

West Sussex County Council – Annual Meeting

20 April 2018

At an Annual Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 20 April 2018, at County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mr L H Barnard (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Ms D M K Kennard
Mrs P A C Arculus	Mrs L Kitchen
Lt Cdr N A Atkins, RD	Mr R A Lanzer
Mr A N Baldwin	Mr A C Lea
Mr D H Barling	Ms K Lord
Mr A J Barrett-Miles	Mr P A Marshall
Mrs E A Bennett	Mr S A McDonald
Mr K Boram	Mrs M E Millson
Mr P J J Bradbury	Mr C R Mitchell
Mr D Bradford	Mr J A P Montyn
Mrs A Bridges	Mrs S R Mullins
Mr I R J Buckland	Mr R J Oakley
Mr R D Burrett	Mr S J Oakley
Mr P C Catchpole	Dr K F B O'Kelly
Mr M A Cloake	Mr F R J Oppler
Mr D Crow	Mr C G Oxlade
Mrs J A Dennis	Mr V K Parikh
Dr N P S Dennis	Mr A Patel
Mrs J E Duncton	Mrs J A Pendleton
Mr D Edwards	Mr C J Petts
Mr R C Elkins	Mr D M Purchase
Mr J D Fitzjohn	Mrs L C Purnell
Ms H A Flynn	Mr B J Quinn
Ms M L Goldsmith	Mrs J E Russell
Mrs A D Hall	Mr D J Simmons
Mr P D High	Mr R J Smytherman
Mr S R Hillier	Mrs C E Sparkes
Mr J C Hunt	Mr B W Turner
Mrs A F Jones, MBE	Mrs D L Urquhart
Mr M G Jones	Mr S G Waight
Mrs A J Jupp	Dr J M M Walsh, KStJ, RD
Mr N P S Jupp	Mr D R Whittington

Chairman

- 1 Mr Oakley, the Vice-Chairman of the Council, took the chair for the election of Chairman of the County Council.

Election of Chairman

- 2 The Vice-Chairman stated that he had one nomination for the office of Chairman of the Council, that of Mr Lionel Barnard. Mr Barnard was

Minutes: Item 3

elected Chairman of the Council for the ensuing year.

- 3 Mr Barnard made the prescribed declaration of acceptance of office and took the chair.

Election of Vice-Chairman

- 4 The Chairman stated that he had one nomination for the office of Vice-Chairman of the Council, that of Mr Roger Oakley. Mr Oakley was elected Vice-Chairman of the Council for the ensuing year.

- 5 Mr Oakley made the prescribed declaration of acceptance of office.

Death of Mr Tony Sutcliffe

- 6 The Chairman reported the death of a former member of the Council – Mr Tony Sutcliffe – who had represented the Nyetimber division from 2013 to 2017.

- 7 The Council stood for a minute's silence in memory of Mr Sutcliffe.

Apologies and attendance

- 8 Apologies were received from Lt Col Barton, Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Markwell, Mrs Smith and Mr Wickremaratchi. Mr Acraman arrived at 10.35 a.m. and Mr Jones arrived at 10.40 a.m. Mr Lea gave his apologies and left at 12.20 p.m. Mr Barling and Mrs Kitchen gave their apologies for the afternoon session. Mr Purchase was absent for the afternoon session.

Interests

- 9 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

Minutes

- 10 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 16 February 2018 (pages 3 to 25) be approved as a correct record.

Review of Proportionality

- 11 The County Council was reminded of its statutory duty to review the proportionality on its committees annually. A paper on the application of the proportionality rules and how they were applied was set out at pages 26 and 27 together with a table showing the number of seats on committees.

- 12 Resolved –

That the review of proportionality on committees be agreed.

Notification of Appointment of Cabinet Members, Senior Advisers and Advisers to Cabinet Members

- 13** The County Council was reminded that the Leader was required each year to give notice to the Council of her appointments to the Cabinet and allocation of Cabinet portfolios between the Cabinet Members, together with the appointment of Senior Advisers and Advisers to Cabinet Members.
- 14** The Council noted that Ms Goldsmith had given notice to the County Council of her appointments for the ensuing year, as set out on pages 27A to 27E.

Appointments

- 15** A Schedule setting out the nominations for the re-appointment of the chairmen, vice-chairmen and members of Select Committees and non-Executive committees and substitutes was circulated.
- 16** The schedule was agreed as set out at Appendix 2 attached.

Corporate Parenting Panel

- 17** The Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Panel moved the report of the recent work of the Panel (pages 28 to 29).
- 18** The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People agreed to look at a suggestion from Mr Baldwin that apprenticeships could be used to as a way of providing work for care leavers.
- 19** Resolved -
- (1) That the report be noted; and
 - (2) That members be asked to consider promoting the role of corporate parenting through County Local Committee meetings.

Notice of Motion by Mrs Pendleton

- 20** The following motion was moved by Mrs Pendleton and seconded by Mr Simmons.

'This Council recognises the excellent work that has been achieved over the lifetime of our Think Family programme. It has brought partners together to make a very real difference to some of our most vulnerable families whilst reducing demand on high cost specialist services. It not only realises a financial saving across numerous public services in the county, it also fully embraces our ambition give children the Best Start in Life. It also enhances economic productivity and social mobility.

This Council recognises with regret that the central government funding for this programme is due to finish in the 2019/20 financial year. In a

Minutes: Item 3

time of severe cost pressures this puts at risk the important preventative work undertaken with families to reduce the generational issue evidenced in Social work. Therefore this Council calls upon the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People to:

- (1) Lobby national government to continue funding this kind of focused preventative work around vulnerable families for at least another five years; and
- (2) Also ask the Government to ensure that any scheme retains the aspect of payment by results, in order to ensure the quality of the work and the ring-fencing of the funding in local authority budgets.'

21 The motion was carried.

Notice of Motion by Mrs Millson

22 The following motion was moved by Mrs Millson and seconded by Mr Baldwin.

'This Council notes that:

- (a) 105 - 110 young people (aged 16 or over) leave the care of West Sussex County Council every year, and begin the difficult transition out of care and into adulthood.
- (b) Research from The Centre for Social Justice found that over half (57%) of young people leaving care have difficulty managing their money and avoiding debt when leaving care.
- (c) This Council has statutory corporate parenting responsibilities towards young people who have left care up until the age of 25.
- (d) The Children and Social Work Act 2017 places corporate parenting responsibilities on district and borough councils for the first time, requiring them to have regard to children in care and care leavers when carrying out their functions.

This Council believes that:

- (1) To ensure that the transition from care to adult life is as smooth as possible, and to mitigate the chances of care leavers falling into debt as they begin to manage their own finances, the burden of council tax should be relieved until they are 25; and
- (2) Care leavers are a particularly vulnerable group for council tax debt.

This Council, therefore, resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People to use the County Council's convening powers and expertise in corporate parenting to work with all district and borough councils in West Sussex to explore the options for relieving the council tax

burden for all care leavers in the county up to the age of 25, sharing any arising costs proportionately, and to provide other such support as may be agreed.'

- 23** The motion was referred to the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People for consideration.

Question Time

- 24** Members asked questions of members of the Cabinet on matters relevant to their portfolios, questioned the Leader on matters currently relevant to the County Council and asked questions of chairmen, as set out at Appendix 4. This included questions on those matters contained within the Cabinet report (pages 30 to 43) and written questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 15(2) (set out at Appendix 3).

Waiver of Standing Orders re submission of review of the Constitution to Council

- 25** The Council noted that a technical review of the Constitution was underway, with oversight by the Governance Committee. Members were informed that it was expected that a revised text would be submitted to the Council in July for approval, on the recommendation of the Governance and Standards Committees. The review is intended to make the Constitution easier to understand and to reduce duplication.

No material changes to political governance arrangements were being considered. As the material is substantial and the changes technical, the Council was asked to agree to waive Standing Order 6(2) for the item, so that the draft revised Constitution could be issued electronically for the Council in July. Hard copies would be available on request. A report would set out the main changes being proposed.

- 26** Resolved -

That the waiver of Standing Orders be agreed.

Report of Urgent Action

- 27** The report of urgent action taken under regulation 11 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 (pages 44 and 45) was noted.

Chairman

The Council rose at 2.35 p.m.

Minutes: Item 3 - Appendix 1

Agenda Item No. 3 – Interests

Members declared interests as set out below. All the interests listed below were personal but not pecuniary or prejudicial unless indicated.

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
All items	Mr Boram	Member of Adur District Council
Item 9 – Report of the Corporate Parenting Panel	Mr Baldwin	Member of Horsham District Council
	Mr Cloake	Foster carer
	Mrs Jones	Care leaver
Item 11 – QT all paragraphs	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and Trustee of Sussex Learning Trust
	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council and Trustee of Coastal West Sussex Mind
Item 11 – QT paragraph 8 (Winter Resilience and Mobilisation)	Mrs Jones	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and Burgess Hill Town Council
Item 11 – QT paragraph 20 (Queen Victoria Hospital East Grinstead Archive Project)	Mrs Bennett	Stakeholder Governor of Queen Victoria Hospital NHS Trust
Item 11 – QT paragraph 27 (Loss of Water Supply)	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Portsmouth Water Customer Challenge Group
Item 11 – QT paragraph 29 (Pension Fund Pooling)	Mr Burrett	Deferred member of the Local Government Pension Scheme
	Mr Lanzer	Deferred member of the Local Government Pension Scheme
Item 11 – Written Question 8 (Talking Buses)	Mr Smytherman	President of Sight Support Worthing

**Nominations for Committees – April 2018
(excluding non-Council members*)**

Children and Young People's Services Select Committee (12)	Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee (12)	Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee (12)	Performance and Finance Select Committee (15)
Mr Baldwin Mrs Bennett Mr Cloake (Ch) Mrs Dennis Mrs Hall Mr High (V-Ch) Mrs Jones Ms Lord Mr Marshall Mrs Mullins Mrs Pendleton Mr Wickremaratchi	Mr Baldwin (Ch) Mr Barrett-Miles Lt Col Barton Mrs Bridges Mrs Brunsdon Mr Jones Mr McDonald (V-Ch) Mr S J Oakley Mr Oppler Mr Patel Mr Purchase Mrs Purnell	Mrs Arculus Lt Cdr Atkins Mrs Bridges Mr Edwards Mr Fitzjohn Ms Flynn Mrs Jones Dr O'Kelly Mr Petts Mrs Smith (Ch) Mr Turner (V-Ch) Dr Walsh	Mr Barrett-Miles Mr Boram Mr Bradbury Mr Cloake Mr Crow Mrs Dennis (V-Ch) Mr Elkins Mrs Kitchen Mr Lea (Ch) Mr Montyn Mrs Mullins Mr Smytherman Mr Turner Mr Waight Dr Walsh



Changes shown in bold, italic text.

20 April 2018

- 1.** Written question from **Mrs Millson** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Adults and Health**

Question

I understand that the Council has suspended admission of new County Council-funded residents to all Sussex Health Care homes, due to ongoing police investigations and safeguarding concerns. The term 'new residents' applies even when people are currently in the care of Sussex Health Care, but are being forced to move by circumstances beyond their control, so other homes in the group are not available to them.

Whilst recognising that the safety of residents for whom the Council is responsible is paramount, it is clear that there will be ramifications from this decision, in terms of the overall number of beds available (particularly in the north of the county), and the impact that any bed shortage may have on the ability of friends and family to visit residents placed outside their home area.

Can the Cabinet Member please advise the Council:

- (a) When this decision was made and how long this suspension is expected to continue?
- (b) Whether she is concerned about any impact this will have on the number of available beds in the Horsham area, particularly given the impending closure of the Rapkyns Care Home?
- (c) If this is the case, what actions are proposed to manage this shortage?
- (d) How are family members of residents of Rapkyns being supported to find suitable alternative placements for their relatives?
- (e) How many residents of Sussex Health Care Homes are currently funded by the County Council and how does the Cabinet Member intend to ensure their safety and that of all continuing residents in the interim period?
- (f) When local members will receive a full briefing on the decision and the full implications for the whole NHS and Social Care sector in the north of the county?

Answer

- (a) The decision was made on 13 March 2018 and the suspension will continue until we are satisfied that all our concerns have been adequately addressed.
- (b) The County Council has a statutory duty to make sure that there are sufficient care services for the local population. It commissions less than 11% of the beds available from Sussex Health Care (SHC). Currently

Minutes: Item 3 – Appendix 3

there are sufficient vacancies in Horsham and the surrounding areas to support individuals funded by the County Council. The decision to close Rapkyns Nursing Home was a business decision taken by SHC and took place before the suspension was put in place.

- (c) As stated it is not the case that there is a shortage of placements in the Horsham area. It may however be helpful for members to know that Adults' Services maintains and regularly updates a list of all vacancies across the county. Work is also taking place to invest capital into the care market to increase provision. This follows a market testing event with providers in late 2017.

The County Council continues to work with existing providers to establish opportunities to remodel services to meet the requirements of customers with complex needs. On 19 April there was a market event to explore the potential to develop new local provision for customers with complex needs who require high levels of care and nursing support.

- (d) All Rapkyns residents, wherever their funding comes from, have a named worker who is supporting them to find a suitable placement. Social work staff have attended relatives' meetings at Rapkyns, where families were able to ask questions and get information on alternative care home services. Advocates have also been arranged for people who have no family or friends to support them.
- (e) The Council funds 73 individuals in 15 SHC homes. There are planned visits by County Council social workers, occupational therapists, contract monitoring staff and CCG nurses across the services. Staff will make contact with a number of residents and their families, not just those funded by County Council during these visits. Visits also take place in the evenings and weekends when appropriate to monitor services. Safeguarding enquiries are continuing and the County Council is working with partners and the provider to improve services and make sure that residents are safe.
- (f) If the suspension of placements is not sufficient to improve services and the council has to consider different action then members will receive a further briefing. At the moment the impact of the suspension is not significant across the NHS and social care economy. However, the Cabinet Member would be pleased to liaise with individual members who have any specific concerns about their local residents.

2. Written question from **Mrs Mullins** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Education and Skills**

Question

I am aware of a petition calling for the Thomas Bennett Community College in Crawley to reverse proposed cuts that would see:

- the removal of the headteacher post;

- the closure of the sixth form in 2020; and
- a 20% cut in leadership posts, up to 15% cut in teachers (five posts of which are in the SEND department) and up to 32% cuts in support staff.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm:

- (a) What discussions he has had to date regarding this matter;
- (b) Whether he has any other concerns about the school;
- (c) What duties he has in terms of sixth form and special support centre provision; and
- (d) What powers he has to intervene.

Answer

I am concerned about the current issues regarding Thomas Bennett Community College, Crawley. As members will be aware, this is a TKAT (The Kernnal Academies Trust) Academy and therefore falls under the remit of the Regional Schools Commissioner. As a local authority we have no powers to intervene in any proposed restructure. However, the children are West Sussex children and, therefore, we need to ensure they are getting the best start in life and champion their education.

- (a) Because the College is an Academy, TKAT is not obliged to share any details of any proposals relating to Thomas Bennett Community College with the County Council. The Director of Education and Skills contacted the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of TKAT before the Easter holiday to get a clearer and first-hand picture of the situation. The Director will report back to the Cabinet Member as soon as any detailed information is secured.
- (b) I have discussed this matter with the Director of Education and Skills and voiced some concerns over the unsettling effect these proposals have had on the local community.
- (c) We do have a statutory duty to ensure the sufficiency of places and SEND provision and are assured that the Special Support Centre is not closing. However, when School Sixth Forms become unviable, they are sometimes closed and students travel to their nearest Sixth Form College for Post-16 studies. If the Sixth Form were to close, and at present no conversation has taken place around this proposal between the Director of Education and Skills and the TKAT CEO, then any such proposal would have been discussed at Trust level and with the Regional Schools Commissioner.
- (d) As I have already outlined, the local authority has no powers to intervene as an Academy is not within local authority control.

Minutes: Item 3 – Appendix 3

3. Written question from **Mr Jones** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources**

Question

The County Council recently published its gender pay gap figure of 7.75% which means that, on average, men earn 7.75% more than women within the County Council. There has been a lot of press recently regarding gender pay within academies, revealing that Schoolsworks Academy which has a number of schools in West Sussex has a median hourly pay gap in favour of men of 62%, meaning a woman working in that academy is paid £38p for every £1 earned by a man.

I understand the County Council's gender pay figure does not include schools and that those schools with more than 250 employees are required to publish their own information.

Whilst I appreciate the data for schools might not need to be published, given that many of the schools under this multi-academy trust were previously West Sussex County Council maintained schools, can the Cabinet Member tell me what the average gender pay figure is for schools in West Sussex with less than 250 employees:

- (a) Primary schools in West Sussex; and
- (b) Secondary schools.

Answer

Unfortunately, I am unable to provide you with the gender pay gap figure for employees in West Sussex (maintained) primary and secondary schools. Due to the complexities of calculating these figures we do not hold this information, and under current legislation we are not required to do so.

To explain some of the complexities of calculating the gender pay gap, we would need to take into account all the elements which make up an employee's pay. This would include such things as:

- calculation of allowances, bonus and shift payments to employees;
- carrying out calculations to remove the impact of hours of work to remove the part time/full time bias;
- analyse the casual/claims-based payroll to understand which casuals were working on the snap shot date; and
- carry out complex calculations for those employees on less than full pay (such as sick pay, maternity leave etc.).

I hope this is helpful in understanding why, on a voluntary basis, the County Council has not carried out these very complex calculations for West Sussex schools.

Finally, it is worth noting that the gender pay gap reporting deadline has now passed. This means that all organisations in the public and private sector should have published their results, and there is now a substantial amount of data about

gender pay gaps available for the County Council to review. In particular, the pay gaps of the Academy providers in West Sussex and the equivalent results for our neighbouring local authorities will be reviewed. This will enable the County Council to benchmark its results against a relevant local comparator group.

4. Written question from Mr Smytherman for reply by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

Question

At a Pension Panel meeting on 6 November 2017 there was a request from petitioners to divest the County Council pension fund from fossil fuels in future investments.

Please could the Cabinet Member, in his role as Chairman of the Pensions Panel, inform me of any progress towards this goal and if there is a proposed date for full divestment?

Answer

The County Council received a petition from Worthing Climate Action Network requesting that the County Council and Adur & Worthing Borough Council divest all their funds currently invested in fossil fuel companies and instead invest in renewable sources.

In consideration of the issues raised, the Panel noted 'the petition relating to investment in fossil fuel industries and will give due consideration to the issues and challenges it raises when considering future investment strategies.'

The Pensions Panel has directed the fund managers, in acting in the best financial interests of the Fund, to consider, amongst other factors, the effects of social, environmental and governance issues on the performance of a company when considering the acquisition, retention or realisation of investments for the Fund. As part of managing their portfolios, the investment in certain stocks will change over time but there are no instructions for them to divest from investment in a specific industry type or certain stocks.

This is consistent with the Pensions Panel's fiduciary and public law duties to scheme employers and to scheme members whereby the administering authority's power of investment must be exercised for investment purposes (wide variety of suitable investments which achieve the best financial position of the fund), and not for any wider purposes.

Finally, both managers have signed up to the United Nations Principles of Responsible Investment which has been set up by the United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative to encourage asset owners and asset managers to incorporate environmental, social and governance issues into investment analysis and decision making.

Minutes: Item 3 – Appendix 3

5. Written question from **Mrs Mullins** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure**

Question

I submitted a motion to the County Council in 2014 asking for a reviewing of urban parking arrangements within West Sussex - that motion was amended and agreed by the Council in March 2015. Following progress on the Chichester Road Space Audit, I was relieved to read in the 8 March 2017 edition of the Members' Information Service (MIS) that a Road Space Audit (RSA) for Crawley was seen as integral to the development of its growth programme commencing in the financial year 2017/18.

That edition of MIS went on to provide details of the timescales for preparatory work in respect of the Crawley RSA which anticipated a detailed project/cost plan for a Crawley RSA being produced by mid/late June 2017. Having subsequently enquired about delays I was told it had taken longer than first thought to fully agree the requirements of the discovery phase with the County Council's consultants, along with the associated resources.

As far as I can see this project is almost a year behind schedule because work does not appear to have moved out of the discovery phase yet.

Can the Cabinet Member please let me have an updated timetable for this project, explain the reason for the delays and assure me that adequate funding for carrying out the audit is in place?

Answer

Preparatory work on the Crawley RSA did start slightly behind schedule in May 2017 and County Council and Crawley Borough Council members were advised of this via e-mail on 22 May 2017. In August 2017 all members were subsequently invited to workshops at Crawley Borough Council that would present the results of the preparatory work (aka 'the discovery phase') and also seek to determine the scope of the RSA. To avoid summer holidays the workshops took place in September 2017.

The feedback report from the workshops, including an agreed scope for the RSA, was presented to officers and members in early January 2018, effectively marking the end of the discovery phase.

Following the feedback all parties were advised that work would continue on each element of the scope. The first outcomes of this work will be reported back to members in the next two to three weeks.

A programme for the project is available at request should any member wish to see this. Funding for this project is in the budget for 2018/19.

6. Written question from **Mr S J Oakley** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure**

Question

Government consultations on the Revised National Planning Policy Framework and reforms to the Developer Contributions system

What consequences, changes and issues have County Council Officers identified in the proposals contained in the above consultations that may affect County Council Policies and its ability to deliver the infrastructure required to support the major housing growth expected to be delivered in West Sussex? In particular, does the proposed Housing Delivery Test and its effect on whether a Local Development Plan can be considered up to date pose a challenge to the County Council in its being able to obtain/deliver Local Development Plan-led infrastructure, given local authorities have little or no control over the delivery/rate of delivery of new housing?

Answer

With regard to the County Council's statutory planning policies for minerals and waste, the proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are not considered to have any major implications and are unlikely to require any substantive changes to be made to adopted or approved policies.

With regard to the delivery of infrastructure (such as highways and transport, education, libraries) required to support housing growth, the proposed changes to the NPPF are not considered to have any major implications and are unlikely to require any substantive changes to be made to corporate policies or processes.

The proposed introduction of the Housing Delivery Test may result in the need for increases in housing numbers, over and above those currently planned for in adopted/soon-to-be adopted local plans. Any planned increases in housing numbers (and/or the rates of delivery) are likely to have significant resource implications for the County Council with regard to the need for new or improved infrastructure to support the delivery of the new homes.

There are likely to be financial and other challenges for the County Council with regard to planning, delivering and funding any additional infrastructure that is required. However, the impacts are likely to vary by service and by area; much will depend on the type and scale of infrastructure that is required and the timing of delivery over the short, medium and long-term (during the 15-year timeframe of each local plan).

The proposed changes to the developer contributions system are likely to have one positive impact through the removal of the pooling restrictions on the use of s106 contributions in those areas where the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) has been adopted. Therefore, allocating s106 and CIL funding to infrastructure is likely to be more straightforward in those parts of West Sussex where CIL is in place (which currently excludes the non-South Downs National Park parts of Adur, Arun and Mid Sussex Districts).

Minutes: Item 3 – Appendix 3

However, the proposed changes do not address the flaws in the current system with regard to the role of County Councils as key infrastructure providers (including for education, and highways and transport) in two-tier areas. First, it does not propose to give upper-tier authorities a statutory role in the CIL process, including the allocation of the levy to priority items. Second, although the consultation paper refers to giving combined authorities and joint committees with strategic planning powers the ability to introduce a Strategic Infrastructure Tariff to fund new or improved services, it does not propose to make this ability available to upper-tier authorities, such as the County Council, in areas without devolved powers.

7. Written question from **Mr Quinn** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure**

Question

Many of the roads around the county are in an appalling state, being either riddled with potholes or suffering from crumbling edges. I appreciate this is as a result of the recent bad weather conditions and am aware the Government has recently provided funding from its pothole action fund to address some of the problem.

I understand the intention was for a new contract for highways maintenance to be in place from July 2018. Can the Cabinet Member please:

- (a) Confirm that arrangements for the new highways maintenance contract remain on track;
- (b) Outline what contractual measures are in place to guarantee the arrangements for repairing potholes will continue to be addressed in the final stages of the Balfour Beatty contract;
- (c) Advise whether the additional funding will see additional pothole gangs introduced to speed up repairs as has been done previously; and
- (d) Provide details of the number of claims relating to pothole damage in the period November 2017 to February 2018, as follows:
 - (i) received by the County Council;
 - (ii) paid out; and
 - (iii) the amount paid in respect of each accepted claim.

Please also provide comparative information for the same periods in the respect of the previous two winters.

Answer

- (a) We are currently addressing some legal and technical difficulties which have prevented the award of the new Highway Term Maintenance

Contract. Mitigating measures are in place and the County Council is fully engaged in making plans and service arrangements arising from the contractual delay to ensure full continuity of service.

- (b) Balfour Beatty are currently under contract until the end of June 2018. All work carried out before the end of the contract is guaranteed for a minimum of 12 months depending on the work type. In the latter stages of the contract a retention clause is activated which allows the Council to withhold funds, which can be used to rectify any unsatisfactory repairs, in the unlikely event that Balfour Beatty do not meet their obligations.
- (c) Part of the additional funding will be used to deploy three extra pothole repair gangs which are programmed to start work in the week commencing 16 April 2018.
- (d) The number of claims relating to pothole damage in the period November 2017 to February 2018 is laid out below, in the format requested, together with comparative information for same period over the previous two years.
 - (i) Claims received by the County Council:

Nov 17 – Feb 18	319
Nov 16 – Feb 17	163
Nov 15 – Feb 16	351
 - (ii) Amount paid out by the County Council:

Nov 17 – Feb 18	£8,474.05*
Nov 16 – Feb 17	£17,905.03
Nov 15 – Feb 16	£22,075.74**

* claims settled to date £520.27
** excludes personal injury claim(s) of £79,237.86
 - (iii) Please tables below for details of the amount paid in respect of each accepted claim.

Minutes: Item 3 – Appendix 3

Question 7(d)(iii) - Accepted Pothole Claims

Accident Date	Claim Date	Date Claim Settled	Incident Description	Damage Description	Paid To Date	Property Damage Paid Out
06/11/15	11/11/15	13/07/16	Pothole	Driver side tyre damaged	£42.00	
05/01/16	11/01/16	15/07/16	Pothole	Puncture to FNS tyre	£44.00	
02/02/16	22/02/16	11/08/16	Pothole	NSR tyre	£51.25	
16/11/15	02/12/15	18/07/16	Pothole	NSF Tyre blown	£54.90	
19/01/16	05/02/16	10/08/16	Pothole	NSF tyre	£57.01	
18/02/16	18/02/16	11/08/16	pothole	wheel	£65.16	
16/01/16	27/01/16	10/08/16	Pothole	NSF tyre	£67.87	
29/12/15	12/01/15	27/06/16	Pothole	NSF Tyre	£70.80	
02/02/16	08/02/16	28/07/16	Pothole	NSF tyre	£73.14	
11/01/16	14/01/16	27/06/16	Pothole	FSF tyre	£80.00	
15/02/16	31/03/16	06/05/16	Pothole	OSR wheel	£84.00	
27/01/16	05/02/16	15/07/16	Pothole	NSF wheel	£85.64	
16/02/16	24/02/16	14/10/16	Pothole	OSF tyre	£87.12	
18/12/15	01/02/16	02/12/16	Pothole	NSF tyre	£88.50	
18/02/16	27/05/16	02/12/16	pothole	tyre	£90.25	
27/11/15	21/01/16	13/10/16	Pothole	NSF	£90.50	
29/12/15	21/01/16	10/08/16	Pothole	NSF tyre	£93.00	
07/11/15	16/11/15	26/05/16	Pothole	Offside Front Tyre Damaged	£100.00	
07/01/16	26/01/16	10/08/16	Pothole	NSF tyre and wheel	£105.50	
08/12/15	08/01/16	24/06/16	Pothole	NSF tyre	£106.39	
27/01/16	10/02/16	30/06/16	Pothole	NSF tyre	£106.79	
29/02/16	10/04/16	12/10/16	Pothole	OSF tyre	£116.00	
28/02/16	22/03/16	09/05/16	Pothole	OSF wheel	£117.60	
03/02/16	22/03/16	22/11/16	Pothole	NSF wheel	£121.00	
17/01/16	15/03/16	21/11/16	Pothole	Damage underneath the car	£125.00	
22/02/16	26/02/16	08/04/16	Pothole	NSR tyre and wheel	£128.00	
29/02/16	29/03/16	08/12/16	Pothole	OSF tyre	£129.05	
15/02/16	19/04/16	01/07/16	Pothole	NSF tyre and track rod	£136.21	
30/01/16	24/02/16	13/10/16	Pothole	NS F&R wheel and tyre	£141.57	
10/01/16	28/01/16	12/10/16	Pothole	NS F&R tyres	£147.78	
13/01/16	26/01/16	28/07/16	2 Potholes	NSF tyre and alloy rim	£151.45	
15/01/16	25/01/16	20/09/17	Pothole	OSF tyre	£151.45	
24/02/16	11/03/16	09/05/16	Pothole	NSF wheel and tyre	£165.34	
18/11/15	09/12/15	01/07/16	Pothole	NSF tyre	£166.21	
29/11/15	29/11/15	11/08/16	Pothole that was covered by standing water	OSF tyre	£168.00	
29/01/16	22/02/16	06/04/16	Pothole	NSF alloy wheel and tyre	£170.00	
04/01/16	11/01/16	10/08/16	Pothole	NSF Tyre and NSR Tyre	£170.59	
15/12/15	24/12/15	05/12/16	Pothole	NSF Tyre	£177.26	
05/12/15	23/12/15	06/12/16	Pothole	NSF tyre	£191.67	
27/02/16	09/03/16	14/10/16	Pothole	OS F&R wheels	£195.19	
28/01/16	12/02/16	02/12/16	Pothole	NSR wheel	£203.81	
15/02/16	02/03/16	13/10/16	Pothole	Failure to NSF suspension	£216.99	
06/01/16	11/01/16	26/05/16	Pothole	NSF Tyre	£219.00	
22/11/15	22/11/15	18/07/17	Pothole	NSF wheel and tyre damaged	£226.00	
12/01/16	07/12/16	27/07/17	pothole	exhaust pipe knocked off	£230.86	
26/12/15	29/03/16	07/12/16	Pothole	NS Coil spring	£232.21	
13/02/16	23/02/16	30/06/16	Pothole	NS F&R wheels	£236.91	
30/01/16	16/02/16	10/08/16	Pothole	NSF tyre and NSF coil spring	£237.18	
19/02/16	26/02/16	26/05/16	Pothole	NSF wheel and tyre wheel alignment affected	£255.87	
19/02/16	03/08/16	08/11/16	pothole	rear drivers side tyre damaged	£261.50	
19/02/16	25/02/16	14/10/16	Pothole	NSF tyre and wheel	£322.36	
05/02/16	10/02/16	30/06/16	Pothole	NSF tyre and wheel	£335.99	
10/01/16	02/02/16	17/10/16	Pothole	NSF wheel, alloy and tyre	£340.50	
08/01/16	15/03/16	01/08/17	Pothole	OSR tyre and wheel	£354.90	
22/12/15	15/01/16	11/08/16	Pothole	NSF tyre, OSF tyre, split front feuder	£375.70	
13/11/15	18/04/16	02/12/16	Pothole	Wishbone, bulb, NSF tyre and coil spring	£390.00	
25/02/16	29/07/16	08/11/16	pothole	damage to OSR wheel	£395.00	
27/01/16	20/02/16	12/04/16	Pothole	NSF wheel and tyre NSR wheel, adjustments to tracking and suspension	£410.86	
29/02/16	12/04/16	12/10/16	Pothole	OSF wheel and tyre	£413.97	
07/02/16	12/02/16	30/06/16	Pothole	NSF wheel buckeled and tyre damaged	£433.34	
16/02/16	24/02/16	12/10/16	Pothole	NSF tyre and alloy wheel	£433.74	
27/02/16	08/03/16	17/10/16	Pothole	OS F&R wheels	£504.00	
10/11/15	18/01/16	13/10/16	Pothole	NSF tyre	£573.74	
21/01/16	26/01/16	14/10/16	Pothole	NSF tyre and wheel	£758.08	
16/11/15	19/01/16	12/10/16	Pothole	NSF tyre and NSR tyre	£800.00	
29/11/15	16/02/16	10/08/16	Pothole	OS F&R tyres sensor	£881.11	
07/02/16	30/03/16	14/10/16	Pothole	NSF wheel	£1,274.78	
15/12/15	08/02/16	08/12/16	Pothole	NSF tyre, dented door & side skirt strip, distorted NSF suspension & steering	£1,490.04	
26/02/16	22/02/16	30/06/16	pothole	Wheel and tyre	£1,576.82	
15/12/15	15/01/16	22/11/16	Pothole	Both NS tyres and gearbox damage	£2,744.29	
27/12/15	19/04/16		Pothole	Blind in right eye, heavy cuts and bruising to face, internal bleeding on the brain, fracture to cheek bone, fracture to eye socket and head injury	£18,706.73	£0.00
01/11/15	21/12/15		Pothole	Fracture to left clavicle, ulna, vertebrae and ribs.	£60,964.13	£433.00
					£101,313.60	£22,075.74

Minutes: Item 3 - Appendix 3

Accident Date	Claim Date	Date Claim Settled	Incident Description	Damage Description	Paid To Date	Property Damage Paid Out
2016-17						
11/02/17	02/03/17	04/10/17	Pothole	Side wall of tyre split	£60.00	
28/02/17	03/04/17	02/10/17	Pothole	Tyre damage	£96.18	
13/02/17	07/03/17	09/10/17	Pothole	Burst tyre	£98.99	
22/02/17	01/03/17	13/10/17	Pothole	Rear drivers side tyre split	£103.08	
06/02/17	24/02/17	22/08/17	Pothole	Tyre wall damaged	£112.40	
31/01/17	20/02/17	26/09/17	Pothole	Split Tyre	£112.50	
10/01/17	27/01/17	26/09/17	Pothole	Puncture to rear driver side tyre	£130.99	
03/02/17	23/02/17	02/10/17	Pothole	Tyre damage	£135.36	
15/01/17	28/03/17	02/10/17	Pothole	Damage to front left tyre	£138.94	
29/01/17	13/02/17	12/10/17	Pothole	NSF tyre	£147.93	
16/01/17	06/02/17	22/08/17	Pothole	Exhaust brackets broken underneath car	£156.00	
14/02/17	28/02/17		Pothole	Buckled front offside, front nearside, rear offside and rear nearside wheel. Puctured tyre.	£162.00	
28/12/16	25/01/17	20/09/17	Pothole	Rear offside buckled/dented alloy and damaged tyre	£185.94	
22/02/17	06/03/17		Pothole	Damage to shock absorber	£195.00	
01/11/16	28/11/16	01/08/17	pothole	vehicle damage	£216.00	
12/01/17	02/02/17	02/10/17	Pothole	Right tyre flat	£243.00	
13/02/17	28/02/17	31/08/17	Pothole	Damage to front nearside tyre	£249.98	
07/02/17	14/03/17	27/09/17	Pothole	Damage to front nearside wheel rim and tyre.	£317.45	
04/02/17	20/03/17	22/08/17	Potholes	Tyre damage	£339.98	
17/02/17	20/03/17		Pothole	Damage to mounts, shock absorber and tracking.	£463.00	
21/01/17	14/02/17	22/08/17	Pothole	NSF NSR tyres	£537.29	
04/01/17	02/02/17	03/08/17	Potholes	Front passenger wheel damage	£621.12	
03/02/17	20/02/17	22/08/17	Pothole	Damage to nearside left tyre/alloy wheel.	£747.95	
02/02/17	20/02/17	23/08/17	Pothole	Near side front and near side rear tyres are both damaged.	£780.00	
10/02/17	07/04/17	26/03/18	Pothole	Damage to nearside suspension and right hand door mechanism.	£800.00	
23/02/17	16/03/17	02/10/17	Pothole	Split tyre and broken coil spring.	£803.92	
12/01/17	25/01/17	20/11/17	Pothole	Ripped tyre and gauged alloy wheel. Front driver side.	£898.71	
28/02/17	01/06/17		Pothole	Puctured front tyre with ripped sidewall. Buckled rear wheel.	£913.92	
15/01/17	31/01/17	23/05/17	Pothole	Sidewall damage to front and rear tyre. Leaking from dent in front wheel. Window chip has turned into crack.	£945.85	
04/02/17	08/03/17	27/09/17	Pothole	Buckled wheel	£960.00	
16/01/17	19/01/17	23/05/17	Pothole	Front left wheel damaged. A blow out and rim damage and torn mudguard. Geometry to be assessed.	£6,231.55	
					£17,905.03	
2017-18						
27/12/17	11/01/18		Pothole	NSF tyre	£62.22	
15/01/18	19/02/18		Pothole	Damage to front tyre	£66.99	
06/11/17	22/01/18		Pothole	Damage to Inner wall of left front tyre	£67.20	
14/12/17	28/12/17		Pothole	NSF tyre	£72.00	
13/11/17	30/11/17		Pothole	NSF and NSR tyres damages	£75.00	
14/12/17	22/12/17		Pothole	NSF tyre	£83.00	
16/01/18	15/02/18	19/03/18	Pothole	Puncture to front right tyre	£88.27	
20/12/17	23/02/18		Pothole/drain	Damage to front alloy wheel	£100.00	
19/12/17	23/02/18		Pothole/Drain	Damage to front O/S Tyre	£111.74	
13/12/17	22/12/17		Pothole	NSF tyre	£119.00	
29/01/18	08/03/18		Large Pothole	Damage to both O/S tyres and exhaust	£124.68	
26/01/18	08/03/18		Large Pothole	Damage to front O/S tyre and alignment	£125.23	
14/12/17	06/03/18		Pothole	Front passenger tyre popped and damage to tracking	£134.46	
26/01/18	08/03/18		Large Pothole	Front O/S tyre damaged	£144.00	
04/12/17	14/12/17		Pothole	NSF tyre and wheel damage and NSR wheel damaged	£187.07	
09/02/18	08/03/18		Pothole	Front tyre on driver side damaged, which caused a flat tyre	£205.19	
24/01/18	08/03/18		Pothole	Damage to both O/S Tyres and wheels	£228.00	
14/12/17	11/01/18		Pothole	NSF alloy wheel and tyre	£250.01	
14/11/17	27/11/17		Pothole	NSF broken and snapped coil spring which sheared off pierunk and damage to shock absorbers which caused fluid leak	£302.91	
14/12/17	03/01/18		Pothole	NSF tyre, alloy wheel and tracking damage	£347.00	
20/12/17	25/01/18		Pothole	Damage to front N/S Wheel and Tyre	£381.36	
11/12/17	22/01/18	19/03/18	Pothole	Tyre Damage	£432.00	
26/01/18	08/03/18		Pothole	Both O/S Tyres damaged	£478.68	
03/01/18	02/02/18		Pothole	Damage to Both N/S tyres	£560.01	
14/11/17	30/11/17		Pothole	NFS Wheel alloy damage	£580.02	
24/11/17	04/12/17		Pothole	OS rear and front tyres damaged and damage to both rims	£684.00	
09/02/18	08/03/18		Pothole	drivers side front tyre damaged on the join on the sidewall.	£1,080.00	
14/12/17	18/01/18		Pothole	Both N/S alloy wheels buckled, front N/S coil spring snapped	£1,384.01	
					£8,474.05	

8. Written question from **Mr Smytherman** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure**

Question

Talking Buses

- (a) On 8 March 2018 the Cabinet Member issued a press release titled 'Giving voice to high-tech signs to help visually-impaired passengers'. A total of £900,000 from the Crawley Growth Programme has been used to replace older displays which had no audio with new key fobs. Can the Cabinet Member confirm which blind and visually impaired organisations were consulted on providing the key fob solution?
- (b) I understand that had the Council asked either the RNIB or Guide Dogs UK, the Council would have been encouraged to work with the bus provider and spend the £900,000 on 'talking buses' instead. The provider in Crawley is Metrobus and four out of the 47 routes they run currently are already 'talking buses'; therefore, the company already has this technology in place. Will the Cabinet Member in future, when rolling out technological solutions for the visually impaired and blind people in other parts of the county, consult local and national visually impaired charities to ensure the right solution is delivered with the funds that are available?

Answer

- (a) For this particular Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) project, no blind and visually impaired organisations were consulted on providing the key fob solution. The audio announcement technology (activated by the key fob) is readily available and is already being used at over 115 RTPI displays at bus stop locations across the county. The solution was originally designed by the RNIB. It is the County Council's standard practice to make the audio facility available on all new RTPI displays installed in West Sussex.

The RTPI displays installed in Crawley in 2005/06 did not have the audio announcement facility and the displays had also come to the end of their life. The £900,000 investment (fully supported by Metrobus) was to replace the existing RTPI displays and install new displays at other bus stop locations. There was no additional cost to development or incorporate the audio announcement facility.

- (b) The County Council works in close partnership with the local bus operators (in this particular case Metrobus) to deliver benefits for all bus users. Metrobus are currently investing in 'talking buses' (audio announcements on the bus) and plan to extend this to cover all of their 143 buses on all routes by the end of May 2018. The full cost of this investment is being made by Metrobus.

The key fobs solution (provide by the County Council) helps those waiting for a bus by providing audio announcements on departure times of bus services at the bus stop. The 'talking buses' solution (provided by

Metrobus) is located on the bus itself and provides information on when/where to alight from the bus. Both solutions use established technologies and complement each other. If different technological solutions are considered in the future, then the consultation will take place with the relevant organisations.

9. Written question from Mr Jones for reply by the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities

Question

We have previously heard worrying reports that up to half the County's fire engines cannot be used, because retained firefighters are not available.

In a recent presentation to the Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee we were told that, at weekends, as few as ten are available. This Council is legally required to provide an efficient fire and rescue service, but it is clearly failing at times when over 70% of fire engines cannot respond to emergencies.

With eight fire engines crewed by whole-time firefighters at weekends that means up to a staggering 93% of the fire engines crewed by retained firefighters are not in a position to respond to emergencies, and surely, therefore, cannot assist if an incident occurs, effectively rendering them useless. Despite the best efforts of senior officers, the situation has been getting steadily worse.

It is time for the political leadership of this Council to take radical action to deal with this crisis. Members of the Select Committee made a number of suggestions, so can the Cabinet Member please tell us what action she has taken. Can she also tell us what further action she intends taking to ensure that residents of West Sussex are properly protected at all times

Answer

The West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service (WSFRS) Retained Duty System (RDS) officers are highly professional and incredibly committed to providing the Service with exceptional levels of availability. Despite such commitment, it is not possible to cover all of the West Sussex retained stations all of the time, which has always been the case. This is the fundamental difference between whole-time resources and RDS resources.

There are significant challenges in attracting and retaining RDS staff in modern times. Notably these are issues of pay, the huge demands and importance WSFRS places on training and maintaining competencies, the lack of flexibility in providing cover within four minutes of the retained fire station, reluctance of local businesses to release their staff for RDS commitments, the increase of primary employment being out of county and the reduction in operational incidents. All of these are significant factors that affect RDS numbers and by extension RDS availability, this is despite consistent and concerted efforts to recruit and retain RDS staff.

Minutes: Item 3 – Appendix 3

The aforementioned challenges are very much national issues, being addressed as a priority by the National Fire Chief's Council and locally within WSFRS, through a number of high priority projects and initiatives. As these are supported by the Cabinet Member and include initiatives for West Sussex they provide a summary of the actions and planned actions to address the concerns expressed. These include:

- (a) The re-introduction of Retained Liaison Officers (RLO) and Support Officers (RSO) to alleviate some of the administration and management pressures currently placed upon RDS unit leaders, also to support and deliver RDS recruitment, retention and training events. The main reason for an RDS fire engine not being available is due to the lack of a supervisory officer or a driver. Therefore, these officers will also provide essential crewing in both capacities at retained stations, thus improving overall availability.
- (b) New crewing proposals are being consulted upon which would allow whole-time staff to be used to provide additional crewing at retained stations, often making the difference between a retained fire engine being available or unavailable. This additional cover would be centrally co-ordinated by a crewing officer, to ensure that current RDS availability is optimised.
- (c) New crewing proposals would also increase the prevention and protection activities WSFRS undertakes in the rural areas, which are more often covered by RDS staff.
- (d) In addition to this, WSFRS is currently implementing new arrangements that will allow some of the retained staff to provide additional whole-time cover, thereby giving them access to additional opportunities to enhance their pay; this being a significant issue for people leaving the retained service. This will also allow WSFRS to enhance the level of weekend cover provided, which is a particular pinch point for availability. This initiative is in tandem with efforts to encourage RDS staff to provide more of their retained availability at weekends where the whole-time cover is at its lowest.
- (e) WSFRS has also provided better opportunities for retained staff to access whole-time jobs, which is always seen as an attractor to retained recruitment.
- (f) WSFRS is also working to expedite the process from initial attraction and recruitment of potential RDS staff through to training, ensuring there are no unnecessary delays in developing new RDS firefighters.
- (g) WSFRS is currently researching and developing options for our retained staff to safely crew fire engines with fewer than four operational staff. This will be supported by the introduction of new training and equipment to ensure safe systems of work can be employed and operational activities are both efficient and effective.
- (h) The WSFRS Management Team regularly meets both Retained Officers and with Representative Bodies to ensure it is doing all that can be done to improve overall RDS support, availability and performance.

- 10.** Written question from **Dr Walsh** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities**

Question

The Birling Gap chemical haze incident last year was managed using Sussex Resilience Forum inter-agency procedures, which are signed up to by West Sussex County Council and West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service. Concerns have been voiced publicly about the handling of the incident.

- (a) Can the Cabinet Member confirm that the Sussex Resilience Forum has held a debrief on the incident and that a report on findings and recommendations has been published?
- (b) Can the Cabinet Member give any reassurance that lessons have been learnt and that a similar incident affecting the West Sussex coast would be better managed?

Answer

- (a) A Sussex Resilience Forum (SRF) multi-agency structured debrief was held on 9 November 2017 with representatives from all agencies involved in the Birling Gap incident which occurred on 27 and 28 August 2017. The debrief was conducted by NHS England as the lead agency and supported by Sussex Police. A report was published on 11 January 2018 and shared with all members of the SRF via the national resilience intranet system, Resilience Direct. A copy of the report is filed and available to all those with access.
- (b) Areas for improvement and areas of good practice were identified in the report and a series of recommendations made available to the Chairmen of the SRF Delivery and Executive Groups. The recommendations are in the process of being actioned by the relevant identified leads and several have already been completed. The recommendations made were in line with the Joint Organisational Learning framework which was developed to ensure future incidents were managed as effectively as possible.

Minutes: Item 3 – Appendix 4

Agenda Item No. 11 - Question Time

Members asked questions of members the Cabinet and chairmen as set out below. In instances where a Cabinet Member, the Leader or a chairman undertook to take follow-up action, this is also noted below.

Best Start in Life

Paragraph 1, Transforming Children and Young People's Mental Health Provision: Government Green Paper (Cabinet Member for Children and Young People), from Mrs Arculus, Mrs Dennis, Mrs Jones, Ms Lord and Dr O'Kelly.

In response to a question from Dr O'Kelly the Cabinet Member agreed to let her know the average wait for non-urgent appointments, whether they met the standards, were better or worse than average and how they compared to previous years and to neighbouring authorities.

In response to a question from Ms Lord about peri-natal support for mothers under 18, the Cabinet Member agreed to respond to Ms Lord with details.

Paragraph 3, Teasel Close Residential Children's Homes retains Outstanding rating Ofsted (Cabinet Member for Children and Young People), from Mr Crow and Mr Oxlade.

In response to a request from Mr Crow, the Cabinet Member agreed to pass on members' congratulations to the manager.

Paragraph 5, School Recruitment Fairs 2018 (Cabinet Member for Education and Skills), from Mrs Duncton and Mrs Mullins.

Written Question 2, Thomas Bennett Community College (Cabinet Member for Education and Skills), from Mrs Millson and Mrs Mullins.

A Prosperous Place

Paragraph 7, Local Enterprise Partnership – Strategic Economic Plan (Leader/Economy), from Mr Barling.

Paragraph 9, Real Time Passenger Information Displays (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Dr Dennis and Mr S J Oakley.

In response to questions from Dr Dennis as to whether funding was in place for the routine maintenance of the system and whether there was scope for small summary displays under bus stop flags at lesser-used locations, the Cabinet Member said he would respond to Dr Dennis. In relation to bus stops without displays, the Cabinet Member also agreed to raise the issue of publicising the code for the text messaging system with bus companies.

In response to a question from Mr Oakley about where the money would come from to replace the displays when necessary given the initial funding was from one-off S106 monies, the Cabinet Member said he would respond to Mr Oakley.

Mid Sussex District Plan (Leader), from Mr Bradbury and Mrs Jones.

A Strong, Safe and Sustainable Place

Paragraph 13, Cycling Initiatives (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Mr Buckland, Dr O'Kelly and Mr S J Oakley.

Paragraph 14, Defra's Air Quality Grant for Local Community Projects (Cabinet Member for Environment), from Mr Marshall and Mrs Mullins.

Paragraph 15, Dementia Action Week (Cabinet Member for Adults and Health), from Mrs Jones, Ms Kennard, Mr S J Oakley and Mr Quinn.

In response to an invitation from Mrs Jones to visit the virtual dementia tour in Burgess Hill on 24 May, the Cabinet Member said she would attend if she could.

Paragraph 19, Waste Week 2018 (Cabinet Member for Environment), from Mr Elkins.

Paragraph 20, Queen Victoria Hospital East Grinstead Archive Project (Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Mrs Bennett.

Written Question 7, potholes, from Mrs Millson.

Written Question 9, Fire and Rescue Service, and Fire and Rescue Service cuts (Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Mr Jones, Mr Purchase and Dr Walsh.

In response to questions from Dr Walsh as to whether the Cabinet Member was aware of specific implications of service availability and response times from current service plans and whether she would take similar action to the Leader of the Isle of Wight Council who had led his Council to vote out similar proposals, the Cabinet Member said she would respond to Dr Walsh.

In relation to the consultation on the Fire & Rescue Service Integrated Risk Management Plan, in response to a question from Mr Purchase the Cabinet Member agreed to write to Mr Purchase with the dates and venues of consultation meetings.

Bank closures (Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities/Leader), from Ms Lord.

In response to a question from Ms Lord about bank branch closures and the impact particularly on rural communities, the Leader said the Cabinet Member was due to meet NatWest Bank shortly to see how the bank and the Council could work together to minimise the issues in rural areas, particularly for the elderly and small businesses, and that the Leader and the Cabinet Member would report back following the meeting. The Leader also agreed to write to other banks to see if they were prepared to discuss their plans for branch closures.

Potholes and comparative figures for neighbouring counties (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Mr Jupp and Mr Waight.

Review of proposals to increase parking charges (Cabinet Member for Highways

Minutes: Item 3 – Appendix 4

and Infrastructure), from Mr Jones.

Independence in Later Life

Paragraph 24, Community Reablement Service (Cabinet Member for Adults and Health), from Ms Flynn.

A Council that works for the Community

Paragraph 25, Government and Parliamentary Engagement (Leader), from Mr Smytherman.

Paragraph 27, Loss of Water Supply (Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Mr Bradbury, Mrs Dennis and Mr S J Oakley.

In response to a question from Mr Bradbury, the Cabinet Member agreed to let him know the time scale for the review of the water supply resilience arrangements, what the outputs would be and when he would be able to communicate them to the residents of Cuckfield.

Equality, in response to a question from Mr Oxlade about the Equality Act and why the Council did not feature in the 2015/16, 2016/17 or 2017/18 Stonewall equality indexes Cabinet Member agreed to respond to him.