



Council  
28 October 2021

# ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

Ward(s) Affected: N/A

## Motions on Notice 3

### Report by the Director for Communities

#### Executive Summary

#### **1. Purpose**

- 1.1 The report before Council sets out a motion received from Councillor Catherine Arnold and seconded by Councillor Jeremy Gardner
- 1.2 Council is asked to deal with the motion under provisions set out in paragraph 14 of the Council Procedure Rules (under part 4 of the Council Constitution - Rules of Procedure).

#### **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the motion, upon being moved and seconded, be noted by Council and referred without debate to the Joint Strategic Committee

#### **3. Context**

- 3.1 A motion on notice has been received from Councillor Catherine Arnold, (attached as Annex A).
- 3.2 The content of the motion is relevant to a matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties and which affects the District.

- 3.3 There is nothing substantive within the motion that would cause its rejection under the terms of the Constitution.
- 3.4 The motion before Council contains part of the subject matter that is within the remit of Joint Strategic Committee as defined in para 14.4.1 and 14.4.3 of the Council's Procedure Rules. The motion includes a proposal for the Council to take substantive action (Para 14.4.4). Therefore, it shall be moved and seconded, immediately noted by the Council and referred without debate to the Joint Strategic Committee for consideration and determination.
- 3.5 If a motion on the agenda at Full Council is to be referred automatically to the Executive, a Regulatory Committee or another Council Committee, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14.4, the proposer of the motion will confirm to the Chairperson their proposal of the motion as set out in the report before Council **without** a speech.
- 3.6 Where a motion has been referred by Full Council to the Joint Strategic Committee, the mover, or the seconder in the absence of the mover, shall be entitled to attend the relevant meeting and explain the motion.

#### **4. Issues for consideration**

- 4.1 Motions considered by Full Council are done so under part 14 of the Council's Procedure Rules

#### **5. Financial Implications**

- 5.1 The motion has subject matter that comes within the remit of the Joint Strategic Committee and should the Joint Strategic Committee determine that the motion be accepted there may be financial implications in the future.

#### **6. Legal Implications**

- 6.1 Rules concerning motions are set out in the Council's Constitution under paragraph 14 of the Council's Procedure Rules

### **Background Papers**

None

**Officer Contact Details:-**

Chris Cadman-Dando

Democratic Services Officer

01903 221364

[chris.cadman-dando@adur.gov.uk](mailto:chris.cadman-dando@adur.gov.uk)

This Council notes that

This summer Southern Water (SW) was fined a record £90m for deliberately dumping between 16 billion and 21 billion litres of raw sewage into the seas and rivers of Kent, Hampshire and Sussex (including Chichester Harbour) between 2010 and 2015

The judge summed up “each of the 51 offences seen in isolation shows a shocking and wholesale disregard for the environment, for the precious and delicate ecosystems along the North Kent and Solent coastlines, for human health, and for the fisheries and other legitimate businesses that depend on the vitality of the coastal waters”

This criminal activity has put the health of residents and visitors to Adur and Worthing at risk through the contamination of the seas of the Sussex coastline and contamination of local sea food, damaged the reputation of local beaches and the local environment and threatens local businesses, particularly the Shoreham Port Authority and anyone involved with the harvesting of sea food.

Just days after the £90m fine Peacehaven treatment works carried out an “emergency arrangements release” of raw sewage into the sea after a build up of disposable items. Let us also not forget of late, the forced closure of beaches from Lancing to Ferring for six days.

Furthermore, raw sewage threatens the council's seabed lease initiative to boost marine conservation and to help in the council's bid towards carbon neutrality by 2030.

The water industry has accumulated debts of £48billion since 1989 which cost £1.3billion in annual interest. In that time the industry has paid £57billion in shareholder dividends, while customer bills have increased by 40% above inflation.

It further notes that

A number of incidents have taken place during the summer along the Adur and Worthing coast involving the release of raw sewage which emphasise the need for urgent investment in the area's wastewater treatment facilities.

The Council resolves to:

Write to the Chief Executive and Director of the Environment at SW insisting that they meet with the Council to account for the impact of SW's behaviour on local communities, to give a clear picture of the current inadequacies of the waste water infrastructure servicing in West Sussex and to lay out their plans for how they will remedy the situation...demanding that Southern Water make the investment needed to:

- ensure that local water treatment works are functioning legally and safely and that our rivers, streams and shoreline are not affected by serious pollution incidents in the future
- improve the capacity and effectiveness of the local waste water infrastructure so that sewage is not discharged into the River Adur and the sea

Write to local MP's and the Department of the Environment asking for:

- The Environment Agency be given more power and resources to fine water companies, acting as an incentive to radically invest in their water treatment plants
- That fine income be used to support improvements in the regulatory arrangements for water companies and to provide compensation to local authorities and local businesses that have suffered from the criminal activities of SW.
- That the current management arrangements for the water industry are revised so that private companies like SW cannot secretly pursue criminal activities over many years in order to avoid financial penalties and the cost of upgrading infrastructure.