

**Minutes of a meeting of Council  
held on Wednesday, 29th June, 2022  
from 7.00 pm - 9.57 pm**

**Present:** M Belsey (Chairman)  
P Coote (Vice-Chair)

J Ash-Edwards	S Ellis	Anthea Lea
R Bates	R Eggleston	J Llewellyn-Burke
J Belsey	A Eves	G Marsh
A Bennett	B Forbes	C Phillips
L Bennett	L Gibbs	M Pulfer
P Bradbury	I Gibson	R Salisbury
P Brown	S Hatton	A Sparasci
R Cartwright	J Henwood	L Stockwell
P Chapman	S Hicks	D Sweatman
R Clarke	S Hillier	C Trumble
M Cornish	T Hussain	N Walker
J Dabell	R Jackson	N Webster
R de Mierre	J Knight	R Whittaker
B Dempsey	C Laband	

**Absent:** Councillors G Allen, A Boutrup, H Brunsdon, E Coe-Gunnell White, R Cromie, J Edwards, Andrew Lea, J Mockford, A Peacock, S Smith and R Webb

**1. OPENING PRAYER.**

The opening prayer was read by the Vice-Chairman.

**2. TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.**

**The following question was received from Mr Batte**

At the recent Stop Cuckstye meeting Jonathan Ash Edwards said, "we need to ensure we are taking account of the Government's changes to the planning system" and cited environmental concerns as a reason for "pausing" the District Plan Review. Please explain why these environmental concerns and the changes to the planning system don't apply to SA12 & SA13 and the DPD?

**The following response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Planning:**

The District Plan review and the Sites Allocation DPD are at different stages in the plan making process. Plan making is lengthy and complex. All DPDs must go through two rounds of public consultation and an Examination in Public. The Site Allocation DPD is at the most advanced stage in plan making terms. It has been through two rounds of public consultation and a public examination. The independent planning

Inspector has found it sound and legally compliant with legislation. Proposed future changes to the planning system are not yet law, the Sites DPD is therefore unaffected by them.

In examining the Plan, the Inspector reviewed detailed evidence put forward by all parties, including ecological reports and assessments, and concluded that the sites were sound and capable of adoption. Policies SA12 and SA13 include specific requirements regarding Green Infrastructure, conserving and enhancing wildlife value and ensuring a net gain to biodiversity. These will all need to be satisfied at the planning application stage.

It is now up to the Council to either adopt the Sites DPD or not. In comparison the District Plan review is at a very early stage. All the evidence is still being gathered and no decisions have been made. It has not yet been through the first round of public consultation.

**The following question was received from Ms Green**

If you as you said in January & again this month, you need to "pause" the District Plan Review - an agreed part of the District Plan process - why can't you pause (not stop altogether) the Site Allocations DPD until the new planning legislation comes in? This would not only benefit the people of Burgess Hill who want to save Sites SA12 & SA13, but residents of all the towns and villages in the district negatively affected by this DPD. Why will you not take this step, when the changes in law are coming soon?

**The following response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Planning:**

Thank you for your question which provides me with an opportunity to clarify the situation.

Plan making is a very complex area and in fact it never stops. When the Council adopted the District Plan in March 2018 the Inspector stipulated that the Council must also adopt a Site Allocations DPD to account for the additional housing he had imposed. The Inspector confirmed that the approach to be taken by the Council, to bring forward a Sites DPD at an early date, was sound.

Separate to this, the Council is also required to review the District Plan every 5 years. This review started in 2021 and the draft was presented to the Scrutiny Committee for Housing and Planning in January this year.

The Committee resolved to delay their consideration of the Plan to enable officers to do more work. This work continues and, once it is completed, as resolved by the Scrutiny Committee, a cross party working group will consider the sites and any proposed changes to the policies. This work will then be scrutinised by the Scrutiny Committee.

The Site Allocations DPD is a 'sister document' to our current District Plan and is at a different stage to the District Plan Review. As outlined in paragraph 36 of the report, under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) the Council can only make a binary choice to either adopt the DPD or not adopt it. Whilst the 5-year housing land supply has been confirmed by an independent Inspector, this assumes the DPD is adopted and the sites in it including Sites SA12 and SA13 will be delivered. Failure to adopt the DPD will place the Council at significant risk of not having a five-year housing land supply leaving the district vulnerable to speculative development, such speculative development is very likely to include sites SA12 and SA13. This is

because now the Sites DPD has been found sound, developers will argue that it is a material consideration in the determination of applications irrespective of whether the Council adopts it or not. Should a planning application be submitted on any of the sites, officers will have to take the Inspector's Report into account in any decision.

It is important to note that during the 7-year period prior to the adoption of the current District Plan, when the Council did not have an up-to-date Plan and was not able to demonstrate a 5-year supply of land for housing, c.3,000 dwellings on greenfield sites were approved. With respect to the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill the Government has stated it will not be enacted until 2024. In the meantime, the Council must operate within the context of existing legislation.

Finally, I should stress that the Government is clear that Plan making must continue. In his Written Ministerial Statement in January 2021, Chris Pincher (the Minister of State for Housing) stated that "Authorities should not use this period [during the reform of the planning system] as a reason to delay plan-making activities. Authorities who have an up-to-date plan in place will be in the best possible position to adapt to the new plan-making system."

Ms Green asked the following supplementary question:

By the time developers can challenge your five-year land supply the changes to planning law and housing targets will either have been changed or well in hand and will carry weight in any legal defence so why aren't you prepared to take a stand at these sites and defend them from developers at this stage? Also regarding 'Stop Cuck-Stye', Councillor Ash-Edwards said we need to make sure we are taking into account of the Government's changes to the planning system and cited environmental concerns as the main reason for pausing the District Plan review, but you refuse to explain why these environmental concerns and changes to the planning system do not apply to SA12 and SA13. Even Mimms Davis has written to the Secretary of State today to 'urge [him] to urgently relook at the inclusion of these sites.' This would give you a better supported District Plan reflecting the hard work you have done on it. We are not suggesting you throw it out, we suggest you pause it while these sites are looked at again and while change to the planning legislation comes in – so please can you answer that.

It was agreed that a response from the Cabinet Member for Planning will be provided in writing.

#### **The following question was received from Ms Parlett**

Objective 8 of your Sustainable Economy Strategy is to "improve, manage and promote biodiversity and nature recovery" and new planning legislation requires a biodiversity net gain of 10%. How does concreting over a rewilded, biodiverse rich ecosystem, such as SA13, fit in with your strategy, and how can 10% net gain ever be achieved by replacing it with a housing estate of 300 dwellings?

#### **The following response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Planning:**

Thank you for this question. It is important to note that statutory biodiversity net gain (BNG) requirements do not come into effect until 2023. However, given the Council's commitment to the environment we wanted to ensure BNG was a requirement of all sites coming forward.

I do not agree that Site SA13 will be 'concreted over' as you suggest in your question. The Policy framework for this site is clear that the development should be "informed by a landscape led masterplan, which responds to the setting of the South Downs National Park". The Policy also sets out comprehensive site requirements regarding biodiversity and green infrastructure, including the need to provide a Habitat Management Plan which must set out how the proposals will conserve and enhance all areas of Habitat of Principle Importance (i.e. woodland, hedgerows and standing water).

The independent Planning Inspector, noted that the Ecological Delivery Report, submitted in support of this allocation, confirms that "there are no over-riding ecological constraints to development of the site, and that the proposal could deliver biodiversity net gain overall." The Inspector concluded that any ecological impact on the site 'can be mitigated to an acceptable level' and therefore found the allocation to be sound.

The assessment of any future planning application on this site will have to consider how the detailed proposals submitted accord with the biodiversity requirements of the Environment Act, the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) and Policy SA13. All of these sites must go through a rigorous planning application process.

Ms Parlett asked the following supplementary question:

Noting that it is brilliant that you have so much hope in the system as developers seem to get round it. When looking at some ecologist's that come to the site – on their websites they quote that they 'can help you get your planning through' so we find they are biased. We know a screening application has been put through on the site, so they do not have to do a proper environmental study as well. You say they will not concrete over and they will go through correct procedure – how will you manage and monitor that. Persimmon have told us in writing that they plan to clear the site in Autumn. They do that to destroy all the biodiversity there so when it comes to putting a planning application in, they will achieve their 10% net gain as they will already have destroyed it. We know they have been on site. We are asking you to pause this tonight to stop this precious site from being destroyed in the autumn as if you vote to agree this tonight there is nothing to stop them in the autumn as it is their own site.

It was agreed that a response from the Cabinet Member for Planning will be provided in writing.

#### **The following question was received from Ms Corbett**

You want to build 300 homes on SA13 but there are already thousands of homes there. Homes to polecats, badgers, snakes & threatened birds like nightingales, what will happen to them? I am very confused as you and the government tell us you are protecting green spaces, but this is a very special one that you are not protecting at all? Why? It really worries me and makes me depressed about my future.

#### **The following response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Planning:**

Thank you, Ms Corbett, for your question. I am sorry you are concerned and will try and reassure you.

The Council, in delivering the government's objectives, has a very difficult job to do: we must ensure that there are enough homes for people to live in whilst seeking to protect important natural habitats. Site SA13 is not protected in the same way as a

site that is nationally recognised for protection such as Ancient Woodland or a Site of Special Scientific Interest or the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. However, even in areas which do not have a 'national' protection, the government still wants to ensure that there is a net gain in biodiversity.

Site SA13 is big enough to ensure that areas of existing wildlife value can be protected as well as providing opportunities for biodiversity improvements, whilst still delivering the new homes. The Council's policy requires developers to demonstrate how they will achieve this, and this can be secured as part of any planning permission. The Council wants to ensure that not only are there enough homes to meet local needs for future generations but that we also protect and enhance biodiversity.

Ms Corbett's supplementary question (put by parent, Mr Corbett) noted that anyone who has visited the site will know that a net gain in biodiversity is a fantastically unachievable and urged Members to pause and visit the site as it is teeming with wildlife. To think you can go in there and build for 3 or 4 years and not interrupt the wildlife is naive – how are you going to do that? Also, as there is talk about how the Council holds developers to account, can we see published evidence where the Council has some and metrics on how you measure and enforce that?

It was agreed that a response from the Cabinet Member for Planning will be provided in writing.

**The following question was received from Mr Inman**

Developers are required to deliver a 10% biodiversity net gain for new developments. Can MSDC and the developers Persimmon and Thakeham give a definitive, 100% cast iron guarantee that building on sites SA12 and SA13 will result in an increase in species?

**The following response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Planning:**

It is important to remember that site allocations and plan making, and the determination of planning applications are two very separate processes. The Planning Inspector was satisfied that any ecological impact on the site 'can be mitigated to an acceptable level' and therefore he found the allocation of the site to be sound.

When considering a planning application for Site SA13 the Council, will require the applicant to submit evidence to demonstrate how the Policy requirements set out in Policy SA13 regarding biodiversity and green infrastructure will be met. Finally, it is important to remember that biodiversity net gain can, by law, be delivered on-site, off-site or a combination of the two.

Mr Inman noted that there has been no ecological survey before the site was selected and gave assurance that if development SA12 and SA13 go ahead, many birds, animals and plant life will go (citing an extensive list of species). He asked if the development does go ahead, will the Council prove that there has been an increase in diversity.

It was agreed that a response from the Cabinet Member for Planning will be provided in writing.

**The following question was received from Mr Brooks**

Regarding the Sustainable Economy Strategy, is the Ricardo Action Plan complete yet? If so when will the report be made available? If not, then when is it expected to be finished and have any extra costs been incurred above the initial £47,000 cost?

**The following response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Economic Growth and Net Zero**

The Action Plan is not yet complete. The first phase of this work is with the consultant and is almost complete which is to baseline our current emissions. That report is imminent, and the next stage is to bring it to Council where we will look at an action plan to achieve Net Zero. We hope to set the target towards the end of this year and once the target is set then an action plan will be in place to achieve it.

To date the Council has expended £47k on this work plus a further £4k to extend the contract. The extension was to take account of covid related delays.

Mr Brooks asked that once Ricardo has finished the action plan, will that be made public, and can we expect it soon?

Councillor Hillier confirmed that the Council will be setting the target towards the end of this year and following that there will be the action plan. Everything will be in the public domain. All Councillors will have a chance to see it and comment on it and it will go through the scrutiny process. It will certainly be in the public domain.

**The following question was received from Councillor Moore (Tandridge District Council)**

Has the Council fully considered the effect of the MSDC Site Allocation Plan on local residents living on the Imberhorne estate and Felbridge Village?

Local infrastructure is considered overstretched in capacity, namely the Star junction, A22, A264 and M25. Small village roads were not built to take traffic from large housing estates.

Felbridge rural village is being destroyed by urban sprawl with houses being built right up to the boundary.

Gulledge has two herds of deer and much wildlife with awe-inspiring scenery which I have enjoyed over 38 years and wish the next generation to be able to experience.

**The following response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Planning:**

As a District Councillor yourself you will be aware that Councils have a duty to meet the areas housing needs.

This Council was required by the Inspector to bring forward a Site Allocation DPD. As a Councillor you will be aware the plan making process is both democratic and prescribed. This means any allocation of a site must be evidence based. This includes evidence of any impact on infrastructure and the environment. You will also be aware that this evidence is in the public domain.

Specifically, regarding highways infrastructure, the Inspector carefully considered the evidence and has confirmed in his Report that he is satisfied with the Mid Sussex Strategic Transport Model and associated study and that it is fit for purpose.

You will also be aware that the Plan is subject to two rounds of public consultation and an Examination in Public by an independent planning inspector. Following this the Inspector will either find the plan sound or not sound. In the case of the Site Allocation DPD the Inspector has found the Plan sound. This means he is satisfied that the Council has met all the tests.

Councillor Moore asked a supplementary question noting that Felbridge is a conservative minded village and building on precious farmland is an unpopular choice. If Mid Sussex exceeds its house building target, could it not preserve the beautiful Gulledege farmland and its inhabitants for future generations?

It was agreed that a response from the Cabinet Member for Planning will be provided in writing.

**3. TO CONFIRM MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 27 APRIL AND ANNUAL COUNCIL ON 11 MAY 2022.**

The minutes of the meeting of Council held on 27 April and 11 May were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

**4. TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS IN RESPECT OF ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA.**

Councillor Gibson declared a personal interest in item 7 as he is a West Sussex County Councillor for Imberdown Division. Councillors Hillier, Bradbury and Liz Bennett also declared that they are West Sussex County Councillors.

**5. TO CONSIDER ANY ITEMS THAT THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL AGREES TO TAKE AS URGENT BUSINESS.**

None.

**6. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

The Chairman noted that the nomination period for the Mid Sussex Applauds Awards is open and encouraged Members to put forward nominations in order to recognise the hard work of residents within the District. She also highlighted the Chairman's Charity Fundraising Concert taking place on October 20<sup>th</sup> noting that all Members are invited to help support the Kangaroos Disability Clubs charity.

**7. SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT - ADOPTION.**

Councillor Salisbury moved the item noting that at District Plan examination, the Inspector raised the housing numbers significantly and allowed the Council time to incorporate it into the District Plan through the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (Site Allocations DPD). He noted that the document provides greater certainty for the Council's five-year housing land supply and although he acknowledged there are concerns, the Inspector found the sites to be sound, and each will still have to go through the formal planning application process before

proceeding. He highlighted the difference between this document and the District Plan. He also noted that the Site Allocations DPD is a binary decision for Council to agree or reject. If rejected it could result in a worst-case scenario for the Council with no five-year housing land supply and sites being put forward by developers on an ad hoc basis with limited scope for the Council to refuse. This was seconded by Councillor Ash-Edwards.

Councillor Eggleston proposed an amendment to the recommendations due to the sensitivities around sites SA12 and SA13 on ecological, strategic and traffic grounds. The amendment also takes into consideration a letter sent to the Secretary of State from the Member of Parliament for Mid Sussex. This was seconded by Councillor Alison Bennett who highlighted the need for perception that the political and democratic process has been sound in this decision making. At her request, clarification was also provided by the Head of Regulatory Services that if the Council agreed a deferral was possible. He noted that if the document was agreed, the Secretary of State has call-in powers, and it could be open to Judicial Review, but it will have been approved by this Council.

The amendment is as follows:

To delete items 1-3 and replace with 'Defer the adoption of the Site Allocations DPD to allow the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities to reconsider the inclusion of SA12 and SA13 in the plan document as requested by the Member of Parliament for Mid Sussex on 29 June 2022.'

Members discussed the reasons for delaying the adoption of the document, and the potential impacts this may have. A number of Members raised concern over the decisions taken by the cross-party working group in choosing the sites to be included and the lack of opportunity for some Members to revisit those decisions. Those Members felt that the process and the document was therefore flawed and needed a pause to reconsider the options available. Issues relating to biodiversity net gain were also raised as were issues relating to housing oversupply and infrastructure pressures.

Several Members countered by noting that the requirement for extra housing was determined by the Inspector and the proposals now being considered had been through a cross party working group and two public consultations resulting in it being found to be sound in the Inspector's final conclusions. It was noted that if the amendment to defer was agreed, it would have an impact on proposed employment sites such as the Science Park which would lead to a negative economic impact on the District. The Council would also not meet its housing requirement in full, and a lack of a five-year housing land supply would open the possibility of speculative development. This could still result in sites SA12 and SA13 being put forward with an inability to defend them at the planning application stage, as developers could argue that the Inspector's comments are a material consideration.

With regards to pausing the process until the letter sent by the Member of Parliament for Mid Sussex had been considered, it was noted that the Council could proceed to adopt the document and then amend in light of any decision made by the Secretary of State. It was also noted that the Inspector was chosen by the Secretary of State and therefore the request to review his findings could place the Secretary of State in a difficult position. A Member cited the Inspector's conclusion at paragraph 328 of the report as he notes 'there are no soundness issues in relation to development management, uncertainties or risk and the plan is therefore sound in relation to these



aspects.' It also complies with all relevant legal requirements and issues around the Local Development Scheme.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the proposed amendment. 18 Members voted in favour, 25 against and there were no abstentions. Consequently, the amendment to defer was lost.

Members discussed the substantive recommendations noting the extensive work that has gone into reaching this position. Ecological issues with sites SA12 and SA13 were further discussed, including requirements around environmental impact assessments. Several Members were unable to support the recommendations whilst specific greenfield sites such as SA12 and SA13 were included.

Discussion was also held on the provision of adequate infrastructure to meet the needs of the new housing and employment sites. Members acknowledged that some areas do face issues such as traffic congestion but noted that no sites were listed as a major concern by the Inspector. It is also possible for mitigations and infrastructure improvements to be put in place.

In conclusion, seconding the original motion Councillor Ash-Edwards acknowledged that planning is the most difficult issue for Local Authorities to undertake and although there are often disagreements, the Council has to work to assist the whole District. He highlighted that if the document is not adopted, the Council will lose control of development within the District, as it will not be possible to rely on the policies and mitigations contained in the Sites Allocation DPD. He thanked past portfolio holders and the current Cabinet Member for their work in bringing the document to this point. He also acknowledged the concerns of Members who raised specific issues in their towns and wards, particularly noting the need to cooperate with the West Sussex Highways Authority with regards to East Grinstead and reassured Members that this collaborative working was part of policy requirements (and therefore protection) provided for within the document. He noted that there is a need to provide housing and that no alternative sites have been put forward during the process to replace the ones that have been disagreed with and reiterated that the Inspector has concluded that the plan is sound.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendations as contained in the report. A recorded vote was taken and the recommendation was approved with 24 in favour, 18 against and there was 1 abstention.

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Ash-Edwards, J.	✓			Henwood, J.		✓	
Bates, R.		✓		Hicks, S.		✓	
Belsey, J.	✓			Hillier, S.	✓		
Belsey, M.	✓			Hussain, T		✓	
Bennett, A.		✓		Jackson, R.		✓	
Bennett, L.	✓			Knight, J.	✓		
Bradbury, P	✓			Laband, C	✓		
Brown, P.		✓		Lea, Anthea	✓		
Cartwright, R.		✓		Llewellyn-Burke	✓		
Chapman, P.		✓		Marsh, G	✓		
Clarke, R.	✓			Phillips, C.		✓	
Coote, P.	✓			Pulfer, M.	✓		

Cornish, M.		✓		Salisbury, R	✓		
Dabell, J.	✓			Sparasci, A.		✓	
Dempsey, B		✓		Stockwell, L	✓		
de Mierre, R.	✓			Sweatman, D.	✓		
Ellis, S	✓			Trumble, C.	✓		
Eggleston, R.		✓		Walker, N	✓		
Eves, A.		✓		Webster, N.	✓		
Forbes, B.	✓			Whittaker, R.			✓
Gibbs, L.		✓					
Gibson, I.		✓					
Hatton, S		✓					

## RESOLVED

Council agreed to:

- (i) Adopt the Site Allocations Development Plan Document;
- (ii) Publish the Site Allocations Development Plan Document, Sustainability Appraisal Report and the Adoption Statement;
- (iii) Give delegated authority to the Divisional Unit Leader for Planning and Economy, to make typographical and minor factual corrections to the documentation as necessary before publication.

## 8. REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES.

Councillor Ash-Edwards moved the item asking Members to vote on the recommendations as per column 1 of the report. This was seconded by Councillor Webster.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendations as contained in the report which was approved with 39 in favour and 3 abstentions.

## RESOLVED

Council approved the nominations to outside bodies listed in paragraph 4 of this report.

## 9. ADOPTION OF MODERN SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING TRANSPARENCY STATEMENT.

Councillor Anthea Lea moved the item noting that in October 2020 the Council undertook to be a slavery free community and remove slave-based labour from its supply chains. In March 2022 the Scrutiny Committee reviewed the statement and unanimously agreed it. The item was seconded by Councillor Webster who thanked the Scrutiny Committee for the way in which they debated and supported it.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendation as contained in the report which was approved unanimously.

## **RESOLVED**

Council adopted the attached draft Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking Transparency Statement for 2022/2023.

### **10. MSDC PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2022/23.**

Councillor Ash-Edwards moved the item noting it is an annual report. This was seconded by Councillor de Mierre who noted that it was a requirement of the Localism Act 2011 and reflects current practice.

A Member asked whether any payment above £100k was to be referred to Council and sought clarity on whether that includes all exit payments for a post holder. The Leader explained that recent Government Guidance clarified the existing legal position. The Guidance defined clearly what constituted 'special severance payments' and what the recommended governance was for such payments. He also confirmed that payments required contractually or under enactments did not constitute 'special severance' and did not count towards the £100k threshold. Special Severance were largely discretionary payments .

The member suggested the Council could chose to adopt a £100k threshold regardless and the Leader advised that the Council should instead continue to follow legal requirements.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendations as contained in the report which was approved with 35 in favour and 8 against.

## **RESOLVED**

Council agreed the Pay Policy at Appendix A, to comply with the requirements of the Localism Act.

### **11. SCRUTINY COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES FOR 2022/23.**

Councillor Webster moved the item noting that the changes reflect the agreed portfolio changes as reflected in the constitution. This was seconded by Councillor Ash-Edwards.

Discussion was held on items such as sport and leisure which are now split between two committees. It was noted that Members could attend other Scrutiny Committees if the wish. A Member requested that the Scrutiny Committee for Planning, Economic Growth and Net Zero should meet as planned and the working group with regards to the District Plan should proceed. In response to a question on the subject, Councillor Webster confirmed that the recent Governance Review was taken into consideration when the changes to these committees were considered.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendations as contained in the report which was approved with 39 in favour, 2 against and 2 abstentions.

## **RESOLVED**

The Council agreed:

- (i) Three Scrutiny Committees entitled (1) Scrutiny Committee for Leader, Deputy Leader and Housing and Customer Services dealing with the work

carried out by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing and Customer Services,(2) Scrutiny Committee for Planning, Economic Growth and Net Zero to shadow the work of the Cabinet Member for Planning and the Cabinet Member for Economic Growth and Net Zero and (3) the Scrutiny Committee for Community, Leisure and Parking to shadow the work of the Cabinet Member for Community and the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parking.

- (ii) The three Committees will meet at 7 pm in the Council Chamber unless otherwise agreed by the relevant Committee Chairman.

## **12. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET HELD ON 6 JUNE 2022.**

Councillor Ash-Edwards moved the item. This was seconded by Councillor John Belsey who highlighted the three additional projects added to the Capital Programme including works to bring temporary accommodation to East Grinstead at Swan Mead, works to Bedelands and work to finalise arrangements to the toilets at the Orchards Shopping Centre.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendations on both items as contained in the report which was agreed with 42 in favour and 1 abstention.

### **RESOLVED**

#### **FINANCIAL OUTTURN 2021/22**

Council approved:

- (i) that grant income as set out in paragraph 12 to 25 of the Cabinet report be transferred to Specific Reserves;
- (ii) that requests totalling £82,000 be transferred to Specific Reserves as set out in Table 1 of the Cabinet report;
- (iii) that balance of interest totalling £174,111 as set out in paragraph 27 of the Cabinet report is transferred to the General Reserve;
- (iv) that the shortfall in Dividend income totalling £19,232 as set out in paragraph 31 of the Cabinet report is met from the General Reserve;
- (v) that the 2022/23 capital programme be increased by £5,215,000 as a result of slippage of some 2021/22 capital projects as detailed in Table 2 of the Cabinet report;
- (vi) that the revenue underspend in 2021/22, totalling £144,000, be transferred to General Reserve.

#### **CAPITAL PROGRAMME AND REVENUE PROJECTS UPDATE**

Council approved:

- (i) the variations to the Capital Programme and Revenue Projects 2022/23 contained in paragraph 17 of the Cabinet report in accordance with the Council's Financial Procedure rule B3.

## **13. TO RECEIVE THE LEADER'S REPORT.**

The Leader confirmed that the interim report on the Clair Hall site will be reported to Cabinet in July to set out work carried out by the Steering Group. A report will also be

published that outlines the significant challenges of the existing building. In response to a question on when it will be presented to a Scrutiny Committee, he reiterated that it will be presented to Cabinet in July.

The Leader also confirmed that the Council continues to receive positive feedback from the Government regarding the Levelling Up Fund for Burgess Hill and is preparing for submitting a bid in round two. More details will follow in due course.

In response to a question from a Member regarding standards, the Leader noted that Councillors have an obligation to set a good example in their role.

#### **14. REPORT OF CABINET MEMBERS, INCLUDING QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.1.**

Deputy Leader

The Deputy Leader noted that work continues to progress the food waste trial and participating residents will be written to in July and Members will have a briefing on the subject, with further comms being issued soon after. He confirmed that it will be a '3-2-1 trial' with food collected weekly, recycling collected fortnightly, and the residual waste collected every 3 weeks. The food waste will be taken to Basingstoke to be bio digested. Further composition analysis and benchmarking will also take place and the Council is continuing to push important alternatives such as home composting and alternative plastic recycling. In terms of garden waste, the Council is nearing 23000 users which is the current capacity so ways to expand this are being investigated.

Cabinet Member for Economic Growth and Net Zero

The Cabinet Member provided feedback from his attendance at the West Sussex Joint Climate Change Board Meeting where key items being discussed included an update on how West Sussex Local Authorities are proceeding towards the decarbonisation of their estates, and how we can work together on carbon off-setting and sequestration. He reported that Mid Sussex will be looking to our prospective refreshed District Plan to feature new and enhanced policies in this area. During the meeting he also suggested that work was needed to look at what reasonable measures we all should be taking to make our areas more resilient to climate change. For example, flooding, water resilience, increased temperatures affecting homes and workplaces and energy consumption, and its impact upon our species. In response to a Member's request to work with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), he confirmed that SDNPA is part of the West Sussex Joint Climate Change Board.

Regarding the Burgess Hill Growth Area, he confirmed that the Green Circle is 99% done and the Green Links are 97% done, both due to complete this month and reflecting a huge investment into Burgess Hill and partnership working with West Sussex and Homes England resulting in a superb network of cycling and walking pathways around and into the town. West Sussex are now about to commence their large projects to enhance the linkages and sustainable transport experience around some of the town centre. He acknowledged a Member's concern that there will be disruption in Burgess Hill when the roads are dug up for the place and connectivity programme and noted comments that West Sussex County Council needed to be better at the communication around this disruption. However, he noted the long-term gain to be had from the works.

In relation to the Economy, he confirmed that the Micro Business Grant scheme is open for bids and urged Members to promote them to local businesses. He also noted that the Council supported the Burgess Hill Business Park Association's STEM week with local schools and will be supporting the forthcoming Haywards Heath STEM challenge.

#### Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parking

The Cabinet Member noted that the three leisure centres are increasing their membership and the number of visits continues to rise. It is now around 70% of pre covid levels and in a good position to achieve the target of 400000 visitors and 11000 members in this fiscal year. She confirmed that there is a revised management income of £600,000 in this fiscal year and Officers are negotiating the management income for the next financial year. Places Leisure have also identified a number of decarbonisation projects which subject to funding being available they would like to progress.

Regarding parking service data, this is 21% up on last year's figures. Season tickets also saw an increase but remain at 43% compared to the pre covid period.

Regarding the first phase of the electric vehicle charging point project with West Sussex, phase one is nearly complete. 66 charging points have been installed in Council car parks and Connected Curb are preparing a list of potentially viable other locations, with plans to install some in disabled bays as well.

In response to a question on enforcement when petrol/diesel cars park in the charging spaces, the Cabinet Member noted that enforcement takes place in the same way as for other bad parking. She agreed to provide further information on when patrols could take place in the Hurstpierpoint Trinity Road car park. She also agreed to respond in writing to Members on the current position with the charging point in Cyprus Road which is not currently working.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on whether to extend the meeting past 10pm which was lost with 15 in favour, 26 against and 1 abstention.

#### Cabinet Member for Community

The Cabinet Member reminded Members of a programme of free play days across the District during the summer. He reminded Councillors of the new Integrated Care System (ICS) coming into place on 1 July to replace the Clinical Commissioning Groups in Mid Sussex. The ICS is beginning engagement exercises across Mid Sussex from Friday 1 July.

He also was pleased to note the Armed Forces commemorative events held recently across the district, as well as the many Platinum Jubilee celebrations.

#### Cabinet Member for Planning

The Cabinet Member noted that training sessions have run for Planning Committee Members. The session on Planning Enforcement was open to all Members and slides from this session will be circulated to Members.

**15. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.2.**

Two questions received were withdrawn by the Member who posed them.

The meeting finished at 9.57 pm

Chairman