



Meeting of the Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held in The Council Chamber, County Hall, St Annes Crescent, Lewes on Thursday, 25 February 2016 at 2.30pm

Present:

Councillor R O’Keeffe (Chair)

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; B Bovington; J Carr; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; S Davy; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; V lent; A Lambert; I Linington; A Loraine; R Maskell; E Merry; S Murray; D Neave; T Nicholson; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; T Rowell; S Saunders; J Sheppard; A Smith; C Sugarman; R Turner and L Wallraven.

Apology received:

Councillors W Botting and T Jones.

Minutes

58 Minutes

The Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of the Council held on 14 January 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

59 Urgent Items

The Chair reported that she had agreed, in accordance with Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, that the revised details in respect of Report No 32/16, which had been circulated to all members of the Council on 23 February 2016 under cover of Council Document C, be considered as a matter of urgency under Agenda Item 12(iii), in order that the Council could take its decisions based on the most recent information which was available.

Action

60 To Receive any Announcements From the Chair of the Council, Leader of the Council, Members of the Cabinet or the Chief Executive

Chair of the Council's Engagements

The Council received the list of the Chair of the Council's engagements carried out since the Meeting of the Council held on 9 December 2015.

61 Questions from Members of the Public

Written questions were asked of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Maskell, on the following subjects, copies of which were circulated to all Councillors at the meeting and made available to the public attending the meeting (a copy of which is contained in the Minute Book). Oral replies to the first two questions were given at the meeting and a written reply would be sent to the questioner, Mr Carrick, respect of the third question:

DCS/
ADCS

Questioner

Question Concerning

Vivian Carrick

The Council had commissioned an economic impact study of the New Homes Project, including Peacehaven, in December 2015. When would the Council make it available to the public?

Vivian Carrick

The Council had commissioned the Project Centre to carry out a further Car Park Study of Steyning Avenue Car Park in Peacehaven in December 2015. When would the Council make it available to the public?

Vivian Carrick

Would the Council please confirm in detail the title conditions of Piddinghoe Avenue, Steyning Avenue and Roderick South Car Parks in Peacehaven and why the title conditions of Steyning Avenue Car park were not satisfied?

62 Petitions

(i) The Chair received a petition from Councillor Carter, Jordan Halls and Claire Heath, on behalf of the Skatehouse, Lewes, which contained in excess of 3000 signatures. The petitioners supported the Skatehouse Campaign to Support the Skatehouse.

Councillor Carter, Mr Halls and Ms Heath addressed the Council on the

subject matter of the petition and the number of signatures.

As the petition contained 1,500 or more signatures, in accordance with the Council's Petitions Scheme, as set out in Part 6 of its Constitution, it would be debated by the Council at a future meeting as an individual Agenda Item.

DBSD (M
Woodford)

(ii) The Chair received a petition from Laurence O'Connor on behalf of the Peacehaven & District Residents Association which contained 383 signatures. The petitioners requested the Council to listen to the people who wished to save the coast road car parks at Steyning Avenue and Piddinghoe Avenue, Peacehaven, which, they felt, were essential to the town and its residents.

Mr O'Connor addressed the Council on the subject matter of the petition and the number of signatures.

As the petition contained less than 750 signatures, the Council would contact Mr O'Connor in order to advise him as to what action it would be taking in respect of the petition.

DSD
(B Lewis)

63 Questions to the Leader of the Council

Questioner

Question/Response

Councillor
Saunders

Question:

Following the recent Cabinet meeting relating to the New Homes Project, an article had appeared in the local press which had suggested that, along with the proposed development at the Robinson Road, Newhaven site, Meeching Down, Newhaven, might also proceed.

Would the Leader of the Council assure the residents of Newhaven that the Meeching Down site would not proceed and that their objections to development of that area, which had been raised through a petition to the Council at its Meeting on 16 July 2015, would be taken into account and that they had not been ignored?

Response (by Councillor Smith, Leader of the Council):

The proposed development contract relating to the New Homes Project had been terminated on the grounds of its viability and any future proposals would not be progressed in the same way as had been the case for that contract. In light of the Housing and Planning Bill 2016 which would put pressure on the Council to utilise its underutilised assets, Councillor Smith was not able to indicate which of the Council's asset sites might, or might not, be the subject of future development proposals.

64 Ward Issues

Ward issues were raised by Councillors on the following subjects:

<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
Councillor Turner – Ouse Valley and Ringmer Ward	<p>Approximately two years ago the Council had undertaken to devolve its land at The Forges, Ringmer, to Ringmer Parish Council, an issue which had not yet been completed.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Council aim to complete the above devolution process as soon as possible.</p>	DCS
Councillor Turner – Ouse Valley and Ringmer Ward	<p>There were serious drainage problems in Firle village.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Council write to the Highways Department at East Sussex County Council to request that the ditches and drains in Firle village be cleaned out.</p>	S Lomas
Councillor Turner – Ouse Valley and Ringmer Ward	<p>A lot of walkers visited Firle in which there were no footpaths.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Council write to the South Downs National Park Authority to request that it consider funding, or part-funding, the provision of a footpath in Firle in order that walkers could be kept safer.</p>	S Lomas
Councillor Sheppard – Newick Ward	<p>In Newick there was a small development of 28 sheltered housing units, one of which was currently frequently used as a Community Centre by residents of the units and by others. There was no other suitable alternative facility in Newick in light of its proximity to the other community centre which was located some distance away. However, the Council wished to revert the Centre that was located within the sheltered housing units, back to being a dwelling.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Council reverse its decision to revert the Community Centre that was located within the sheltered housing units, back to being a dwelling.</p>	DSD

<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
Councillor Barnes – Newhaven Denton and Meeching Ward	<p>The road junction which existed at Cantercrow Hill; St Leonards Close; and St Leonards Road, Denton, Newhaven, had no junction road markings which was confusing for road users and residents and which was concerning.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Council write to the Highways Department at East Sussex County Council requesting that it undertake a traffic survey at that junction in order that it could understand the problems and concerns of road users and residents.</p>	S Lomas
Councillor Gander – Ouse Valley and Ringmer Ward	<p>The ditches that were located outside Yeomans, Ringmer, had recently almost overflowed which, if that occurred, would flood Yeomans. For the last four years, East Sussex County Council had been requested to clear out those ditches but such work had not yet been undertaken</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Council write to East Sussex County Council in order to ascertain why the clearance work had not been undertaken.</p>	S Lomas
Councillor Gander – Ouse Valley and Ringmer Ward	<p>There was flooding at one of the main drains that was located outside the shopping precinct in Ringmer which, when it rained, resulted in flooding of the road and part of the precinct.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Council write to the Highways Department at East Sussex County Council requesting that the above drain be cleaned out as a matter of urgency in order to prevent the flooding from recurring.</p>	S Lomas
Councillor Gander – Ouse Valley and Ringmer Ward	<p>There was a considerable amount of rubbish along the A26 and A27 roads that had fallen from the backs of lorries which had been driven along those roads.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Council ascertain which authority was responsible for clearing the rubbish and write to them in order to request that clearance work be undertaken.</p> <p>That the Council write to the appropriate authorities, companies and organisations in order to request them to encourage lorry drivers to fasten suitable covers/nets over their loads in order to prevent</p>	DSD DSD

<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
	materials from escaping from their vehicles whilst they were being driven along the A26 and A27 roads.	

65 Recommendations from Cabinet

(i) Recommendations from the meetings of the Cabinet held on 7 January 2016 and 8 February 2016 relating to:

- (a) Minute 47 relating to the Adoption 'Making' of the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan;
- (b) Minute 51 relating to the Contract Procedure Rules;
- (c) Minute 53 relating to the Meetings Timetable 2016/2017; and
- (d) Minute 57 relating to The Council Plan 2016 – 2020.

Unreserved Item

The Chair of the Council moved, and Councillor Gardiner seconded, the motion that the recommendation of Cabinet held on 7 January 2016 contained in Minute 53 relating to the Meetings Timetable 2016/2017, be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

65.1 Accordingly.

ADCS

Reserved Items

The Leader of the Council moved, and Councillor Sheppard seconded, the motion that the recommendation of Cabinet held on 7 January 2016 contained in Minute 47 relating to the Adoption 'Making' of the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan, be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

65.2 Accordingly.

DBSD

The Leader of the Council moved, and Councillor Harrison-Hicks seconded, the motion that the recommendation of Cabinet held on 7 January 2016 contained in Minute 51 relating to the Contract Procedure Rules, be

received and adopted subject to further amendments which incorporated the new European Union Thresholds that were updated from 1 January 2016; and paragraph 14.3 which inadvertently referred to £75,000 and which had been corrected to read £100,000 to align with paragraph 16.1 (the amended version of the Rules was set out on pages 12 to 42 of Council Document A).

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

65.3 Accordingly.

DCS

The Leader of the Council moved, and Councillor Maskell seconded, the motion that the recommendation of Cabinet held on 8 February 2016 contained in Minute 57 relating to The Council Plan 2016 – 2020, and the recommendations set out in Report No 31/16 entitled “The Council Plan 2016 – 2020”, be received and adopted (NB the final version of the Plan, as referred to in Minute 57, was set out in Report No 31/16 on the Agenda for this Meeting of the Council).

Councillor Davy moved, and Councillor Saunders seconded, an amendment that the two paragraphs that appeared under the heading of “PLACE” on the page entitled “Our commitments”, be revised to read as follows:

“The Lewes district is a vibrant and diverse place. Whilst balancing the need for growth we have a commitment to protect our environment, open spaces and countryside.

A recent survey showed that local people living in our towns and villages wish to see affordable housing that fit the local demands and needs of their community. The survey showed that economic regeneration, supporting business and campaigning for improved road/rail infrastructure to be important roles for the Council. These views have been reflected in this Plan.”

The amendment was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

65.4 Accordingly.

DBSD

Councillor Rowell moved, and Councillor Ient seconded, an amendment that reference, on the page that was headed “Place Growth and prosperity”, to continuing to make a case for Gatwick as the most sustainable location for a second runway in the South East, be removed from the Plan.

The amendment was put to the meeting, Declared not Carried, and it was

Resolved:

65.5 Accordingly.

Councillor Adeniji moved, and Councillor Robertson seconded, an amendment that an additional bullet point be included in the list of such points on the page that was headed "Place Clean and green district" under the sub-heading of "We will achieve this by" as follows:

"Working in partnership with towns and parishes to unlock development and growth projects."

The amendment was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

65.6 Accordingly.

DBSD

The substantive motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

65.7 Accordingly.

DBSD

(ii) Budget Recommendations from Cabinet held on 8 February 2016

- (a) Minute 59 - General Fund Revenue Budget 2016/2017;**
- (b) Minute 60 - Housing Revenue Account Budget 2016/2017;**
- (c) Minute 61 - The Capital Programme 2015/2016 to 2018/2019; and**
- (d) Minute 62 - Annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 2016/2017 to 2018/2019**

Reserved Items

The Leader of the Council moved, and Councillor Giles seconded, the motion that Minute 62 of the Cabinet entitled "Annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 2016/2017 to 2018/2019"; be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

65.8 Accordingly.

DCS

The Leader of the Council moved, and Councillor Bovington seconded, the motion that:

Minute 59 entitled "General Fund Revenue Budget 2016/2017", together with the recommendations contained in Report No 32/16 of the Director of Corporate Services entitled "Setting the Council Tax" as amended by the document which had been circulated to all Members of the Council on 23 February 2016 under cover of Council Document C;

Minute 60 entitled "Housing Revenue Account Budget 2016/2017"; and

Minute 61 entitled "The Capital Programme 2015/2016 to 2018/2019",

be received and adopted.

The Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Giles, then delivered the Budget Speech, a copy of which is attached to these Minutes.

Councillor Osborne moved, and Councillor Giles seconded, an amendment as follows:

"That up to £50,000 be ring fenced to assist the current privately owned business trading from land owned and leased by LDC to relocate within the Lewes District. This can be funded from the economic regeneration reserve".

The amendment was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and the vote thereon was recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.6 as follows:

For the Amendment:

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; B Bovington; J Carr; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; S Davy; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; V Ient; A Lambert; I Linington; A Loraine; R Maskell; E Merry; S Murray; D Neave; T Nicholson; R O'Keefe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; T Rowell; S Saunders; J Sheppard; A Smith; C Sugarman; R Turner and L Wallraven (38).

Resolved:

65.9 Accordingly.

DCS/
DSD/
DBSD

Councillor Osborne moved, and Councillor Maskell seconded, an amendment as follows:

“That £50,000 is allocated from reserves for the development and implementation of an extension to private sector leasing scheme in Lewes District; This is an invest to save proposal; and

That a Working Panel, Chaired by the Cabinet Member for Housing with representation from the opposition group, the Director of Service Delivery and other appropriate Officers will oversee the project and consider carefully any proposed expenditure of the £50,000 to advance the private sector leasing scheme.”

The amendment was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and the vote thereon was recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.6 as follows:

For the Amendment:

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; B Bovington; J Carr; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; S Davy; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; V Ient; A Lambert; I Linington; A Loraine; R Maskell; E Merry; S Murray; D Neave; T Nicholson; R O’Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; T Rowell; S Saunders; J Sheppard; A Smith; C Sugarman; R Turner and L Wallraven (38).

Resolved:

65.10 Accordingly.

DCS/DSD
/ADCS

Councillor Gardiner moved, and Councillor Nicholson seconded, an amendment as follows:

“That £296,750 be added to the Council’s General Fund Capital Programme over a minimum of 3 years: (£112,750 in 2016/17; £136,000 in 2017/18 and £48,000 in 2018/19) to be financed from the repatriated ring-fenced Environment Agency Levy in the Council’s general fund revenue budget;

That a cross party Working Group be established in order to oversee the scheme approvals and the ring-fenced flood alleviation budget; and

That it be made clear that the actual release of funds to individual schemes may vary from the programme set out as new information is garnered.”

(NB The proposal related to the Council’s funding of upper Ouse flood protection and water retention work, further details of which had been circulated with the Agenda papers under cover of Council Document B).

The amendment was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and the vote thereon was recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.6 as follows:

For the Amendment:

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; B Bovington; J Carr; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; S Davy; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; V Ient; A Lambert; I Linington; A Loraine; R Maskell; E Merry; S Murray; D Neave; T Nicholson; R O’Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; T Rowell; J Sheppard; A Smith; C Sugarman; R Turner and L Wallraven (37).

Resolved:

65.11 Accordingly.

DCS/DSD
/ADCS

Councillor Murray moved, and Councillor Rowell seconded, an amendment as follows:

“That the Council sets aside up to £5,000 from the service priority budget to produce a business case for a sustainable homes fund on the basis that any such future scheme is break even to the Lewes District Council tax payer.”

The amendment was put to the meeting, Declared not Carried, and the vote thereon was recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.6 as follows:

For the Amendment:

Councillors G Amy; S Barnes; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; O Honeyman; V Ient; A Lambert; S Murray; R O’Keeffe; S Osborne and T Rowell (15).

Against the Amendment:

Councillors S Adeniji; B Bovington; S Davy; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; I Linington; A Loraine; R Maskell; E Merry; D Neave; T Nicholson; J Peterson; R Robertson; J Sheppard; A Smith; C Sugarman; R Turner and L Wallraven (21).

Resolved:

65.12 Accordingly.

Councillor Rowell moved, and Councillor Murray seconded, a revised version of the amendment that was set out in the Agenda as follows:

“That the Council sets aside further funding into the hardship fund that is being established to support vulnerable families from the imposition of a minimum contribution to council tax from 1 April 2016, subject to a review at six months or earlier if that deemed to be necessary.”

The above amendment was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and the vote thereon was recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.6 as follows:

For the Amendment:

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; B Bovington; J Carr; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; S Davy; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; V lent; A Lambert; I Linington; A Loraine; R Maskell; E Merry; S Murray; D Neave; T Nicholson; R O'Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; T Rowell; S Saunders; J Sheppard; A Smith; C Sugarman; R Turner and L Wallraven (38).

Resolved:

65.13 Accordingly.

DSD/DCS

Councillor Carter withdrew her proposed amendment which was set out in the Agenda papers relating to the setting aside up to £12,000 to assist with the relocation of the Skatehouse youth facility that was currently situated on the North Street site, Lewes, in light of an offer which was made by the Leader of the Council to investigate, and consider at a future meeting of Cabinet, the possible availability of funding from Section 106 money which might be able to be used to assist with the relocation of the Skatehouse to a suitable venue within the District (NB The meeting was adjourned for approximately ten minutes during the Council's consideration of this item).

DCS/
DBSD (M
Woodford)

(iii) Adoption of a Formal Resolution for the Council Tax for the Year Ending 31 March 2017

The Leader of the Council moved, and Councillor Giles seconded, the motion that the Council, having considered the financial Reports with the Agenda, and the information contained in the draft Council Tax Resolution as amended by the document which had been circulated on 23 February 2016 under cover of Council Document C, approves the Lewes District Council General Fund Council Tax Requirement of £6,823,300 for 2016/2017 and the resultant band D tax of £190.61 as set out in Appendices A and E to Report No 32/16 as amended by the document which had been circulated on 23 February 2016 under cover of Council Document C, and now adopts the formal Resolution for the Council Tax for the year ending 31 March 2017, in the terms set out in Appendix G to that Report as amended by the document which had been circulated on 23 February 2016 under cover of Council Document C, the final version of which is appended to these Minutes.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and the vote thereon was recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.6 as follows:

For the Motion:

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; B Bovington; J Carr; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; S Davy; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; V Ient; A Lambert; I Linington; A Loraine; R Maskell; E Merry; D Neave; T Nicholson; R O’Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; J Sheppard; A Smith; C Sugarman; R Turner and L Wallraven (34).

Abstained:

Councillors J Carter; S Murray and T Rowell (3).

Resolved:

65.14 Accordingly.

DCS/
DSD/
DBSD/
ADCS

66 Notices of Motion

(a) The Chair reported that a Notice of Motion had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 14 by Councillor Osborne relating to the Housing and Planning Bill 2016.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14 and with the agreement of the Council, Councillor Osborne moved, and Councillor Merry seconded, a revised version of the Notice of Motion to that which was set out in the Agenda papers as follows:

“Motion on Housing and Planning Bill 2016

This Council notes:

The Government’s proposal to extend the Right to Buy to Housing Association tenants is to be paid for by a forced sell off of the most expensive Council Housing stock. The proposals in the Bill allow the Secretary of State to require a regular payment from councils based on an amount determined by central government in secondary legislation.

The LGA “First 100 Days” campaign highlighted there are 1.7 million households on waiting lists for affordable housing across England and that there are more than 3.4 million adults between 20 and 34 living with their parents.

Social rents are not subsidized, they are set at levels which pay in full for the management, maintenance and renewal of properties and the debt interest.

The so called 'Pay to Stay' will see rents for a 2 bed property in Lewes District double from approx. £100 pw to £200 pw if they are charged at the Local Housing Allowance Limit and go up to £269 pw if at market level.

60,000 households in England will be unable to afford to remain in their

council properties from April next year as a result of 'Pay to Stay' (according to report commissioned by the LGA).

214,000 households will be affected by the 'Pay to Stay' policy in England.

Proposals to increase rents for 'high-income' tenants are likely to be a disincentive to work and may well disproportionately affect women. The Resolution Foundation found that a household with two earners (in Oxford for e.g.) which took on one more hour of work per week (tipping earnings over £30,000) would see rent increase by £4,000 a year.

The policy will reduce spending power and there will be a negative effect on the local economy.

The Government's proposals would remove flexibilities of councils to offer different kinds of tenancies in response to local need.

The requirement to review each tenancy every five years would be a significant administrative burden and difficult to police.

Proposals on planning in the Bill, including national interventions in local plan making and new performance regimes, risk putting additional strain on stretched local planning authorities while taking away local community influence.

Proposals to exempt Section 106 affordable housing contributions will likely cut £3 billion of investment from the supply of affordable and social rented properties. The Government's own impact analysis suggests that for every 100-starter homes built through section 106 agreements, between 56 and 71 affordable or social rented homes will not be built.

This Bill is a further attack on the freedom of local authorities with 34 new powers being given to the Secretary of State.

To note the concerns and opposition of some Councillors relating to the forced sell off of council housing to pay for this plan and notes that the Government's Bill also

- i) May have the unintended consequence of reducing the availability of much-needed council housing
- ii) Effectively gives Government the freedom to decide how much it would like to 'tax' each council with housing stock, and to define high value for their area to deliver that figure.
- iii) Could hamper the ability of local authorities to invest in new affordable council housing and create the right mix of housing that local residents can afford.
- iv) Will lead to an increase in the housing benefit bill as more people are forced to move into the more expensive private-rented sector, and do little to help councils reduce homelessness and reduce spending on temporary accommodation.

- v) Will put more pressure on existing local infrastructure because of the proposals to exempt 200,000 starter homes from the Community Infrastructure Levy and other infrastructure spending pots.
- vi) That local planning authorities, will no longer have enough flexibility to shape the number, type and quality of Starter Homes within and across developments alongside other types of affordable housing. It is vital that new housing products are delivered in response to the needs of residents and economies in local housing markets as assessed locally by councils as part of developing their local plans.
- vii) That the process for determining the additional income from the so called 'Pay to Stay' is unlikely to reflect the reality for tenants and councils or the difficulty of adjusting rents in line with fluctuating household incomes.
- viii) Local Authorities' will be taking all the risk and Government all the benefit as the payment due from councils, is based on a national estimate whether or not that estimate is borne out in reality.
- ix) It may create more need for housing if parents ask adult earning children to leave to reduce household income below the 'Pay to Stay' threshold.
- x) It will be costly to administer and police. Collection rates will be difficult to maintain.
- xi) It may damage the relationship between the council and its tenants
- xii) It is likely that the policy may encourage an increase in Right to Buy that would reduce the numbers of higher income tenants.
- xiii) We are concerned the Government's proposals would remove flexibilities on councils to offer different kinds of tenancies in response to local need.
- xiv) The requirement to review each tenancy every five years would be a significant administrative burden on councils.

The Council therefore resolves:

1. To work with other neighbouring authorities to oppose the current government proposals to force councils to sell off high value stock (or any equivalent charge based on estimates of high value stock);
2. To write to local MPs, asking them to support the Council's position and to speak up in parliament:
 - a) To push for more social housing and to push for a genuine "one for one" replacement but not at the cost of losing more council housing.
 - b) To leave Councils free to manage their housing assets and to retain 100 per cent of receipts to invest in new and existing homes. As a minimum all councils should retain sufficient funds to replace each home sold on a like for like basis. This should also apply to council Right to Buy, as required rent reductions reduce the capacity of

councils to replace those homes sold under the scheme.

- c) To recycle the discount on Starter Homes in perpetuity, as is the case in council exception schemes, or extend it, so that more families can benefit.
- d) To make voluntary the proposals to increase rents for 'high-income' tenants, as it will be for housing associations. Councils should also retain any additional income to reinvest in new and existing housing. Local flexibility on rents would enable councils to ensure that housing remains affordable for tenants, particularly key groups likely to be affected such as those working in education, healthcare and other public services.
- e) To leave Councils free to manage their tenancies in a way that drives best value from stock while supporting strong local communities.
- f) To allow councils to set planning fees locally to ensure effective, responsive and fully funded council planning services.
- g) To amend the Bill to give councils greater flexibility on Article 4 planning directions, which remove the automatic right to convert properties between different types of use, to manage the problems caused by concentrations of houses in multiple occupations in small areas. Amendments to notice period and compensation provisions for Article 4 directions would allow local authorities to respond to resident and landlord concerns and local priorities more effectively.
- h) To provide flexibility for local authorities to exempt certain types of development and development on certain land or in certain areas from the permission in principle development order as well as from the register of land.
- i) To press the government to publish Draft regulations as soon as possible to allow for effective scrutiny."

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

66.1 Accordingly.

(b) The Chair reported that a Notice of Motion had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 14 by Councillor Murray relating to Lewes Crown Post Office.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14 and with the agreement of the Council, Councillor Murray moved, and Councillor Chartier seconded, a revised version of the Notice of Motion to that which was set out in the Agenda papers as follows:

"This council acknowledges the strong belief of many of our local residents

DBSD/
DSD

that Lewes Crown Post Office is under threat.

It further takes on board the fact that the downgrading of the Crown Post Office to an in-store franchise is likely to have a detrimental effect upon the viability of the upper part of Lewes High Street, (which it has already noted to be vulnerable within planning documents), and of many local businesses which depend upon it to send out many packages and parcels every day (the rise of internet shopping and working from home makes this ever more important). It notes the reduction in range of services that franchising brings about and the value that having these services within the town has to residents.

It further notes that a petition against the plans has gathered a large number of signatures, over 1000 in the first 48 hours of the petition, showing sizeable public opposition to franchising proposals being put forward by Post Office Ltd.

The council therefore resolves to publicly announce that it supports the efforts of local residents to keep a Crown Post Office in Lewes and opposes any proposals to downgrade it and lessen the service available to our residents. It asks the Chair of the Council to write to the Communications and Corporate Affairs Team at Post office Ltd outlining the damaging effects upon Lewes residents and businesses of these proposals and requesting that the Crown post office be retained in its current form at its current location.

NOTES

On January 19th Post Office Ltd announced plans to franchise 39 of its branches, and close three. Lewes Post Office is on the list of those to be franchised once a suitable retailer is found. Lewes is a busy Post Office - customers are well aware of the queues frequently experienced at peak times. Yet the Post Office wants to sell the valuable building and put the Lewes PO into a local shop, which will lead to longer queues, less services offered, and an all round inferior service, which will affect businesses and individual customers. Lewes Post Office has been on the same site for over 100 years -a site that serves the town well. The process is out to consultation at the moment but the consultation is mainly focused on finding another business to take on the service rather than dealing with the issue of whether the post office should stay at it's current location."

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

66.2 Accordingly.

DBSD/
ADCS
(Head of
Dem
Svces)

67 Updating of Lewes District Council's Gambling Statement of Principles

Councillor Franklin moved, and Councillor Adeniji seconded, the motion that the recommendation set out in Report No 33/16 relating to Updating of Lewes District Council's Gambling Statement of Principles, be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

67.1 Accordingly.

DSD

68 Change of Polling Place for Lewes Priory Electors

The Councillor Smith moved, and Councillor Gander seconded, the motion that the recommendation set out in Report No 34/16 relating to a Change of Polling Place for Lewes Priory Electors, be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

68.1 Accordingly.

ADCS

69 Changes to Committee Memberships and Outside Body Representatives

The Councillor Smith moved, and Councillor Robertson seconded, the motion that the recommendations set out in Report No 35/16 relating to Changes to Committee Memberships and Outside Body Representatives, be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

69.1 Accordingly.

ADCS

70 Updated Code of Conduct Policy - Employees

Councillor Merry moved, and Councillor Harrison-Hicks seconded, the motion that the recommendation set out in Report No 36/16 relating to the Updated Code of Conduct Policy in respect of Employees, be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

70.1 Accordingly.

HR Mgr/
ADCS
(HDS)

The meeting ended at 5.32pm.

R O'Keeffe
Chair