



Email: committeeservices@horsham.gov.uk
Direct line: 01403 215465

Council

Wednesday, 11th December, 2019 at 6.00 pm
Park Suite, Parkside, Chart Way, Horsham

To: All Members of the Council

(Please note that Mr Simon Quail (Lay Minister) will take prayers before the meeting commences)

You are summoned to the meeting to transact the following business

Glen Chipp
Chief Executive

Agenda

	Page No.
1. Apologies for absence	
2. Minutes	5 - 12
To approve as correct the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on the 16th October 2019. <i>(Note: If any Member wishes to propose an amendment to the minutes they should submit this in writing to committeeservices@horsham.gov.uk at least 24 hours before the meeting. Where applicable, the audio recording of the meeting will be checked to ensure the accuracy of the proposed amendment.)</i>	
3. Declarations of Members' Interests	
To receive any declarations of interest from Members.	
4. Announcements	
To receive any announcements from the Chairman of the Council, the Leader, Members of the Cabinet or the Chief Executive.	
5. Questions from the Public	
To receive questions from the public under Rules 4a.2(f) and 4a.8-18.	

6. **Recommendations from Cabinet** 13 - 18
To receive recommendations from the meeting of Cabinet held on 28th November 2019. Reports available online at: [Cabinet Agenda 28th November 2019](#).
7. **Recommendations from Committees** 19 - 20
To receive the recommendation of the Governance Committee held on the 26th November 2019 and, if approved, to adopt the recommendations contained therein. Report available online at [Governance Agenda](#).
8. **Reports of representatives**
To receive reports from representatives on outside bodies.
9. **Members' Questions on Notice**
To receive questions from Members under Rules 4a.20(b)-25.
10. **Urgent Business**
To consider matters certified by the Chairman as urgent.

GUIDANCE ON COUNCIL PROCEDURE

(Full details in Part 4a of the Council's Constitution)

Addressing the Council	<p>Members must address the meeting through the Chairman. When the Chairman wishes to speak during a debate, any Member speaking at the time must stop. The Chairman will decide whether he or she prefers Members to stand or sit when addressing the Council.</p>
Minutes	<p>Any comments or questions should be limited to the accuracy of the minutes only</p>
Quorum	<p>Quorum is one quarter of the whole number of Members. If there is not a quorum present, the meeting will adjourn immediately. Remaining business will be considered at a time and date fixed by the Chairman. If a date is not fixed, the remaining business will be considered at the next ordinary meeting.</p>
Declarations of Interest	<p>Members should state clearly in which item they have an interest and the nature of the interest (i.e. personal; personal & prejudicial; or pecuniary). If in doubt, seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting</p>
Announcements	<p>These should be brief and to the point and are for information only – no debate/decisions</p>
Questions from the public (Notice must have been given in writing to the Chief Executive by 12.00 three working days before the meeting)	<p>Directed to Leader, Cabinet Member or Chairman of an ordinary committee and relevant to the business of the meeting. 2 minutes in total to put the question. Appropriate Member to reply. Questioner may ask one supplementary question. Member to reply (max 2 minutes unless Chairman consents to a longer period). Overall time limit for questions of 15 minutes or six questions, whichever is greater. The questioner must be present. If a question cannot be dealt with at the meeting (lack of time or absence of relevant Member), a written reply to be given. No discussion but any Member may move that a matter raised by a question is referred to Cabinet or committee. If seconded, no discussion – vote taken.</p>
Cabinet recommendations (see also rules of debate)	<p>Leader/Cabinet Member presents and moves recommendation(s) – seconder required. Members may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ask a question on the item under consideration – max 2 minutes; and/or - make a statement – max 5 minutes.
Questions from Members on Notice (Notice must have been given in writing to the Chief Executive by 12.00 two working days before the meeting)	<p>These are directed to the Chairman, Leader, Cabinet Member or chairman of any committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 minutes maximum for initial question - 2 minutes maximum for the response - 2 minutes maximum for a supplementary question - 2 minutes maximum for a response to the supplementary question - 5 minutes maximum for the questioner to make a final statement in response, if they wish - If an oral reply is not convenient (e.g. too lengthy) a written answer may be circulated later. <p>No discussion. Maximum of 30 minutes overall for questions and answers.</p>

<p>Rules of debate</p>	<p>The Chairman controls debate and normally follows these rules but Chairman’s interpretation, application or waiver is final.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No speeches until a proposal has been moved (mover may explain purpose) and seconded - Chairman may require motion to be written down and handed to him/her before it is discussed - Secunder may speak immediately after mover or later in the debate - Speeches must relate to the question under discussion or a personal explanation or a point of order (max 5 minutes) - A Member may not speak again except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o On an amendment o To move a further amendment if the motion has been amended since he/she last spoke o If first speech was on an amendment, to speak on the main issue (whether or not the amendment was carried) o In exercise of a right of reply. Mover of motion at end of debate on original motion and any amendments (may not otherwise speak on amendment). Mover of amendment has no right of reply. o On a point of order – must relate to an alleged breach of Council Procedure Rules or law. Chairman must hear the point of order immediately. The ruling of the Chairman on the matter will be final. o Personal explanation – relating to part of an earlier speech by the Member which may appear to have been misunderstood. The Chairman’s ruling on the admissibility of the personal explanation will be final. - Amendments to motions must be to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Refer the matter to an appropriate body/individual for (re)consideration o Leave out and/or insert or add others (as long as this does not negate the motion) - One amendment at a time to be moved, discussed and decided upon. - Any amended motion becomes the substantive motion to which further amendments may be moved. - A Member may alter a motion that he/she has moved with the consent of the meeting and seconder (such consent to be signified without discussion). - A Member may withdraw a motion that he/she has moved with the consent of the meeting and seconder (such consent to be signified without discussion). - The mover of a motion has the right of reply at the end of the debate on the motion (unamended or amended).
<p>Voting</p>	<p>Any matter will be decided by a simple majority of those voting, by show of hands or if no dissent, by the affirmation of the meeting unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two Members request a recorded vote - A recorded vote is required by law. <p>Any Member may request their vote for, against or abstaining to be recorded in the minutes.</p> <p>In the case of equality of votes, the Chairman will have a second or casting vote (whether or not he or she has already voted on the issue).</p>

Council
16 OCTOBER 2019

Present: Councillors: Kate Rowbottom (Chairman), Karen Burgess (Vice-Chairman), Matthew Allen, Andrew Baldwin, Tony Bevis, John Blackall, Toni Bradnum, Alan Britten, Chris Brown, Peter Burgess, Jonathan Chowen (Deputy Leader), Philip Circus, Paul Clarke, Christine Costin, Michael Croker, Leonard Crosbie, Brian Donnelly, Ruth Fletcher, Billy Greening, Frances Haigh, Tony Hogben, Nigel Jupp, Liz Kitchen, Lynn Lambert, Richard Landeryou, Gordon Lindsay, Tim Lloyd, Paul Marshall, John Milne, Colin Minto, Christian Mitchell, Mike Morgan, Godfrey Newman, Roger Noel, Bob Platt, Louise Potter, Josh Potts, Stuart Ritchie, Jack Saheid, Jim Sanson, David Skipp, Ian Stannard, Diana van der Klugt, Claire Vickers, Belinda Walters and Tricia Youtan

Apologies: Councillors: Roy Cornell and Ray Dawe

CO/38 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 4th September 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

CO/39 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Councillors Nigel Jupp, Liz Kitchen and Christian Mitchell declared personal and prejudicial interests in the item on the former Novartis site, Parsonage Road, Horsham as they were Members of West Sussex County Council (the applicant) (Minute No CO/45 below refers).

CO/40 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman thanked all those Members who attended the Civic Service held on the 6th October in St Mary's Church. She went on to thank the Reverend Loveless for leading prayers at Council. Reverend Loveless would be moving to a new parish in Rustington shortly.

The Deputy Leader offered his congratulations to Councillor Paul Marshall on his nomination as Leader of West Sussex County Council.

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Waste advised Members that West Sussex County Council had introduced residents checks at Household Recycling Centres in the County. He had expressed concern regarding the situation to the Director of Environment and Public Protection at West Sussex County Council as there were concerns that it would increase queuing, especially at the Hop Oast Site. He had raised the issue as there were many residents who thought that the centre was controlled by Horsham District Council, rather than West Sussex County Council. He went on to say that any measure that made

the deposit of waste more difficult would increase the risk of fly tipping, which would impact on Horsham District Council.

The Cabinet Member for Horsham Town Centre reported that on the 10 November there would be a Remembrance Service in Carfax.

CO/41 **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No questions relevant to the business of the meeting had been received.

CO/42 **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET**

The Deputy Leader provided a report on operation of the café and bar at the Capitol. The Cabinet Member reported that on 31 March 2019 the contract for the operation of the cafe and bar at The Capitol had ended. As previous tender exercises had resulted in few applications, it was proposed to trial managing the service in-house. The trial began on the 1st April 2019. Over the eight years of the most recent external contract, the average net income per annum had been £24,000. The expected net income from the direct management was £72,000. An increase of almost £50,000. So far, the new direct management had delivered £16,100 net income which was in line with projections. The recommendation was seconded by Councillor Roger Noel.

RESOLVED

- i) That the café and bar at The Capitol be managed directly in-house.

CO/43 **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES**

The Chairman of the Audit Committee reported that as at 31 March 2019, the Council's external debt was £4m and investments totalled £36.1m including call accounts and Money Market Funds. During 2018/19, the Council's cash balances had been invested in accordance with the Council's treasury management strategy. Interest of £0.887m had been earned on investments, an average return of 2.1%.

In reply to a question from a Member regarding the raising of the Public Work Loans Board increase in lending rates by 1%, the Director of Corporate Resources said that the council had no debt at the moment, so was unaffected by this change. Financial activity had shifted toward inter authority loans, as the rates were more favourable. The recommendation was seconded by Councillor John Blackall.

RESOLVED

That:

- i) an increase from £1m to £1.5m in the limit on lending to subsidiary companies in the 2019/20 Investment Strategy be approved; and;

- ii) a £0.5m limit on shareholding in its subsidiary companies in the 2019/20 Investment Strategy

CO/44 **REPORTS OF REPRESENTATIVES**

A Member said that Horsham in Bloom was helping to create and support many of the environmental support groups in the town. A new committee and logo for the organisation had been created. She hoped that the new committee would be well supported by the council.

CO/45 **FORMER NOVARTIS SITE, PARSONAGE ROAD, HORSHAM, WEST SUSSEX**

Councillors Nigel Jupp, Liz Kitchen and Christian Mitchell declared personal and prejudicial interests in the item on the former Novartis site, Parsonage Road, Horsham as they were Members of West Sussex County Council and withdrew from the meeting for the item.

The Principal Planning Officer reported that an outline application had been submitted for the erection of up to 300 dwellings, including the conversion of existing offices buildings up to 25,000sqm of employment floorspace and provision of 618sqm of flexible commercial/community space within the ground floor of a converted building. The scheme included improvements to existing pedestrian and vehicular accesses from Parsonage Road and Wimblehurst Road, together with associated parking and landscaping.

This application had been deferred from the Council meeting on the 4th September 2019 to allow Peter Brett Associates (PBA) to comment on the Road Safety Audit (RSA). To provide confirmation on parking and clarification of Sussex Police comments. Two additional letters of objection had been received, including a further letter from the Wimblehurst Residents Association which was forwarded to all Members. These comments had been taken into consideration.

The Officer went on to say that PBA had assessed the Road Safety Audit and identified areas of the RSA that required review and amendment in order to be fully GG119 compliant. The applicant had submitted an updated RSA and PBA had commented that the RSA had now addressed their comments. In assessing the RSA, PBA had undertaken a site visit and had considered the comments and concerns of local residents including the Wimblehurst Road Residents Group. Based on all available information PBA have advised that it was unlikely that the development would cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

He went on to say that parking details were outlined in detail in the report, and up to 308 spaces are proposed for residential uses and up to 872 spaces are proposed for the employment uses. This met the parking provision for new developments under West Sussex County Council guidance. Condition 10 of the recommendation required the submission of a parking strategy prior to the commencement of works. The purpose of the strategy was to agree how parking would be provided for the residential and commercial areas. This would allow

some flexibility in how parking was allocated, including opportunities to use the employment parking as overspill for the residential units in evenings and at weekends.

At the previous Council meeting, clarification had been sought as to what was classed as 'severe' in highway safety terms. This related to paragraph 109 of the NPPF. PBA have commented that there was no definitive answer to this question. Since the launch of the NPPF in 2012, what could be classed as 'severe' in highway terms had caused substantial uncertainty. Based on appeal decisions provided by PBA, it was clear that there were no trends as to what constituted 'severe'. What was also clear was that the term 'severe' set a high bar for intervention via the planning system in traffic effects arising from development. Appeal decisions highlighted that more congestion and inconvenience was not sufficient to trigger the 'severe' test in itself but rather it was a question of the consequences of such congestion taken as a whole. Given the uncertainty regarding what was classed as severe, the advice of the Highway Authority on the highway impacts of a proposal remained critical in determining whether a proposal would have a severe impact.

Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application. Two representatives spoke in support of the proposal. Representatives of North Horsham Parish Council and Horsham Denne Neighbourhood Council spoke in objection to the application. A local Member spoke in objection to the application, but stated that there were no reasons to turn it down on planning grounds. She did not feel, however, that she could endorse the application. A Local Member said that he did not feel that the scheme was of sufficient quality for the site. He believed that there would be traffic problems as a result of it. If the application was turned down, it was likely that West Sussex County Council would sell the land to a developer, which would mean that the provision of employment facilities would be unlikely. As a result, he would reluctantly support the application.

A Member stated concerns about the traffic and highway safety of the scheme but pointed out that if the scheme were to be turned down, any appeal would be likely to be lost, with substantial costs. Approving it would mean that the council would have continuing control and involvement in a scheme in an important site in the centre of the town.

In reply to a question from a Member, the Principal Planning Officer said that there were a number of legal stipulations in terms of highways improvements and mitigations. These included off-site pedestrian and cycling, changes to the bus waiting facilities in North Heath Lane and improvements to the Wimblehurst road and Parsonage road junctions. PBA had suggested additional improvements, which could include a new crossing on Parsonage Road. A travel plan would also be secured through the Section 106 agreements. A traffic management monitor would ask companies coming onto the site to instigate traffic moderation schemes.

In reply to a question from a Member, the Principal Planning Officer said that it was important that Members determine the proposal that was before them. Improvements had been made, and additional contributions had been made for

pedestrian improvements. There were no grounds to refuse the application on highways safety grounds. He said that placing an informative on the application that redesigned the scheme, were it to be passed could have implications on any future applications. Alternative ways could be considered in order to reduce traffic movements.

Members went on to address the issues of utilisation of brown field sites, the necessity for additional office space in the town, and the economic sustainability of the development.

It was moved and seconded that the recommendations in the report be approved.

RESOLVED

That

- i) The application for approval to the Head of Development, subject to completion of a legal agreement and appropriate conditions be approved.
- ii) In the event that the legal agreement was not completed within three months of the decision of the Council, or other later date as agreed by the Head of Development, the Director of Place be authorised to refuse permission on the grounds of failure to secure the Obligations necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

CO/46 **A27 ARUNDEL BYPASS CONSULTATION - DRAFT HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL RESPONSE**

The Deputy Leader reported that in August 2017, Highways England had published a consultation paper with six potential options for a new road bypass on the A27 around Arundel. In May 2018, Highways England published their Preferred Route Announcement, known as Option 5AV3. This new road layout would not be located in Horsham District, but it was believed that any change to this part of the A27 would have a big impact on reducing the high number of vehicles that currently use routes through Horsham District. It would accordingly improve the poor air quality villages such as Storrington and Cowfold, where there was declared Air Quality Management Areas.

Horsham District Council was a statutory consultee and the report set out the proposed response to this consultation. It was proposed that the Council favoured the 'Magenta option' as this should achieve significant reductions in traffic flows and consequent enhancements to air quality in Horsham District, minimising the impact on the South Downs National Park ancient woodland, and minimising likely environmental impacts. He went on to say that the original letter had been amended in order to remove the references to the grey and amber options, and a revised version had been circulated for consideration and approval. The amendment was seconded by Councillor Peter Burgess.

A Member stated that the works were part of a strategic road system undertaken by Highways England, and should be regarded as such.

A Member stated that she supported the reasons behind the council's response regarding the use of roads through villages and the serious congestion that resulted. Of the options, the Magenta option had significant environmental impact, massive cost and would incur significant objection and delay. She said that there were other options available, which included the Arundel Alternative, which would have less environmental impact and cost as it used the existing road in a way that kept the traffic flowing. A dual carriageway was not required in this location.

A Member stated that work undertaken by the Storrington Air Quality Control Group to ban lorries from the centre of the village had made little difference to the air quality there, as there were inherent difficulties in enforcing restrictions on heavy lorries. It was therefore important to be clear about the Council's recommendation on this matter. He supported the amended motion put forward by the Deputy Leader.

A Member pointed out that there had been a number of studies across Europe and the United States that showed that increasing the size of the roads was not an answer to congestion, as the traffic numbers merely grew to fill the available space.

A Member spoke in support of the amendment and pointed out that additional traffic was caused by the necessity to build houses in the district. He supported providing signs to separate cyclists and pedestrians.

Having been moved and seconded, the amendment was put. The amendment was therefore declared as CARRIED.

Councillor Fletcher stated that during a climate emergency it was inappropriate to build an enormously expensive dual carriageway through the countryside of West Sussex and proposed an amendment to the substantive motion that read:

'The Council requests that Highways England also assess the effectiveness and deliverability of the 'Arundel Alternative' proposal from SCATE. The potential advantages of this proposal are a significantly reduced environmental impact, lower cost and possibly less public opposition. As a result, it may enable a satisfactory solution to the current problems to be delivered in a shorter timescale.

We understand that the proposal is to maintain steady vehicle flow throughout this section by removing and bypassing the points which currently cause hold-ups.

From the east, this route remodels Crossbush junction removing traffic signals and continues over a new rail bridge bypassing pinch points at Warringcamp junction, the railway station, bus stops, pedestrian crossing and Causeway roundabout. The river bridge is upgraded and Ford roundabout is remodeled to create a through road.

The proposal is for a 40mph single carriageway providing comparable capacity and very little difference in journey time compared with 70mph dual carriageway options.

Whichever option is chosen, this Council would encourage Highways England to construct any bypass and consequential bridges to the highest possible architectural standard and to take appropriate account of any potential flooding issues, given the sensitivity of the local environment.

There needs to be a strong commitment to provide for cycling and walking. Provision along and across the SRN should be in accordance with Highways England's own Standards for Highways, CD195, Designing for Cycle Traffic and should follow NPPF principles: to 'give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements' and to 'protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice'.

In particular we emphasise the need to

- provide cycleways rather than shared-use footways
- avoid any diversion or severance to existing rights of way, minor roads and paths
- make provision for potential future walking and cycle routes by safeguarding land and by including bridges and underbridges with sufficient width for walking and cycling at potential severance locations.'

The motion was seconded by Councillor Bob Platt. Having been moved and seconded, the amendment was put. The amendment was declared LOST.

The original motion was therefore proposed by Councillor Jonathan Chowen and seconded by Councillor Paul Clarke. Having been moved and seconded, the motion was put.

RESOLVED as follows:

That the consultation response to be submitted to Highways England by 24 October 2019 be approved, subject to the removal of the line on page 2: 'Grey (Option 5BV1) and Amber (Option 4/5AV2) would also provide a beneficial outcome.'

CO/47 **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

No questions had been received.

CO/48 **URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business.

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm having commenced at 6.00 pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL 11th DECEMBER 2019

CABINET RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MEETING HELD ON THE 28th NOVEMBER 2019

Details of recommendations to Council made at the Cabinet meeting held on 28th November 2019 are set out below. Reports from the meeting can be found on line here: [Cabinet Agenda 28th November 2019](#)

EX/36 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2020/21 TO 2023/24

The Leader stated that the report set out the proposed strategy for the period 2020/21 to 2023/24 in order to establish the context for the Council's budget and medium term financial planning scenarios and assumptions. This had been done in the context of unprecedented levels of uncertainty. The impact on the Council from the future of business rates and the Fair Funding Review in the 2020/21 budget setting process had been delayed by Government's parliamentary election and until the UK's relationship with the European Union was resolved. The funding for the 2020/21 budget year was being prepared based on a 'same as last year' theory. However, with the existing political and therefore financial uncertainty being exceptionally high, the actual budget and MTFS that Council would set in February 2020 for 2020/21 could well be subject to change.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That:

- i) the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020/21 to 2023/24 be approved, and:
- ii) the projected budgets and potential actions as detailed in paragraph 3.53 and table 4 of the report be noted.

EX/37 WILDER HORSHAM DISTRICT

The Leader spoke on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture and said that Horsham District Council had already taken measures to protect and enhance the natural environment across the District and particularly on its own land. The report proposed to enhance this approach by establishing a unique partnership with the Sussex Wildlife Trust. This would build on a long standing relationship that the Council already had with the Trust. The partnership would focus on ensuring that wildlife thrives across Horsham District by creating networks and expanding habitats.

The report sought approval to create the partnership and included a document which set out the actions that would be taken over the next five years. The funding requested in the report was £571,000 for the life of the programme. Outcomes from the programme would be regularly reviewed to ensure delivery, with associated adjustments to the budget. The Sussex Wildlife Trust were also contributing funding to the partnership.

The report also proposes establishing two funding pots in 2020/21. One to provide implementation funding for Parish Councils and communities wishing to undertake projects that complement the partnership and one to plant trees on Council owned land to replace ones that were felled due to disease and pests. These would require ongoing funding but would be regularly reviewed.

RESOLVED

That:

- i) the formation of a partnership with the Sussex Wildlife Trust be approved;
- ii) the partnership document be approved and its aims and actions be endorsed; and:

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That the budget for 2020/21 includes a green reserve of £571,000 for the costs of the Wilder Horsham District programme.

Reasons for Recommendations

- i) To allow the partnership with the Sussex Wildlife Trust to be formed, with the associated resources to achieve the aims of the partnership over a five year period.
- ii) To provide a budget to replace trees lost to disease and pests etc. on Council owned land.

EX/38 HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL'S CARBON FOOTPRINT

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Waste and Recycling reported that Horsham District Council was committed to tackling climate change and had a good track record on addressing environmental issues which it could build on. The report provided an update on the Council's work to examine and reduce its own carbon footprint, as it moved towards becoming a carbon neutral organisation. This was only the first step for the Council as an organisation. Having established its footprint, this would be followed up with a science based target and a practical and costed action plan as to how this could be achieved. The report and action plan would follow in early 2020.

The report also proposes establishing a seed funding pot of £40,000 per annum, commencing in 2020/21 financial year in order to support community groups and Parish Councils who wanted to implement projects that addressed climate change.

RESOLVED

- i) That the details of the carbon footprint generated by the Council's buildings, transport and operations be noted;

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That in the budget for 2020/21, £200,000 be transferred into a green reserve to create a seed funding pot for community groups for a five-year period.

Reasons for Recommendations

- i) The Council's carbon footprint will form the basis of setting a science based target for reducing its carbon emissions and producing a practical, costed action plan to achieve the target;
- ii) Community groups and Parish Councils would be able to apply for funding for projects that tackle climate change and contribute to a District wide approach to addressing this issue. The fund would be £40,000 per annum

EX/47 CIL GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

The Cabinet Member for Planning & Development reported that Horsham District Council had introduced a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in order to allow funds to be raised from developers to pay for infrastructure that was needed to support growth. The Council adopted its Charging Schedule for CIL on 26 April 2017 and implementation of the levy commenced on 1 October 2017. The Council had overarching responsibility for the allocation of CIL monies and reporting the amount of money collected and spent. It was needed to establish a clear CIL Governance Structure to oversee the collection, auditing and spending of CIL monies. The report proposed the key governance arrangements for the delivery of infrastructure through CIL in order to achieve the following aims:

1. That there was clarity, transparency and consistency in the collection, allocation and spending of CIL receipts;
2. That the relationship between the Council as charging authority and key stakeholders and infrastructure providers (internal and external);
3. To ensure CIL receipts were spent on infrastructure required to support development, in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010;
4. To ensure CIL served its purpose of contributing to the delivery of the infrastructure necessary in order to support the Horsham District Planning Framework.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That:

- i) The arrangements set out in the report for the future governance of the receipts from the Community Infrastructure Levy be approved;
- ii) A Joint Officer Working Group be established to prioritise infrastructure projects seeking funding from the Community Infrastructure Levy and provide recommendations to the Director of Place regarding which projects should receive such funding;
- iii) An Infrastructure Projects Working Group (IPWG) to receive the recommendations of the Director of Place on prioritised schemes, which shall be funded from the Community Infrastructure Levy, be established;
- iv) The prioritisation of and collection and monitoring of CIL spend be delegated to the Director of Place in consultation with the Director of Community Services and the Infrastructure Projects Working Group as charging authority on behalf of the Council;
- v) the Planning Obligations Panel be dissolved and the prioritisation, collection and monitoring of any financial contributions arising from agreements made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 be delegated to the Director of Place in consultation with the Director of Community Services.

Reasons for Recommendations

- i) To provide clarity, transparency and consistency in the collection, allocation and spending of CIL receipts;
- ii) To set out the relationship between the Council as charging authority and key stakeholders and infrastructure providers (internal and external);
- iii) To ensure CIL receipts were spent on infrastructure required to support development, in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended;
- iv) To ensure CIL served its purpose of contributing to the delivery of the infrastructure necessary to support the Horsham District Planning Framework.

EX/47 APPROVAL OF BUSINESS CASES FOR HORSHAM DISTRICT HOMES FOR AFFORDABLE HOMES IN BILLINGSHURST AND SLINFOLD

It was moved that, under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for this item of business, on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, by virtue of paragraph 3 regarding information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information, and in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

To receive the recommendations from the meeting of Cabinet held on 28th November 2019 on Businesses Cases for Horsham District Homes for affordable homes in Billingshurst and Slinfold: [Cabinet Agenda 28th November 2019](#)

RESOLVED

- i. the business case for the purchase of the affordable rental house in Slinfold by Horsham District Homes (Holdings) Ltd be approved;
- ii. the business case for the construction of three homes for affordable rental in Roman Way, Billingshurst by Horsham District Homes Ltd be approved;
- iii. The transfer of the land in Roman Way, Billingshurst from Horsham District Council to Horsham District Homes (Holding) Ltd for a sum to be determined by an independent valuer subject to not needing the consent of the Secretary of State be approved;
- iv. A loan of up to £350,000 to Horsham District Homes Ltd for the construction of the three properties at Roman Way, Billingshurst at the agreed rate of 4% plus base rate, be approved;

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That:

- i) The transfer of s106 funds to Horsham District Homes (Holdings) Ltd for the purchase of the two bedroomed house in Slinfold for a sum of no greater than £205,000 plus stamp duty and agents fees be approved;
- ii) The transfer of s106 funds to Horsham District Homes (Holdings) Ltd for the purchase of three properties at Roman Way, Billingshurst for a sum of no greater than £675,600 be recommended to Council.

Reasons for Recommendations

- i) Approval of the recommendations will allow the details of the transactions to be completed so that the affordable rental properties can be delivered for the benefit of households on the housing list.

COUNCIL 11 DECEMBER 2019

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Details of a recommendation to Council made at the Governance Committee meeting held on 26 November 2019 are set out below:

GO/19 **REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS, POLLING PLACES AND POLLING STATIONS**

The Monitoring Officer presented a report and said that the Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013 required a review of all polling districts and polling places to be completed by 31 January 2020. Subsequent compulsory reviews had to be started and completed within the period of 16 months that starts on 1 October of every fifth year after 1 October 2018.

A major review of polling districts and polling places had been undertaken last year to take account of the new District wards introduced with effect from May 2019. For this reason few changes to polling places and no changes to polling districts were proposed in the current review. An additional mini-review would be conducted prior to the May 2020 elections in order to take account of any issues that arose from the forthcoming Parliamentary General election.

The consultation process in respect of the current review was now complete and the recommendations were set out in Appendix 3 of the report.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (i) A recommendation to Council to approve the revised schedule of polling districts, polling places and polling stations, as set out in Appendix 3, following the review carried out this year be approved; and;
- (ii) An additional mini-review would be conducted prior to the May 2020 elections to take account of any issues arising from the forthcoming Parliamentary General election.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

- i) That the revised schedule of polling districts, polling places and polling stations, as set out in Appendix 3, following the review carried out this year be approved

This page is intentionally left blank