

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of Chanctonbury County Local Committee

Chanctonbury County Local Committee

30 September 2015 – At a meeting of the Committee held at 7.15pm at Henfield Hall, Coopers Way, Henfield, BN5 9DB

Present: Mrs Arculus (Pulborough), Mr Barling (Bramber Castle), Mr Barnard (Henfield) and Mr Circus (Chairman and Storrington).

Welcome and Introductions

23. The Chairman welcomed all attending to the meeting and invited members to introduce themselves.

Declaration of Interest

24. None were declared.

Minutes

25. Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting of the Chanctonbury County Local Committee (CLC) held on 8 July 2015 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the elected Chairman.

Urgent Matters

26. There were no urgent matters.

Progress Statement

27. The Committee noted the progress statement, and made the following comments regarding individual entries:

- **Tesla Site S106 Contributions**– the Member for Pulborough queried whether the monies would remain available if the roundabout could not proceed and requested clarification on the time-limit for spending the funds and what type of schemes it could be used for. – *The Principal Community Officer responded that the money was held by Horsham District Council and could be spent on local schemes in line with the S106 purpose. She added that any potential funds from the County Council would be tied to the current Capital Programme review.*

28. Resolved – that the progress report be noted.

Community Infrastructure Levy/Developer Contributions

29. The Member for Henfield introduced the item, which was intended to act as a forum for local parish representatives to raise issues and queries relating to the forthcoming changes to developer contributions, including the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). He added that although not all questions could be

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of Chanctonbury County Local Committee

answered at the meeting, there would be a further agenda item at the Committee's 2 December meeting to address any outstanding issues.

30. The Chairman informed members that a representative from Horsham District Council (HDC) was unable to attend owing to illness; however a CIL lead officer was currently being recruited, and would be attending the Committee's 2 December meeting.

31. Members raised a number of points, including those that follow. They:

- Expressed concern that Parish Councils did not have adequate information regarding timescales for the expenditure of local S106 funds or clarity as to what funding could be used for. The Member for Henfield stated he had contacted the County Council's Chief Operating Officer regarding parish anxieties on this issue, and was awaiting a response from the Director of Highways. He emphasised the importance of parish councils being enabled to spend money, on appropriate schemes. The Member for Bramber Castle and Cabinet Member for Residents' Services stated that this was a high priority for the Council and work was underway looking at the current funds available and timescales. He also noted that the process going forward was being reviewed as part of the capital programme review and the impact of CIL is part of that.
- Stated that communication with parishes will be important to make sure we have a joined up approach, we need to better understand what schemes have funding and are progressing. - *The Principal Community Officer responded that as part of the capital programme review the Traffic Regulation Order Task and Finish Group would meet on 9 October and will be looking at the process going forward for a report for members would follow that meeting. Once this had been confirmed it would be possible to contact local parish councils and give them more clarity.*
- Stated that CIL was formulated on a flat-rate tariff, per square-metre of residential development and would apply to any residential development of any size. HDC was responsible for setting the formula and also for levying and collecting funds; as yet HDC had not determined its formula. For developments occurring within a parish boundary, the parish council would receive 25% of the funding if they had an adopted Parish Plan, or 15% if not. The remaining 75%/85% would go to the district and county councils.
- Emphasised that with the split ownership of CIL, all levels of local government would need to work in partnership in order to ensure that strategic works, which would benefit local communities, could be funded
- Confirmed that S106 would continue to operate alongside CIL, in order to meet specific additional infrastructure demands related to development such as roads and roundabouts.
- Stated that CIL would not be levied in the district until the District Council's Neighbourhood Plan was adopted, and that until then, S106 would continue, as current. The Chairman, in his capacity as a district councillor, confirmed that HDC was hopeful its plan would be signed off at its 19 November meeting, although this would depend on the Inspectorate and that process was taking longer than anticipated. Members noted that only one of the seven District and Borough Councils in West Sussex had so far had its plan

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of Chanctonbury County Local Committee

adopted and expressed concern that speculative development in the interim could therefore avoid paying the CIF levy.

32. Members of the audience raised a number of issues, including those that follow:

- A Pulborough Parish Council representative queried whether the £30k S106 funding held by the parish council for recycling/public art projects could be reallocated to dealing with potholes – *The Member for Henfield responded that S106 was a legal agreement and the purpose could not be changed. Also, S106 funding could not be used for maintenance. He added that under CIL, funds could be used in this way but only where new development exacerbates existing issues.*
- A representative of Shermanbury Parish Council expressed concern that parish councils might be unable to progress with local priorities, such as tackling flooding, if the County or District had different priorities for funding. – *The member for Bramber Castle responded that the purpose of the funding split was to ensure collaboration between levels of local government. He added that County would consider schemes presented by Parish Councils and the prioritisation of its portion of the funding. He confirmed that parish councils would retain control of their portion of funds.* The Principal Community Officer added that CIL would be collated by the HDC, but funding would be passed to Parishes. HDC were currently confirming governance arrangements.
- The Pulborough Parish Council representative queried whether developers would be allowed to undertake works which had been locally prioritised through CIL, whilst they were completing the development. – *The Principal Community Officer stated that whilst there was nothing to prevent working with developers, this could not be as an 'in kind' payment in lieu of CIL, which would still need to be levied.*
- Queried at what stage of development CIL was levied – *The Member for Bramber Castle responded that in general, CIL would be levied up front, however this could be phased at different points, depending on the individual development.*
- Queried the factors involved in formulating the tariff and the likely level in Horsham - *The Chairman responded that this would be determined by HDC, and would be based on housing and infrastructure requirements. As yet, the process for determining the level had not been confirmed. The Principal Community Officer recommended the Planning Advisory Service's website pages on CIL (<http://www.pas.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy>) as these provided case-studies of other authorities' approaches. She added that there were considerable differences in approach and it was therefore difficult to generalise regarding formula setting.*
- A parish councillor expressed concern regarding the district council's consultation on the 123 schedule as the Parish Council did not hold the technical knowledge to respond to questions regarding the prioritisation of complex issues such as sewage and waste works. – *The Chairman, responding in his capacity as a district councillor, stated that this was an attempt for parish councils to focus on their own needs, and was not intended to be exhaustive. He added that this would be discussed further at*

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of Chanctonbury County Local Committee

the Committee's 2 December meeting, when the HDC officer would be in attendance.

- Queried when the detailed list of S106 funding held by area and including earmarked purpose and timescale for allocation would be available. – *The Principal Community Officer confirmed this would be made available to parish councils as soon as possible, and before the Committee's 2 December meeting. Issues relating to the list could be discussed at that meeting.*

Talk with Us Open Forum

33. The Chairman informed members that Cali Sparks would no longer be supporting the Committee as Principal Community Officer owing to a promotion. Members thanked Cali for her excellent work with communities in the CLC area and welcomed Dean Wadey to the Committee, as the newly appointed Principal Community Officer for the Horsham District.

34. There were no questions from members of the public in attendance.

Chanctonbury Community Initiative Funding (CIF)

a) Feedback from Previous Award Holders

35. Member received feedback from previous recipients of CIF funding on how the funding had helped them achieve their objectives. Feedback was received from:

Shermanbury Parish Council £259.64 towards the 'Beating of the Bounds' event – The event had helped foster community cohesion and involved many local people and organisations. Following this success the event would be held on a biennial basis, on Rogation Sunday.

Ashurst Village Hall £1,200 towards refurbishment of the hall. The further support from the CLC had enabled the project to incorporate extra features, which would otherwise not have been possible. The representative also thanked the County Council for its generous support through the Big Society Fund and confirmed that in total, over £400k had been raised over the course of the project.

Henfield Community Partnership, £1,000 towards graphic design work and promotional materials. The grant had enabled the community-owned day centre to raise awareness of its services locally, including an additional day service for those with lesser needs. He confirmed that the centre would be able to accept those paying for the service, in addition to individuals being funded by the County Council and that this would be available to those living within a 5-10 mile catchment area.

Members thanked the local member (Henfield) for his efforts in securing the Community Asset Transfer (CAT) of the day centre, for the local community.

b) Current Applications

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of Chanctonbury County Local Committee

36. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Law, Assurance and Strategy (copy appended to signed minutes), which sought decisions on the applications received under the CIF scheme.

37. Members considered the applications as listed in Appendix A of the report and the following comments were noted;

38. Resolved that –

a) The following awards were made:

765/C, St Andrews Pre-School, £500, to provide fencing for the play area

770/C, Rotary Club of Storrington, £624, to hire Lodge Hill facility for two days. The funding cannot be used for any retrospective dates.

775/C, Pulborough FC, £2,500, to purchase portable floodlights.

b) The following applications were deferred:

769/C, Age UK Horsham District, £2,500, for the purchase of two tablets, volunteer training and publicity materials. Members requested additional information regarding ongoing access to computer equipment and longer-term outcomes for project participants.

771/C, Steyning Arts, £2,000, display equipment, lighting and banners, as the committee were unable to prioritise the applications given the pressures remaining on available funding. It was agreed to reconsider the application at the last meeting of the municipal year.

Date of Next Meeting

38. The Committee noted that its next scheduled meeting would take place at the Steyning Centre, Fletcher's Croft, Steyning at 7.00 p.m. on Wednesday 2 December 2015.

The meeting ended at 8.55 p.m.

Chairman