member wanted to engage with transport operators and the relevant statutory agencies to ensure that they could offer a co-ordinated approach and that Worthing was at the forefront of opportunities for funding travel improvements in West Sussex.

The meeting was declared closed by the Chairman at 9.25 pm, it having commenced at 6.30 pm

Chairman