

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
Adur District Council**

31 October 2019

QE2 Room, Shoreham Centre, Shoreham-by-Sea

Councillor George Barton, Chairman
Councillor Andy McGregor, Vice-Chairman

Councillor Carson Albury	Councillor Angus Dunn
Councillor Carol Albury	Councillor Emma Evans
Councillor Les Alden	Councillor Liz Haywood
Councillor Catherine Arnold	Councillor Joss Loader
Councillor David Balfe	Councillor Paul Mansfield
Councillor Pat Beresford	Councillor Barry Mear
Councillor Brian Boggis	Councillor Peter Metcalfe
Councillor Ann Bridges	Councillor Robin Monk
Councillor Clive Burghard	Councillor Lavinia O'Connor
Councillor Stephen Chipp	Councillor Neil Parkin
Councillor Dave Collins	Councillor David Simmons
Councillor Lee Cowen	Councillor Sami Zeglam

Absent

Councillor Kevin Boram, Councillor Brian Coomber and Councillor Debs Stainforth

c/24/19-20 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Kevin Boram and Debs Stainforth.

c/25/19-20 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations made

c/26/19-20 Questions from the public

A member of the public asked the following question: *The Joint Strategic Committee on 9 th July agreed that an outline strategy on how the Council will work towards a carbon neutral target should be produced by January 2020 at the latest. This was followed by Adur Council accepting a petition of over 1000 residents and workers on the Climate Emergency at the council meeting on 18 th July and a commitment at the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee in September to set up a working group. Tomorrow is the start of November so my question is to request the Council to supply a progress update and details of what has been achieved so far regarding production of the strategy.* The Leader of the Council responded that specialist consultants were currently undertaking detailed work to produce the Councils' carbon reduction plan following the July declaration. This would show the practical actions required by the Councils to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030. Given the need for urgent action on climate change, The Joint Strategic Committee would be bringing forward the carbon reduction plan early, to the Joint Strategic Committee in December 2019. The report would also include significant revisions to the Councils' sustainable AW

framework, which would help drive activity across a wide range of areas addressing climate change and environmental protection.

A member of the public asked the following question: *The Sustainability AW states its aim to develop and implement a Carbon Reduction Action Plan towards the 2050 clean energy target. Can the council confirm that either it already uses or will investigate switching to one of the 3 electricity supply companies (Ecotricity, Green Energy UK and Good Energy) for its council run buildings and services as a matter of urgency?* These suppliers have been given OFGEN enduring derogation from the price cap in recognition of their investment over and above in new renewable energy sources. The Executive Member for Resources replied that the Council's electricity contracts were renewed in September this year and would be in place for the next two years. In light of the Councils declaring a climate emergency tenders were requested for a renewable electricity supply. This not only contributed to the Council's commitment to reduce the Council's carbon emission by 2030, but also sent a signal to the market and other local authorities of the Councils intent. As a result of this process the renewable electricity supply was split between NPower and SSE. The Councils used the LASER Energy Buying Consortium for the procurement of its energy. LASER is a consortium of local authorities and part of the Commercial Services Division, a company wholly owned by Kent County Council.

A member of the public asked the following question: *My questions relate to the One Public Estate West Sussex Programme. Adur, as you are aware, is a partner in this programme together with NHS Property Services. Under this scheme WSCC are planning to redevelop the Pond Rd area and have applied to demolish Burrecroft. The plans include enhanced health facilities and a new library. It also adds that any surplus land be used for housing. This would be an ideal opportunity to include Social Care Homes and affordable retirement apartments. The apartments would be beneficial to the Council, allowing those who still wish to retain independent living to move into more suitable accommodation therefore releasing housing stock. The site is the last opportunity to build within the town for the elderly, offering on site medical care if required, nearby shopping and excellent transport links. This site would also comply with the Local Plan Policy 4.29 where the OAN report identifies a need for specialist retirement accommodation such as sheltered housing and extra care provision designed to meet the needs of older people. There may also be a requirement in the longer term to provide additional Registered Care (such as nursing and residential care homes). The provision of such housing in both affordable and market tenures, will be supported on appropriate sites close to local facilities. Would the Council agree? Can the Council advise on what discussions and plans have been held with WSCC in relation to this site?* The Executive Member for Regeneration replied that In planning terms the site would be suitable for accommodation for the elderly but ultimately this would be a decision for the West Sussex County Council as they own the majority of the site. The Local Plan (Policy 11) allocates the site for 'community uses, including a health centre and library, residential uses and a civic presence.' The Council previously adopted a Development Brief for the wider Pond Road site incorporating the Community Centre and this suggested that residential development would help to deliver the community uses on the site and deliver public realm enhancements. It is likely that the landowner would still look for some form of enabling development to help deliver new community facilities and this may impact on the scope to deliver affordable retirement accommodation on the site. The Council has not seen any plans for the site from the County Council as it understands that various options are still being considered. Whilst, it is encouraging that the County Council appears to be proceeding to demolish the building, it is disappointing that progress on a key town centre site is still very slow and Adur Council is doing all it can to encourage the County Council to bring this site forward for redevelopment as soon as possible.

A Member of the public asked the following question: *One of the findings in the Greater Brighton Business Survey 2019 commissioned by the Brighton Economic Board of which Adur is a member that local transport is a significant concern particularly congestion and parking. 58% of the 122 businesses consulted in Adur said these were important concerns affecting business performance and a constraint on growth and recruitment. Residents in the roads in Historic Shoreham and around the station are also concerned about congestion and parking. The recommendation in the report is that parking should be addressed as a priority. West Sussex County Council have a proposed transport strategy in place as per a briefing note to Councillor Boram's motion at the last County Council meeting. What action will this Council take to address: Parking in roads particularly by non residents and encourage the use of car parks which are not full. Ensuring good traffic management particularly when temporary traffic lights are set up. Particularly to the forthcoming works on the Norfolk bridge Formulating incentives to encourage the use of public transport. Above all preserving the Historic nature of the town.* The Executive member stated that the Council was conscious that the future development of Shoreham needs to balance its historical setting, enable people and to move with ease around the town and providing for much needed housing. While the question touches on areas within the District Council's responsibility, there are also a number of areas which are under the remit of the County Council as the Highways and Transport Authority - for example the traffic management and temporary lights - which the Executive Member for Regeneration was unable to answer. West Sussex Council Council had a key role to play in this area as the Highways Authority with responsibility for on-street parking. The County are currently undertaking a Road Space Audit in Shoreham. Based on the experience in other areas our expectation is that a series of workshops involving various local stakeholders will look at the space audits findings and other research to identify the future parking and traffic management and measures to encourage more sustainable transport across the town. It was hoped the process would begin by the end of the year. The Joint Strategic Committee was due to be presented with draft plans regarding the District future vision for Cycling and Walking. The Local Cycling and Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) will go through a public consultation but when finally adopted (early 2020) this document will be used to influence external investment into the network, supporting a modal shift towards active travel to reduce congestion and parking in our towns and villages. The Council worked closely with WSCC to ensure that all new developments encourage sustainable ways to travel. In line with national planning policy the emphasis is on improving facilities for cycling and walking and encouraging less use of the private motor car. All major developments are required to provide Transport Assessments and Travel Plans to demonstrate how the development would encourage sustainable transport and mitigate the impact of additional traffic on the road network. Large scale developments provide development contributions to improve bus services and local facilities (including new bus stops and real time passenger information). The Council has a number of Conservation Areas in the town and Management Plans seek to identify opportunities to preserve and enhance the character of these historic areas. Opportunities are identified to reduce street clutter and look at providing high quality public realm to enhance the appearance of these Conservation Areas. These Management Plans will be reviewed to ensure that they are kept up to date and ensure that further enhancement opportunities are identified and implemented.

c/27/19-20

Confirmation of Minutes

Resolved: that the minutes of the meeting of the 18 of July be confirmed as the correct record and be signed by the Chairman

**c/28/19-20 Announcements by the Chairman, Leader of the Council,
Executive Members and / or Head of Paid Service**

The Chairman of the Council gave the Council a synopsis of events that he had attended since the previous meeting and the Council further heard from Councillor Loader who updated members on the progress of the defibrillator appeal. The Leader of the Council announced that Councillor Paul Mansfield would replace Councillor Peter Metcalfe on the Joint Governance Committee.

c/29/19-20 Items raised under urgency provisions

There were no urgent items

**c/30/19-20 Recommendations from the Executive and Committees to
Council**

A) JGC/024/19-20 Joint Governance Committee Appointments: Parish Councillors

Councillor Andy McGregor introduced the recommendation to the Committee and invited questions from the Council. The being no questions the motion was moved, seconded and approved unanimously without debate

Resolved:

That the nomination from Lancing Parish Council of the appointment of Cllr Ann Bridges as a Co-Opted Member of the Joint Governance Committee for 2019/20 be approved

That the nomination from Sompting Parish Council of the appointment of Cllr Caroline Baxter as a Co-Opted Member of the Joint Governance Committee for 2019/20 be approved

**B) JSC/032/19-20 Our Growing Regional Economy - An Update on the Greater
Brighton Economic Board**

The Leader of the Council introduced the recommendation to the Committee and invited questions from members. The Leader answered questions on the programme for the Greater Brighton Economic Board. The Recommendation was proposed and seconded and there being no debate was approved unanimously

Resolved: that Adur District ratify the proposed amendment to the Greater Brighton Economic Board's Head of Terms relating to Arun District Council's membership of the Greater Brighton Economic Joint Committee (which meets with the Greater Brighton Business Partnership as the Greater Brighton Economic Board), subject to the decision of other constituents authorities, and to delegate authority to the Solicitor to the Council to make consequential changes to the Joint Committee Agreement and the Councils' Constitutions.

C) LC/19-20/05 Gambling Act 2005 - Review of Statement of Licensing Policy

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee introduced the recommendation to the Committee and invited questions from members. The Chairman of the Licensing Committee introduced

the recommendation to the Council. Questions were answered about risk assessments. The recommendation was proposed and seconded and there being no debate the recommendation was approved unanimously

Resolved: that the adoption of the draft Statement of Gambling Licensing Policy be approved.

D) JGC/033/19-20 Appointment of Chairmen and Vice Chairmen to Committees

Councillor Andy McGregor introduced the recommendation to the Committee and invited questions from members. There being no questions the recommendation was moved, seconded. The council debated the recommendation. Some members supported the recommendation opining that without a secret ballot at Committee the Chairman and Vice Chairman of Committees became a political appointment along party lines. In opposition to the recommendation it was proffered that a secret ballot was not congruous with open and transparent government.

On a vote the recommendation fell

Ei) JSC/41/19-20 Consultation response and recommendations on the extension and amendment of Public Space Protection Orders (Dog Control) for Adur and Worthing Councils

The Leader of the Council introduced the recommendation to the Committee and invited questions from members. The Leader answered questions about enforcement of the orders. The recommendation was moved seconded and subsequently approved unanimously

Resolved:

1. that both current PSPO's be extended for a period of 3 years;
2. that the fixed penalty fine be increased to £100;
3. that the existing exclusion zone be retained along Worthing Beach;
4. that the number of dogs that can be walked by dog walkers should remain at 6.

Eii) JSC/046/19-20 Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan

The Leader of the Council introduced the recommendation to the Committee and invited questions from members. The Leader answered questions relating the social housing mix and the Joint Area Action Plan's relationship to the Local Plan. The recommendation was approved and seconded. The Council debated costs associated with developing on contaminated land and land that required improved sea defences. The recommendation was voted upon and approved unanimously

Resolved: that Adur District Council

1. note the responses to the consultation on the main modifications to the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan and the contents of the Inspector's Report with her conclusion that the JAAP, as modified, is legally compliant and 'sound';
2. note and consider any comments by the Planning Committee of 7 October 2019 on the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan, the Inspector's Report, Main Modifications and/or revised Adur Policies Map 2019;
3. adopt and publish the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan, incorporating the main modifications and minor modifications, as part of the Development Plan for Adur;
4. adopt and publish the Adur Policies Map 2019 (and Inset Maps), incorporating the policies and proposals in the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan (this will supersede the Adur Local Plan Policies Map 2017 and Inset Maps);
5. revoke the Shoreham Harbour Interim Planning Guidance and Western Harbour Arm Development Brief, which are superseded by the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan;
6. delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Development to make any further minor non-material changes to the text of the plan, or to the content of the policies map in consultation with Brighton & Hove City Council and West Sussex County Council.

Eiii) JSC/047/19-20 Grant Funding to assist the delivery of Key Strategic Housing sites in Adur

The Leader of the Council introduced the recommendation to the Committee and invited questions from members. The Leader was questioned on the financial mechanics of dealing with the Grant Funding. The recommendation was proposed, seconded and there being no debate was voted upon and approved unanimously

Resolved: that Adur District Council include the projects as listed in the report, totalling £15.7 million, in the capital programme fully funded by external funding.

c/31/19-20 Report of the Leader on Decisions taken by the Executive

The Executive Member for Customer Services set out decisions he had made since the last council meeting and was questioned on a decision in relation to a Release of the Affordable Housing Budget to Secure Additional Affordable Housing.

c/32/19-20 Adur Pay Policy Statement 2019/20

Before the Council was a report by the Director for Digital and Resources, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of these minutes as item 9. The report before members sought approval of the Pay Policy Statement 2019/20, which is a statutory requirement under Section 38 (1) of the Localism Act 2011.

The Pay Policy Statement was proposed, seconded and on a vote was approved unanimously

Resolved: that the Pay Policy Statement 2019/20 be approved

c/33/19-20

Members question time under Council Procedure Rule 12

Councillor Les Alden asked the following question of Councillor Carson Albury: *All members will be aware that when a resident contacts their ward councillor it is usually because they have not received a satisfactory reply about their concerns from officers. Or any reply at all. Adur Homes have recently introduced a system where all members enquiries go to a single email address where a reply is promised within 10 working days. Will the Executive member for Customer Services please tell the council: a) If he agrees with me that the 2 week target is too long for members to give a service to their constituents. It risks reputational loss for both the council and the ward councillor. b) How many councillor enquiries have been directed to the particular email address to date since the system began. What percentage of these were answered (not simply acknowledged) within 5 days and 10 days.* The Executive Member for Customer Services responded that The single email address for members was introduced to allow for better monitoring and management of Councillors queries. Its introduction was in response to members' feedback that queries were taking too long to be answered. In my view, 10 days is a reasonable timeframe and reflect usual business practice. However, the expectation is that matters are resolved as quickly as possible, and well within the 10 days if possible. If some complex matters cannot be resolved within 10 days Members should be informed of progress. Since this email address was introduced:

- 48 queries had been received
- 63% were resolved within 9 working days and of these
- 67% were resolved within 3 working days
- 5 were over the 10 day target and managers are following these up with individual officers
- The rest are not yet due

Clearly the officers aim to respond as quickly as possible and of course wish to improve upon these response times. This can be aided by all Councillors using the dedicated email account so that officers can track requests, as well as common themes. Emails sent to other addresses or to several officers may not be picked up quickly, may not reach the right officer and will not be visible to the management team.

c/34/19-20

Motions on notice (1)

Before the Committee was a report by the Director of Communities, a copy of which had been circulated to all members, a copy of which is attached to the signed version of these minutes.

The motion was proposed by Councillor Lavinia O'Connor and seconded by Councillor Catherine Arnold

In accordance with the Constitution the Motion was noted and immediately referred to the Joint Staff Committee

Resolved: that the motion be referred to the Joint Staff Committee

c/35/19-20

Motions on Notice (2)

Before the Committee was a report by the Director of Communities, a copy of which had been circulated to all members, a copy of which is attached to the signed version of these minutes.

The motion was proposed by Councillor Lavinia O'Connor and seconded by Councillor Lee Cowen.

Council debated the motion and were in general agreement with the issue. An amendment was proposed to the motion by Councillor Neil Parkin which was seconded and approved unanimously. The motion as amended was approved unanimously

Resolved: This Council pledges support for the state pension inequality for 1950's women campaign. This Council supports the work of the All Party Parliamentary Group on state pension inequality co chaired by the excellent MP's Carolyn Harris and Tim Loughton since 2016. We thank our local MP for the work on this matter both nationally and with local women affected and the proposals that they have brought forward. This council will join 150+ Councils across the Country in calling upon the Government to make fair transitional state pension arrangements for women born in the 1950s, including those in our own community, who have unfairly borne the burden of the increase to the State Pension Age (SPA) with little or no appropriate notification.

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 8.46 pm, having commenced at 7.00 pm

Chairman