<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE NO.</th>
<th>DECISION</th>
<th>CABINET MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICM/064/160812</td>
<td>Prosecutions for Housing and Council Tax Benefit Fraud (Exempt – Paragraph 7 – Information Relating to Prosecutions) THIS ITEM HAD BEEN DEFERRED FROM 16 AUGUST 2012</td>
<td>Wensley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM/065/230812</td>
<td>Prosecutions for Housing and Council Tax Benefit Fraud (Exempt – Paragraph 7 – Information Relating to Prosecutions)</td>
<td>Wensley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM/066/230812</td>
<td>Award of Contract for the Alteration, repair and Modernisation of One Property in Arundel Road, Littlehampton (Exempt – Paragraph 3 – Information Relating to Business Affairs) DEFERRED FOR FURTHER INFORMATION</td>
<td>Elkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM/067/230812</td>
<td>Local Plan Evidence Base (Transport Assessment)</td>
<td>Bower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM/068/230812</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding for Mutual Aid</td>
<td>Dendle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE NOTE THAT SIGNED DECISIONS WILL NOT COME INTO EFFECT UNTIL 10.00 AM ON THURSDAY 30 AUGUST 2012 UNLESS THE CALL-IN PROCESS IS APPLIED
THE INFORMATION IN THIS REPORT IS OF A CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT NATURE AND IS NOT FOR PUBLICATION BY VIRTUE OF PARAGRAPH 7 OF PART 1 OF SCHEDULE 12A OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED

PART B : INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES?</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CABINET MEMBER RESPONSIBLE:</td>
<td>Councillor Dudley Wensley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT:</td>
<td>Prosecutions for Housing and Council Tax Benefit Fraud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Housing and Council Tax Benefit Prosecution Panel have received one report where benefit has been overpaid and there is evidence that offences have been committed under the Social Security Administration Act 1992. The Panel resolved to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance that the case be prosecuted for Benefit Fraud, subject to the final decision resting with the Solicitor to the Council in relation to specific charges and who may recommend a Local Authority Caution following thorough examination of the evidence.

DECISION:

As recommended in report / as amended by Cabinet / Cabinet Member -
To prosecute in this case subject to the final decision resting with the Solicitor to the Council, who may recommend a Local Authority Caution.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

The case fits the criteria of the Council's Anti Fraud Policy which was adopted by the Council in 2008

OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED:

1. To offer a Local Authority Caution.
2. To apply an administrative penalty equal to 30% of the overpayment and not to prosecute.
3. Do nothing

(Add any further options which arise from the consideration of this decision)

DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:

DISPENSATIONS GRANTED:

ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER WHO IS CONSULTED BY THE MEMBER TAKING THE DECISION:

DECISION BY: Relevant Cabinet Member
SIGNATURE: [Signature]
DATE: 23.3.12.
Leader of Cabinet
PART B: INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES?

NO

CABINET MEMBER RESPONSIBLE:

Councillor Dudley Wensley.

SUBJECT: Prosecutions for Housing and Council Tax Benefit Fraud

OFFICER CONTACT:

Name of Officer: Steve Clark
Ext: 37722
email: steve.clark@arun.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The Housing and Council Tax Benefit Prosecution Panel have received one report where benefit has been overpaid and there is evidence that offences have been committed under the Social Security Administration Act 1992. The Panel resolved to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance that the case be prosecuted for Benefit Fraud, subject to the final decision resting with the Solicitor to the Council in relation to specific charges and who may recommend a Local Authority Caution following thorough examination of the evidence.

DECISION:

As recommended in report / as amended by Cabinet / Cabinet Member -
To prosecute in this case subject to the final decision resting with the Solicitor to the Council, who may recommend a Local Authority Caution.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:
The case fits the criteria of the Council’s Anti Fraud Policy which was adopted by the Council in 2008

OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED:

1. To offer a Local Authority Caution.
2. To apply an administrative penalty equal to 30% of the overpayment and not to prosecute.
3. Do nothing

(Add any further options which arise from the consideration of this decision)

CABINET MEMBER(S)

DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:

DISPENSATIONS GRANTED:

ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER WHO IS CONSULTED BY THE MEMBER TAKING THE DECISION:


Relevant Cabinet Member
Leader of Cabinet
PART B : INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION

URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES?

NO

CABINET MEMBER RESPONSIBLE: Councillor Ricky Bower

SUBJECT: Local Plan Evidence Base (Transport Assessment)

OFFICER CONTACT: Simon Meecham EXTN: 37698 E-Mail: simon.meecham@arun.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As part of the evidence base to inform the emerging Local Plan for Arun, the Planning Policy and Conservation Team is seeking to commission consultants to undertake a Transport Assessment to assess the impact of housing and employment growth upon the district’s existing transport network (indicative cost: £40,000).

This report will provide a draft brief for the study and seek authorisation to spend up to the maximum amount of funding required for the study.

DECISION:

That the Cabinet Member approves the cost of up to £40,000 to be funded from the Local Plan contingency fund to commission consultants to prepare a Transport Assessment as part of the preparation of the Arun Local Plan.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

Insufficient funds to undertake technical work for the Local Plan within the current financial year would mean that the Plan would not be prepared in accordance with the timetable set out in the Local Development Scheme (which was endorsed by Full Council on 11th January 2012). If the decision was made not to fund the work, the Local Plan policies would not be underpinned by a robust evidence base and as a result the Local Plan may be found unsound at Examination.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED:

Not to authorise sufficient funds from the Local Plan contingency fund to commission consultants to undertake a Transport Assessment as part of the preparation of the Arun Local Plan. If the decision was made not to fund the work, the Local Plan policies would not be underpinned by a robust evidence base and as a result the Local Plan may be found unsound at Examination.

(Add any further options which arise from the consideration of this decision)

CABINET MEMBER(S)

DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:

DISPENSATIONS GRANTED:

ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER WHO IS CONSULTED BY THE MEMBER TAKING THE DECISION:
PART B : INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URGENT DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 14.11 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES?</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CABINET MEMBER RESPONSIBLE:</td>
<td>Cllr P Dendle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding for Mutual Aid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICER CONTACT: G Edwards EXTN: 37953 E-Mail: <a href="mailto:Guy.Edwards@arun.gov.uk">Guy.Edwards@arun.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**
In response to the Civil Contingencies Secretariat’s intention, the local authorities in West and East Sussex have had a memorandum of understanding, to which Arun has been a signatory, for seeking and providing mutual aid across the counties.

The Council’s Legal Services department has recommended that authority should be sought for the Resources Director & Deputy Chief Executive and the Assistant Director, Environmental Services to be delegated powers to initiate and implement the recently reviewed MOU for Mutual Aid should the Chief Executive be absent and unable to do so.

This ICM seeks authority for the Resources Director & Deputy Chief Executive and the Assistant Director, Environmental Services to authorise mutual aid in the absence of the CEO.

**DECISION:**
That the Resources Director & Deputy Chief Executive and the Assistant Director, Environmental Services should be given delegated powers to authorise, seek or provide, mutual aid in the absence of the Chief Executive Officer.

**REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**
To enable the authorisation of requests for providing or receiving mutual aid in the absence of the Chief Executive Officer

**OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED:**
Not to agree the proposals contained within this Report

**CABINET MEMBER(S)**

**DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY CABINET MEMBER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION:**

**DISPENSATIONS GRANTED:**

**ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARED BY A CABINET MEMBER WHO IS CONSULTED BY THE MEMBER TAKING THE DECISION:**

**DECISION BY:** Relevant Cabinet Member

**SIGNATURE:**

**DATE:** 23 August 2012

**Leader of Cabinet**