

HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL
24TH FEBRUARY 2016

Present: Councillors: Tricia Youtan (Chairman), Christian Mitchell (Vice-Chairman), John Bailey, Andrew Baldwin, John Blackall, Toni Bradnum, Karen Burgess, Peter Burgess, John Chidlow, Jonathan Chowen, Philip Circus, Paul Clarke, David Coldwell, Leonard Crosbie, Brian Donnelly, Matthew French, Nigel Jupp, Liz Kitchen, Adrian Lee, Gordon Lindsay, Tim Lloyd, Paul Marshall, Mike Morgan, Josh Murphy, Godfrey Newman, Brian O'Connell, Stuart Ritchie, Kate Rowbottom, Jim Sanson, David Skipp, Simon Torn, Michael Willett

Apologies: Councillor: Alan Britten, Roger Clarke, Roy Cornell, Christine Costin, Jonathan Dancer, Ray Dawe, Tony Hogben, Ian Howard, David Jenkins, Connor Relleen, Ben Staines, Claire Vickers

CO/73 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 9th December 2015 and 28th January 2016 were approved as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

CO/74 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

CO/75 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman of the Council referred to the recent deaths of Barbara Palmer, a former Member and Chairman of the Council, and Malcolm Curnock, a former Member. Tributes were paid by current Members and a moment's silence was observed as a mark of respect.

In view of the Notice of Motion later on the agenda, the Deputy Leader made a statement indicating that the Council would continue to honour its statutory obligations under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to clean all roads in the District, including the B2139, as and when it was felt necessary. Also, this issue was to be considered at the next meeting of the Cabinet Member's Clean & Tidy Advisory Group and that the matter would be referred to Cabinet for consideration if appropriate. The Deputy Leader thanked both Councillor Baldwin for highlighting this issue and the many Adopt a Street Volunteers and other residents across the District who gave up their time to litter pick public areas in their own neighbourhoods. It was appropriate that this issue was highlighted as the Country prepared to mark the Queen's 90th Birthday with a "Clean for the Queen Weekend" from 4th to 6th March 2016. It was hoped that all Members would be able to join at least one of the many events being organised across the District and that perhaps all the effort and publicity would persuade others not to drop litter in the first place.

CO/75 Announcements (cont.)

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture also referred to the official opening of the high ropes in Horsham Park which had taken place on 22nd February 2016.

The Cabinet Member for Local Economy congratulated Horsham Markets on winning the Sussex Farmers Market of the Year category at the Sussex Food & Drink Awards this year, the second time they had achieved this accolade in the last three years.

CO/76 **UPDATE ON THE CHAIRMAN'S TRUST**

The Chairman indicated that, in view of the amount of business on the agenda, she had decided to deal with this item by means of an e-mail, which had been sent to all Members, rather than a presentation at the meeting.

CO/77 **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

(1) Mr Kornycky asked the following questions:

On 11th August & 7th September last year, having been dissatisfied with the data released under 2 Freedom of Information requests, I asked for an internal review of each. Such requests require a maximum 40 working day turnaround under the Environmental Information Regulations, (EIR) Regulation 11.

HDC are well aware of this obligation having been formally admonished regarding this exact point in 2014 by the Information Commissioners Office, the ICO.

As the deadlines approached, I sent reminders, all of which failed to elicit any response from HDC. I even called & left unanswered messages.

Being totally ignored, I had no alternative but to refer these cases to the ICO.

Eventually, on 25th January 2016 the ICO advised me as follows:

"I wrote to the Council about your complaint on 21 December, to make enquiries about its withholding of the information you originally asked for in July 2015. The Council has now reversed its position in respect of your requests.

The Council's disclosure has been made significantly later than the compliance period which the EIR requires and it is for this reason that the Commissioner will record a breach of Regulation 5(2) against the Council. Recording this breach allows the Commissioner to gather information about the general compliance of this local authority."

CO/77 Questions from the Public (cont.)

So, after a 6 month struggle, I now have all the originally requested information, but only thanks to the ICO & certainly not to HDC.

Q1. Why did this blatant breach of procedures happen?

Q2. What steps are you taking to prevent any recurrence?

Councillor Jonathan Chowen, the Deputy Leader replied as follows:

Thank you for your questions Mr Kornycky. The matter of the delay in dealing with your freedom of information request was dealt with last week at our Finance and Performance Working Group. I am told you have now received a letter from our Monitoring Officer that provides a full response to your question and also deals with the second question you have posed this evening. A copy of the response you were sent will be printed in the minutes of this meeting.

The response sent to Mr Kornycky was as follows:

"I write further to your email to the Chairman of Finance & Performance Working Group dated 14 February 2016 in which you make comment on the Freedom of Information performance report. The Chairman asked for my response to your email so I set out below the full and un-redacted text of my response. You will note I have referred to you as a member of the public, rather than by name, because the letter may have been read out and I thought it was not appropriate to refer to you by name.

Once again can I apologise for the delay in dealing with your request for a review. I know it may not be of comfort for you to see me referring to our excellent performance in dealing with the vast majority of requests given the delay in your case but I hope you will appreciate the delay in your case should not affect our whole approach. We are really working hard to get to 100% compliance and I think to get to 98% compliance in the last 6 months reflects well on the effort relevant staff have put in.

Our performance is monitored both by Finance & Performance Working Group and the Information Commissioner so there is a high level of assurance that the Council is doing a good job. At the meeting Members of the Working Group decided to retain quarterly reporting of FOI performance.

If you have any further comments to add please let me know.

Yours sincerely etc.

Text of email to Chairman

Dear Councillor Ritchie

I am writing to you in your capacity as Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Finance & Performance Working Group as the officer responsible for the FOI function at the Council. You circulated an email received by a member of the public and after due consideration, my response now follows. I'm not sure if you would want to read my response for the Working Group or alternatively ask Ben Bix to do so but I would be grateful if you would be happy for it to be circulated to all the Members who received the original email so they can note my response.

The member of the public makes two general points in his correspondence, the first is in relation to the reporting process on FOI and second in respect of his individual requests. My response addresses those matters in sequence.

Firstly, contextually, like the rest of the public sector HDC is dealing with more and more FOI requests. In the last three years the number of requests has increased despite the increase in publicly available information. In calendar year 2013 there were 576 requests, this increased in 2014 to 659 requests and again in 2015 there was an increase to 686 requests.

There is a significant and increasing burden that affects all Council Departments and in the current climate it is not a realistic option to increase resources devoted to this area (we have one Information Officer as well as a proportion of my own time) so we have improved our processes to deal with the increased number and to increase our response rate which had been below 85% for a number of years. The ongoing response rate of below 85% had to be proactively addressed to mitigate the engagement of the Information Commissioners Office who may issue a monitoring notice upon the Council. For clarity, the ICO has not issued a monitoring notice.

The focus of the KPIs has been and remains focused on the areas that are measurable and in respect of throughput is the area of interest to the external Regulator (the Information Commissioner). These are the KPIs that we can benchmark against other organisations. The Working Group will continue to receive that information in its quarterly report (earlier on tonight's agenda). The subsequent report before members tonight notes that response performance is reported twice on the agenda and asks whether the Working Group would like to handle the information differently. The quarterly report of the high level indicators would remain in place. The subsequent report restates the high level report. Should the working group wish to receive the report 6 monthly, they are welcome to resolve that.

CO/77 Questions from the Public (cont.)

There has been no disregard of quality as is suggested. There is a clear process to follow which has not been changed. The ICO may formally monitor response rates below 85% - in the last year, monitoring was undertaken by the ICO on Salford, Greenwich, Cumbria and Nottingham councils. Horsham is no longer vulnerable to a monitoring notice as we have got our response rate up to above 98% in the last six months. This response rate aligns us with the very best performance of organisations that deal with FOI requests. Response rates are the focus of monitoring by the ICO and they publish the details of the process involved in monitoring online.
<https://ico.org.uk/action-weve-taken/monitoring-compliance/>.

Secondly, turning to the review process, the steps in the Council's review process have not been changed. There were 32 requests for review out of 789 requests for information since 1 April 2014 (4%). Of those 32 reviews, 24 requestors did not choose to appeal to the ICO. Five did appeal to the ICO and the ICO upheld the Council's decision on all 5 occasions. One appeal was informally resolved by the ICO. A further two were the subject of the email received from a member of the public today which I shall refer to below.

If the Working Group wish to be notified of the number of reviews then it may resolve to do so. The log itself was subject to an FOI request and it is therefore published online in the Council's disclosure log in its redacted form due to the Council's data protection duty
https://horsham.axlr8.uk/disclosureLogMonth.asp?npr=1&year_value=2016&month_value=1 (FOI 298 refers).

Two outstanding reviews are mentioned in the report. Those are the subject of the second part of the correspondence received from the member of the public.

It is correct to say that two of the review requests (the requestors original requests as well as other requests made by the requestor in recent months have been within time limit) were delayed and we have apologised to him for the delay. This particular member of the public has regular contact with the Council utilising FOI requests, questions at Council meetings and other enquiries. Whilst he is within his right to make these requests it should be acknowledged at the same time that Council resource, and at times significant resource, is engaged with dealing with this interaction. It is regrettable but not surprising that his requests fall within the very isolated examples where requests have not been dealt with in the required timely manner.

The member of the public is incorrect to describe the action of the Information Commissioner as decisive and that the Council has a finding against it. By dealing with his request outside the 20 day time limit he is right

CO/77 Questions from the Public (cont.)

to suggest the Council breached regulation 5(2) and in fact in 1 to 2 % of cases the Council continues to breach regulation 5(2) as does every other public body that does not comply with 100% of requests within 20 days. However this is recognised and should be seen in the context that the Information Commissioner has a tolerance level of 85% completed within 20 working days, that is, the Information commissioner has tolerated breaches of regulation 5(2) in respect of 15% of requests. As I have said above we are 98% compliant (well above the tolerance level) but we aim to be 100% compliant.

The member of the public has however failed to state that the Information Commissioner in fact found the Council in compliance with the main duty (regulation 5(1)) to provide the information and therefore closed the case with no further action. It is therefore incorrect to say there is an adverse view of the Council with the Information Commissioner. Some members of the public will continue to seek to involve the Information Commissioner when they are dissatisfied with how the Council has dealt with their request and that is a big part of the Information Commissioner's role. In the last eighteen months the Information Commissioner has either found in favour of the Council or else closed the case because the Council has complied with the substantive duty.

Members may be assured that the Information Commissioner has the necessary powers to address underperformance and have not used those powers with regard to HDC.

In conclusion, this example demonstrates that out of 789 cases, less than 0.2% are the focus of this correspondence. If the Working Group wants to have that report going forward, then they can, but this may be at the expense of understanding the contextual compliance. As I have said above it is regrettable that we have not dealt with these two requests for information from this member of the public to the same high standard we are dealing with 98% of requests and disappointed that this may have distracted attention from the excellent performance of the Council in this area of work."

Mr Kornycky asked a supplementary question as to why the situation in respect of his requests had happened.

The Deputy Leader indicated that this had been addressed in the reply by the Monitoring Officer.

(2) Mrs Kornycky asked the following question:

The draft CIL proposals give minimal detail as to why the North of Horsham strategic development is to have NIL CIL. However, it is clear from the Infrastructure plan that a S106 developer contribution in excess of £10m, perhaps £13.6m, will be sought for the funding of a new Railway Station.

CO/77 Questions from the Public (cont.)

But Horsham District Council has always been adamant that the North of Horsham planning decision is in no way dependent upon the provision of a new Railway Station.

Q1 - Please explain how such a S106 condition can satisfy the 3 tests of CIL 2010 Regulation 122(2), since if an obligation does not meet all of these tests it cannot in law be taken into account in granting planning permission?

At Kilnwood Vale, even though a planning requirement, the S106 for its new Railway Station merely required the site to be provided, & not the building of the station itself.

Q2 – Please explain how it was originally expected that the build of the Kilnwood Vale station would be funded & why a similar approach is not appropriate for North of Horsham, thereby drastically improving the viability margin & potentially allowing at least some CIL to be charged?

Councillor Jonathan Chowen, the Deputy Leader replied as follows:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to clarify this matter Mrs Kornycky.

The provision of a station on land north of Horsham is not a requirement of our recently adopted Local Plan (also known as the Horsham District Planning Framework). As a result, we would not be able to collect CIL monies for its provision neither would we be able to require the developer to pay for it through a s106 agreement.

The developer wishes to see a new station incorporated into the development and the responsibility for funding it therefore rests with them. We will work to ensure that the development as a whole fulfils all relevant planning policy requirements and that these do not suffer because of the cost of the station.

The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule attached to the Council report at Appendix A shows what infrastructure is needed to deliver the local plan strategy and to demonstrate how much will be delivered via section 106 agreements and what will be funded through CIL.

Unfortunately there is a typographical error on page 43 of the document. The estimated cost of the new station should appear in the column headed "Funding Source Other" and not under the heading "Funding Source s106". This will be corrected before the document is published for consultation.

The station at Kilnwood Vale was not a requirement of our adopted planning policies and, as is the case with the proposal at land north of Horsham, it is the developer's choice to pursue this aspect of the development. Whilst

CO/77 Questions from the Public (cont.)

land at Kilnwood Vale has been reserved for a station for a period within the s106 agreement responsibility for funding it rests entirely with the developer. The cost was not part of Crest Nicholson's viability assessment that supported their planning application and infrastructure package.

The Council has been and continues to be consistent in its handling of the two station proposals.

(3) Mrs White asked the following question:

As the A24 from Great Daux to Clarks Green at Capel is the only part of this National Primary Route into London that remains single carriage and little better than a country lane, have you any plans at all for seeking funding for upgrading and dualling it in the foreseeable future – and by setting the CIL for North Horsham at zero aren't you missing a golden opportunity to extract a large contribution towards the costs of this from Liberty's? Why not make it a condition of granting planning permission if and when a formal application is made?

Councillor Jonathan Chowen, the Deputy Leader replied as follows:

West Sussex County Council as the Highway Authority is responsible for the highway network in the District. It has been a long standing aim of both Councils to see improvements to this stretch of the A24.

Developers are only required to provide mitigation measures or contributions when these are required as result of their development. Liberty could not be required to make (or contribute to) improvements to the A24 north of Great Daux Roundabout unless the full Transport Assessment (TA) that will accompany their planning application indicates that it is a requirement of the development. The evidence submitted to date, which was scrutinised by the local plan Inspector indicated that no mitigation measures or improvements on the A24 north of Great Daux Roundabout would be required as a result of the development.

Mrs White asked a supplementary question as to whether the Council was in contact with another developer regarding a number of possible developments southwards from Kingsfold who would contribute to improvements to this stretch of the A24.

The Deputy Leader indicated that this would be dealt with by means of a written response.

CO/78 **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER RULE 10.2**

No questions had been received.

CO/79

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET
Corporate Plan 2016 to 2019

The Deputy Leader reported that, prior to the local elections in 2015, it had been agreed that the Council's 2011 to 2015 District Plan priorities would be revised following the elections. To enable budgets and service plans for 2015/16 to be set the priorities in the District Plan had been carried forward for the current financial year. In recent months Cabinet Members had discussed revisions to the District Plan with the Senior Leadership Team and had identified a set of draft priorities, which were set out in the report to Cabinet.

If approved by Council, the draft priorities together with the Budget recommendations would both form the basis for the 2016/17 departmental service plans.

The priorities were grouped and presented under four broad headings, which covered the Council's economic, environmental, social and organisational responsibilities. These four themes would replace the six contained in the last District Plan and would help put individual priorities and the routine work of the Council in context.

RESOLVED

That the draft Corporate Plan be adopted as submitted.

REASON

To ensure that Corporate Priorities for the remainder of the current Council are clarified and form the basis of service plans and related activity across the Council.

CO/80

BUDGET FOR 2016/17 AND COUNCIL TAX

(a) The 2016/17 Budget and the Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2019/20

In accordance with Rule 13.5 of Part 4A of the Constitution, the Chairman of the Council gave her consent to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets and the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group each speaking for longer than five minutes on this item, if they wished to do so.

Further to the detailed consideration of the Budget for 2016/17 by the Cabinet, Councillor Brian Donnelly, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets introduced this item; presented the recommendations of the Cabinet in respect of the 2016/17 budget and moved that they be approved. Councillor Peter Burgess seconded the proposal.

CO/80 Budget for 2016/17 and Council Tax (cont.)
(a) The 2016/17 Budget and the Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2019/20 (cont.)

Councillor Donnelly reminded Members that, whilst the recommendations from Cabinet proposed a balanced budget for 2016/17, the Council faced significant financial pressure in future years.

The budget for 2016/17 reflected the hard work of officers to increase income opportunities and reduce costs via efficiencies. The proposed small increase in council tax of 1.2% was in line with the local Conservative Group's pledge at the last elections that any rise would be no more than RPI and recognised the impact that such increases had on many of the District's residents.

Councillor David Skipp, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group also addressed the Council. He also expressed his appreciation of the work undertaken by officers to produce a balanced budget for the next year. However, he suggested that it was difficult to determine whether the projected deficit by 2019/20 was accurate, averaged or based on assumptions open to interpretation. A particular area of uncertainty in future years was the continuation and level of New Homes Bonus. He also questioned the majority group's pledge to cap council tax increases at no more than RPI; the increase in the charge for the collection of green waste; and the introduction of Sunday and Bank Holiday car parking charges.

It was proposed by Councillor David Skipp and seconded by Councillor Godfrey Newman that a further recommendation should be added to read: "At its meeting in October the Council is presented with an interim updated Medium Term Financial Strategy after the outcome of New Homes Bonus is known."

On being put, this amendment was declared **LOST**.

Councillor Leonard Crosbie then addressed the Council in his capacity as Chairman of the Scrutiny & Overview Committee.

The debate was opened to all Members and items raised included: the proposed increase in council tax, the costs/ income impact of the increasing number of houses in the District and the effect on the Council's income of the conversion of business premises to residential use.

Having been moved and seconded, the substantive motion was put.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, the voting in respect of the motion was recorded and was as follows:

CO/80 Budget for 2016/17 and Council Tax (cont.)
(a) The 2016/17 Budget and the Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2019/20 (cont.)

FOR THE MOTION: Councillors: John Bailey, Andrew Baldwin, John Blackall, Toni Bradnum, Karen Burgess, Peter Burgess, John Chidlow, Jonathan Chowen, Philip Circus, Paul Clarke, David Coldwell, Brian Donnelly, Matthew French, Nigel Jupp, Liz Kitchen, Adrian Lee, Gordon Lindsay, Tim Lloyd, Paul Marshall, Christian Mitchell, Josh Murphy, Brian O'Connell, Stuart Ritchie, Kate Rowbottom, Jim Sanson, Simon Torn, Michael Willett, Tricia Youtan

ABSTAINED: Councillors: Leonard Crosbie, Mike Morgan, Godfrey Newman, David Skipp,

ABSENT: Councillors: Alan Britten, Roger Clarke, Roy Cornell, Christine Costin, Jonathan Dancer, Ray Dawe, Tony Hogben, Ian Howard, David Jenkins, Connor Relleen, Ben Staines, Claire Vickers

The motion was declared **CARRIED** and it was:

RESOLVED

- (i) That the level of Council Tax for 2016/17 be increased from £135.54 by 1.2% to £137.17 at Band D.
- (ii) That the net revenue budget for 2016/17 of £12.55m be approved, as submitted.
- (iii) That Special Expenses of £270,909 and a Band D charge of £23.93 be agreed in respect of the unparished area for 2016/17.
- (iv) That the capital programme for 2016/17 be approved as submitted and that the indicative capital budgets in the programme for future years be noted.
- (v) That the projected future deficits on the revenue account be noted and the Medium Term Financial Strategy continue to be reviewed and refined to ensure that decisions are taken to develop a balanced budget in 2017/18 and subsequent years.
- (vi) That the Minimum Revenue Provision Statement be approved, as submitted.

CO/80 Budget for 2016/17 and Council Tax (cont.)
(a) The 2016/17 Budget and the Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2019/20 (cont.)

- (vii) That the prudential indicators and limits for 2015/16 to 2018/19 be approved, as submitted.
- (viii) That the statement on the robustness of the level reserves be noted.
- (ix) That a further £2,000,000 of New Homes Bonus Reserve be allocated towards the Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre capital project.
- (x) That the decision to accept the proposed four year settlement be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets, in consultation with the Section 151 Officer, once the detail of the four year settlement has been finalised and the results of the consultation announced.

REASON

To meet the Council's statutory requirement to approve the budget and the prudential indicators before the start of a new financial year.

(b) **Council Tax 2016/17**

It was moved and seconded that the Council Tax resolution for 2016/17 be approved.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, the voting in respect of the motion was recorded and was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Councillors: John Bailey, Andrew Baldwin, John Blackall, Toni Bradnum, Karen Burgess, Peter Burgess, John Chidlow, Jonathan Chowen, Philip Circus, Paul Clarke, David Coldwell, Brian Donnelly, Matthew French, Nigel Jupp, Liz Kitchen, Adrian Lee, Gordon Lindsay, Tim Lloyd, Paul Marshall, Christian Mitchell, Josh Murphy, Brian O'Connell, Stuart Ritchie, Kate Rowbottom, Jim Sanson, Simon Torn, Michael Willett, Tricia Youtan

ABSTAINED: Councillors: Leonard Crosbie, Mike Morgan, Godfrey Newman, David Skipp,

ABSENT: Councillors: Alan Britten, Roger Clarke, Roy Cornell, Christine Costin, Jonathan Dancer, Ray Dawe, Tony Hogben, Ian Howard, David Jenkins, Connor Relleen, Ben Staines, Claire Vickers

CO/80 Budget for 2016/17 and Council Tax (cont.)
 (b) Council Tax 2016/17 (cont.)

The motion was declared **CARRIED** and it was **RESOLVED**:

1. The Council Tax Base 2016/17 be noted:
 - a. for the whole Council area as 58,207.9 (Item T in the formula in section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the “Act”)) and
 - b. for dwellings in those parts of its area to which as Parish Precept or Special Expenses relates as shown below:

Parish	2016/17 tax base
Amberley	313.6
Ashington	1,119.6
Ashurst	147.0
Billingshurst	3,664.4
Bramber	411.1
Broadbridge Heath	1,819.0
Coldwaltham	462.5
Colgate	796.0
Cowfold	812.0
Henfield	2,417.8
Itchingfield	696.9
Lower Beeding	531.7
North Horsham	8,421.4
Nuthurst	1,022.8
Parham	120.5
Pulborough	2,466.9
Rudgwick	1,326.6
Rusper	779.6
Shermanbury	284.4
Shipley	607.8
Slinfold	847.1
Southwater	4,200.0
Steyning	2,559.2
Storrington & Sullington	3,170.9
Thakeham	854.4
Upper Beeding	1,428.2
Warnham	959.2
Washington	1,037.2
West Chiltington	2,183.1
West Grinstead	1,313.0
Wiston	97.1
Woodmancote	271.3
Horsham Town	11065.6
Total	58,207.9

CO/80 Budget for 2016/17 and Council Tax (cont.)
(b) Council Tax 2016/17 (cont.)

2. That the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2016/17 (excluding Special Expenses and Parish precepts) is £137.17.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) £87,052,606.00 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
 - (b) £76,133,902.00 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
 - (c) £10,918,704.00 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
 - (d) £187.58 being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
 - (e) £2,934,256.00 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act
 - (f) £137.17 being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.

CO/80 Budget for 2016/17 and Council Tax (cont.)
(b) Council Tax 2016/17 (cont.)

(g)				
Parish	Precept Amount £	Council Tax at Band D		
		Parish Precept/ Special charge for Unparished Area £	Basic Amount of District Council Tax £	Total £
Amberley	17,935.00	57.19	137.17	194.36
Ashington	92,737.00	82.83	137.17	220.00
Ashurst	10,989.00	74.78	137.17	211.95
Billingshurst	280,790.00	76.63	137.17	213.80
Bramber	20,876.00	50.78	137.17	187.95
Broadbridge Heath	87,985.00	48.37	137.17	185.54
Coldwaltham	13,988.00	30.25	137.17	167.42
Colgate	12,400.00	15.58	137.17	152.75
Cowfold	37,288.64	45.92	137.17	183.09
Henfield	175,050.00	72.40	137.17	209.57
Itchingfield	54,477.00	78.17	137.17	215.34
Lower Beeding	12,307.00	23.15	137.17	160.32
North Horsham	282,726.00	33.57	137.17	170.74
Nuthurst	33,245.00	32.50	137.17	169.67
Parham	3,860.00	32.04	137.17	169.21
Pulborough	180,010.00	72.97	137.17	210.14
Rudgwick	62,848.00	47.37	137.17	184.54
Rusper	25,100.00	32.20	137.17	169.37
Shermanbury	16,500.00	58.01	137.17	195.18
Shipley	25,694.66	42.27	137.17	179.44
Slinfold	49,760.00	58.74	137.17	195.91
Southwater	324,468.00	77.25	137.17	214.42
Steyning	238,793.86	93.31	137.17	230.48
Storrington & Sullington	164,000.00	51.72	137.17	188.89
Thakeham	37,615.00	44.03	137.17	181.20
Upper Beeding	125,000.00	87.53	137.17	224.70
Warnham	58,139.38	60.61	137.17	197.78
Washington	37,930.40	36.57	137.17	173.74
West Chiltington	110,526.00	50.63	137.17	187.80
West Grinstead	64,227.00	48.92	137.17	186.09
Wiston	4,128.00	42.52	137.17	179.69
Woodmancote	8,100.00	29.86	137.17	167.03
Horsham Town - Special charge	264,762.00	23.93	137.17	161.10

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at (f) above the amounts of the special items relating to the dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

CO/80 Budget for 2016/17 and Council Tax (cont.)
 (b) Council Tax 2016/17 (cont.)

4. To note that the County Council have proposed precepts and the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner has notified precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.

Band Authority	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
West Sussex County Council	805.26	939.47	1,073.68	1,207.89	1,476.31	1,744.73	2,013.15	2,415.78

Band Authority	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner	99.27	115.82	132.36	148.91	182.00	215.09	248.18	297.82

The Horsham District Figures are shown below:-

Band Authority	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Horsham District Council	91.45	106.69	121.93	137.17	167.65	198.13	228.62	274.34

5. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3 and 4 above the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2016/17 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings:

CO/80 Budget for 2016/17 and Council Tax (cont.)
(b) Council Tax 2016/17 (cont.)

BAND	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Amberley	1,034.11	1,206.46	1,378.81	1,551.16	1,895.86	2,240.56	2,585.27	3,102.33
Ashington	1,051.20	1,226.40	1,401.59	1,576.80	1,927.19	2,277.59	2,628.00	3,153.60
Ashurst	1,045.83	1,220.14	1,394.44	1,568.75	1,917.36	2,265.96	2,614.58	3,137.50
Billingshurst	1,047.06	1,221.58	1,396.08	1,570.60	1,919.61	2,268.63	2,617.66	3,141.19
Bramber	1,029.83	1,201.48	1,373.11	1,544.75	1,888.03	2,231.30	2,574.58	3,089.50
Broadbridge Heath	1,028.23	1,199.60	1,370.96	1,542.34	1,885.08	2,227.82	2,570.56	3,084.68
Coldwaltham	1,016.14	1,185.51	1,354.86	1,524.22	1,862.93	2,201.64	2,540.36	3,048.43
Colgate	1,006.37	1,174.10	1,341.82	1,509.55	1,845.00	2,180.45	2,515.91	3,019.10
Cowfold	1,026.59	1,197.70	1,368.79	1,539.89	1,882.08	2,224.28	2,566.48	3,079.78
Henfield	1,044.25	1,218.29	1,392.33	1,566.37	1,914.45	2,262.53	2,610.62	3,132.74
Itchingfield	1,048.10	1,222.78	1,397.46	1,572.14	1,921.51	2,270.87	2,620.24	3,144.29
Lower Beeding	1,011.41	1,179.98	1,348.54	1,517.12	1,854.25	2,191.38	2,528.53	3,034.23
North Horsham	1,018.36	1,188.09	1,357.81	1,527.54	1,866.99	2,206.44	2,545.90	3,055.08
Nuthurst	1,017.65	1,187.26	1,356.86	1,526.47	1,865.69	2,204.90	2,544.12	3,052.95
Parham	1,017.34	1,186.90	1,356.45	1,526.01	1,865.12	2,204.22	2,543.34	3,052.01
Pulborough	1,044.63	1,218.73	1,392.83	1,566.94	1,915.14	2,263.35	2,611.56	3,133.88
Rudgwick	1,027.56	1,198.83	1,370.08	1,541.34	1,883.86	2,226.38	2,568.91	3,082.69
Rusper	1,017.44	1,187.02	1,356.59	1,526.17	1,865.31	2,204.46	2,543.61	3,052.33
Shermanbury	1,034.65	1,207.10	1,379.53	1,551.98	1,896.86	2,241.74	2,586.63	3,103.96
Shipley	1,024.16	1,194.86	1,365.55	1,536.24	1,877.63	2,219.01	2,560.41	3,072.49
Slinfold	1,035.14	1,207.67	1,380.18	1,552.71	1,897.75	2,242.79	2,587.85	3,105.42
Southwater	1,047.48	1,222.07	1,396.64	1,571.22	1,920.38	2,269.54	2,618.71	3,142.45
Steyning	1,058.19	1,234.55	1,410.91	1,587.28	1,940.00	2,292.73	2,645.47	3,174.56
Storrington & Sullington	1,030.46	1,202.21	1,373.94	1,545.69	1,889.17	2,232.66	2,576.15	3,091.38
Thakeham	1,025.33	1,196.22	1,367.10	1,538.00	1,879.77	2,221.54	2,563.33	3,075.99
Upper Beeding	1,054.33	1,230.06	1,405.77	1,581.50	1,932.94	2,284.38	2,635.83	3,162.99
Warnham	1,036.39	1,209.12	1,381.85	1,554.58	1,900.04	2,245.50	2,590.97	3,109.16
Washington	1,020.36	1,190.42	1,360.48	1,530.54	1,870.66	2,210.77	2,550.90	3,061.08
West Chiltington	1,029.73	1,201.36	1,372.97	1,544.60	1,887.84	2,231.08	2,574.33	3,089.20
West Grinstead	1,028.59	1,200.03	1,371.45	1,542.89	1,885.75	2,228.61	2,571.48	3,085.77
Wiston	1,024.33	1,195.05	1,365.76	1,536.49	1,877.93	2,219.37	2,560.82	3,072.98
Woodmancote	1,015.89	1,185.20	1,354.51	1,523.83	1,862.45	2,201.08	2,539.71	3,047.66
Horsham Town - Special charge	1,011.93	1,180.59	1,349.24	1,517.90	1,855.20	2,192.51	2,529.83	3,035.79

CO/80 Budget for 2016/17 and Council Tax (cont.)
(b) Council Tax 2016/17 (cont.)

6. To note that the Council 's basic amount of Council Tax for 2016/17 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992.

Horsham District Council Tax Band D

2015/16	2016/17	Council Tax increase
40.03	£141.71	1.20%

As the billing Authority the Council has not been notified by a major precepting authority that its relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2016/17 is excessive and that the billing authority is not required to hold a referendum in accordance with Section 522K Local Government Act 1992.

7. To note that from 1 April 2016, changes to the Council Tax discount policies will affect empty properties in classes C and D, relating to unfurnished and vacant property and for uninhabitable property and the current discounts will be removed. This was previously approved at the Council meeting on 9th December 2015.

REASON

To meet the Council's statutory requirement to set a Council Tax.

CO/81 **NOTICE OF MOTION**

Further to the Deputy Leader's statement at Minute No. CO/75 above, Councillor Andrew Baldwin withdrew his notice of motion.

CO/82 **MINUTES OF COMMITTEES**

The following minutes were received:

CenSus Joint Committee – 11th December 2015

Accounts, Audit and Governance Committee – 6th January 2016

Councillor Godfrey Newman, the Chairman of the Committee, moved the recommendations contained in Minute No. AAG/37.

Treasury Management Strategy 2016/17

RESOLVED

- (i) That the Treasury Management Strategy for 2016/17 be approved.
- (ii) That the Treasury Management Indicators for 2016/17 be approved.

REASONS

- (i) The Council has adopted the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice 2011 Edition which requires the Council to approve a treasury management strategy before the start of each financial year.
- (ii) The Department for Communities and Local Government issued revised guidance on local authority investments in March 2010 that requires the Council to approve an investment strategy before the start of each financial year.

CO/83 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SCRUTINY & OVERVIEW COMMITTEE OF 11TH JANUARY 2016**

The minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny & Overview Committee held on 11th January 2016 were presented by Councillor Leonard Crosbie, Chairman of the Committee.

CO/84 **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE CONSULTATION**

Three members of the public addressed the Council in respect of this item expressing concern regarding the proposed zero CIL charge for the north of Horsham Strategic Development Area and questioning why the full CIL Levy Viability Update Assessment (February 2016) had not been included with the agenda papers.

The Cabinet Member for Local Economy presented this report on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development. He advised Members of a number of typographical changes to the report:

CO/84 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule Consultation (cont.)

- Recommendation (iii) to be amended to read “That the *Cabinet Member for Planning and Development* has delegated authority to agree minor editorial changes.”
- The Billingshurst section of the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule under Community Facilities - Dedicated Youth facility – Eye Project: the delivery group to be amended to the *Billingshurst Community Partnership*.
- The Horsham Town section of the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule under Transport - New Railway Station: the cost of £13.6m to be moved to the ‘*Funding Source Other*’ column.

He also noted that, for clarity, the Draft Regulation 123 List at Annex 1 would be amended by the addition of specific named infrastructure items in the exclusion column of the table, to include items required by policy such as roads, schools and community facilities on site.

The Cabinet Member for Local Economy reported that, following the adoption of the Horsham District Planning Framework in November 2015, the Council was now developing its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL was a new charge on development that had come into force through the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations in 2010 and was intended to fund a range of infrastructure that was needed as a result of development and would operate alongside Section 106 agreements. He reported that, in this respect, the land north of Horsham would be zero rated for CIL as the package of infrastructure would be the subject of a legal agreement, which would be a requirement of planning permission.

The report set out the steps which the Council would need to take towards the adoption of the CIL charge.

Members were asked to approve the Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule for a six week public consultation and submission to the CIL Examiner for independent examination. A further Member seminar would be arranged during the consultation period.

The Cabinet Member for Local Economy confirmed that the full CIL Levy Viability Update Assessment (February 2016) would be available on the website as part of the public consultation and a hard copy was available for Members and members of the public to view.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule and supporting documents be approved for consultation purposes.

CO/84 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule Consultation (cont.)

- (ii) That the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development be authorised to approve the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule for submission to examination, if there was no change proposed to the rates following consultation.
- (iii) That the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development be authorised to agree minor editorial changes.

REASON

The Draft Charging Schedule is the next stage in preparing the Community Infrastructure Levy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out what infrastructure is required to support new growth and how developer contributions from the CIL are likely to be spent.

CO/85 **BILLINGSHURST VILLAGE CENTRE – SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (CONSULTATION)**

The Cabinet Member for Local Economy presented this report on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development.

In order to plan for growth in Billingshurst and to ensure that the village centre was improved so that it could play a role as the social and economic focus for the area a Supplementary Planning Document had been produced based on previous research and stakeholder consultation.

The Supplementary Planning Document identified key issues and priorities for the improvement of the village centre and included a delivery plan which indicated how and when projects would be delivered pending further cost information. Other schemes that came forward for consideration would be considered and prioritised as part of a comprehensive approach to regenerating the village centre within available funding sources.

The Supplementary Planning Document was therefore submitted for approval for consultation purposes. A further report would be submitted following the expiry of the consultation period and consideration of comments received.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the Billingshurst Village Centre Supplementary Planning Document be approved for consultation purposes.
- (ii) That the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development be authorised to agree minor editorial changes.

REASON

Through research and consultation with stakeholders issue and options to enhance Billingshurst Village centre have been identified. This work has been included and will be implemented through a Supplementary Planning Document.

CO/86 **SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE FOR PROPOSED PURCHASE OF AMBULANCE STATION, HURST ROAD, HORSHAM**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets reported that the land at Hurst Road between Horsham Hospital and the Pavilions Leisure Centre had been identified as an area with potential for regeneration, as the public sector buildings in this location were old and, in many instances, expected to become surplus to occupier requirements.

The Ambulance Station, owned by South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECamb), was now surplus to SECamb's operational requirement and had been marketed for sale as a site for residential development. This parcel was an important holding if a site assembly operation was to be successful and therefore terms had been agreed to purchase the property, subject to Member approval. If the Council did not purchase this site, the opportunity to facilitate a comprehensive redevelopment of the Hurst Road site would be compromised or lost.

The proposed purchase would need to be funded from reserves and therefore it was necessary for Council to agree a supplementary estimate to the budget for the transaction to proceed.

RESOLVED

That a supplementary estimate to the budget in the sum identified be approved to enable the proposed transaction to proceed.

CO/86 Supplementary Estimate for Proposed Purchase of Ambulance Station,
Hurst Road, Horsham (cont.)

REASON

For the proposed purchase to take place it is necessary to fund the purchase from Council reserves

CO/87 **CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL 2016/17**

RESOLVED

That, subject to formal election at the annual meeting, it be noted that Councillor Christian Mitchell will be Chairman and Councillor Roger Clarke will be Vice-Chairman for the municipal year 2016/17.

CO/88 **URGENT MATTERS**

There were no urgent matters to be considered.

The meeting closed at 8.05pm having commenced at 6.00pm.

CHAIRMAN