

West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

14 February 2014

At an Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 14 February 2014, at County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mrs A J Jupp (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Mr R A Lanzer
Mrs P A C Arculus	Mr G V McAra
Mr D H Barling	Mr P G Metcalfe
Mr L H Barnard	Mrs M E Millson
Mr A J Barrett-Miles	Mrs J S Mockridge
Mr P J J Bradbury	Mr J A P Montyn
Mr M J Brown	Mrs S R Mullins
Mrs H A Brunsdon	Mr R J Oakley
Mr I J R Buckland	Mr S J Oakley
Mr R D Burrett	Mr F R J Oppler
Mr P C Catchpole	Mr C G Oxlade
Mr P J Circus	Mr L W Parsons
Mr M R Clark	Mr A Patel
Mr M A Cloake	Mr A P Petch
Mr D G Crow	Mr N F Peters
Dr N P S Dennis	Mrs J E Phillips
Mrs J E Duncton	Mr B J Quinn
Mrs E M Evans	Mrs A M Rapnik
Mr P C Evans	Mr J L Rogers
Mrs C M Field	Mr R Rogers
Mr M J Glennon	Mr D P Sheldon
Ms M L Goldsmith	Mr B A Smith
Mrs P A Hall	Mrs B A Smith
Mr P D High	Mr R J Smytherman
Mr S R Hillier	Mr A C Sutcliffe
Mr J C Hunt	Mr B W Turner
Ms S James	Mr G M Tyler
Mrs A F Jones, MBE	Mrs D L Urquhart
Mr G L Jones	Mr S G Waight
Mr M G Jones	Dr J M M Walsh, KStJ, RD
Ms D M K Kennard	Mr B R A D Watson, OBE
Mrs E Kitchen	Mr D R Whittington
Mr P K Lamb	Mr L S Wickremaratchi

Apologies and attendance

121 Apologies were received from Mrs Bennett, Mr Griffiths Mr O'Brien and Mr Rae. Mr Smytherman gave his apologies for the afternoon session. Mr Cloake left at 4.20 p.m., Mr Bradbury, Mr Waight and Mr Wickremaratchi left at 4.30 p.m. and Mr Quinn left at 5.00 p.m.

Minutes

Deaths of Mr Tony Weaver and Mrs Pat Webster

- 122 The Chairman reported the deaths of two former members of the Council – Mr Tony Weaver who represented the Imberdown electoral division from 1993 to 1997 and Mrs Pat Webster who represented the Cuckfield Rural electoral division from 2003 to 2005.
- 123 The Council stood for a minute's silence.

Interests

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

Minutes

- 125 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 13 December 2013 (pages 205 to 227) be approved as a correct record.

Result of By-Election

- 126 The Council received the County Returning Officer's return of the by-election held on 19 December 2013 for the county councillor for the Haywards Heath East Electoral Division.

Review of Proportionality

- 127 The County Council was reminded of its statutory duty to review the proportionality on its committees following the by-election. A paper on the application of the proportionality rules and how they were applied was set out at pages 229 and 230 together with a table showing the number of seats on committees.
- 128 Resolved –
- That the review of proportionality on committees be agreed.

Appointments to Committees

- 129 The following changes to appointments were made which took effect from the end of the meeting:

Committee	Change
Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee	Mr Hillier to fill vacancy
Performance and Finance Select Committee	Mrs Kitchen to fill vacancy
Pensions Panel	Mr M G Jones in place of Mr Lamb

Appointment of Independent Person to advise the Standards Committee

130 The Council considered recommendation that Mr Kieran Diamond be appointed as an Independent Person to advise the Standards Committee (page 231).

131 Resolved -

That Mr Kieran Diamond be appointed as an Independent Person to advise the Standards Committee for an initial period of four years.

Governance Committee: New Corporate Leadership Structure

132 The County Council was asked to consider and approve the removal of the post of Chief Executive, the allocation of the role of Head of Paid Service (Chief Operating Officer) to a member of the existing Corporate Leadership Team and the creation of the post of interim Transformation Director, in the light of a report by the Governance Committee (pages 232 to 238).

133 Resolved -

- (1) That the post of Chief Executive be removed with immediate effect;
- (2) That a temporary post of Transformation Director be created with immediate effect with the functions set out in paragraph 7 of the report;
- (3) That the role of Head of Paid Service be allocated to a new role of Chief Operating Officer (pending the outcome of the organisational review) as an addition to the functions of a current Director role with the functions set out in paragraph 7 of the report ;
- (4) That the other functions of the post of Chief Executive be reallocated as described in paragraph 12 of the report with immediate effect;
- (5) That changes to the Constitution, as set out at the Appendix to the report, be approved; and
- (6) That the Head of Law and Governance be authorised to make further consequential changes to the Constitution provided they are consistent with the changes made in the Appendix to and the other proposals in the report.

Appointment of Head of Paid Service and Transformation Director

134 Further to the changes to the corporate leadership structure agreed in minute 133 above, the Council was asked to approve recommendations from the Chairman's Appointing Committee to appoint a Head of Paid Service (Chief Operating Officer) and an interim Transformation Director of

Minutes

West Sussex County Council (pages 239 to 241).

- 135** The County Council placed on record its appreciation and thanks to Kieran Stigant, the outgoing Chief Executive, for his unstinting service to the County Council over the last 22 years and, in particular, for his work as Chief Executive for the last three years. Members wished Mr Stigant every success for the future.
- 136** Members offered their congratulations to Diane Ashby on her new post and looked forward to welcoming Gill Steward in due course.
- 137** Resolved -
- (1) That Diane Ashby be appointed to the post of Chief Operating Officer (Head of Paid Service) of West Sussex County Council with effect from the end of this meeting; and
 - (2) That Gill Steward be appointed to the post of Transformation Director with effect from 24 February or such date as is finally agreed with the nominee.

Performance Framework and Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2014/15 to 2017/18 and Treasury Management Strategy 2014/15

- 138** The Council agreed to waive Standing Order 14(1) to allow a change to the order of business so that the item could be debated in the morning session.
- 139** The Chairman reported that the Government had given notice of its proposal to introduce legislation to require councils at their budget meetings to have recorded votes on both the recommendations on the budget and on any proposed amendments to it so that people could see how each member present voted. The Council would be amending its Standing Orders accordingly in due course but for the meeting, in the spirit of the new legislation and in accordance with the existing powers under Standing Order 36(1), the Chairman reported her intention to use her discretion to require a recorded vote on the budget recommendations and any amendments.
- 140** The Leader moved the section of the report on the Performance Framework, together with the draft Performance Framework (pages 242 to 245). Members also had before them for information the vision for the county as described in the 'West Sussex: Our Vision for the County' document.
- 141** The Cabinet Member for Finance moved the report on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme (pages 242 to 270) subject to a correction sheet which set out minor changes to the budget as a result of the final local government finance settlement and late notification from borough and district councils of funding information and contained a set of revised recommendations, together with the draft budget pack. Members also had

before them for ease of reference a comparison by the Director of Finance and Assurance of the two amendments set out in minutes 142 and 145. The Cabinet Member also moved the report on the Treasury Management Strategy (pages 271 to 303). He placed on record his thanks to the outgoing Chief Executive and his Leadership Team and to the Director of Finance and Assurance and the Finance team for their work on the budget.

142 The Chairman suspended the meeting briefly under Standing Order 38 following an interruption of the proceedings from the public gallery.

143 The following amendment to the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme was proposed by Mr Glennon and seconded by Ms James:

	£	£m
Total net expenditure in original recommendations		534.802
Additional one-off spending for 2014/15		
1. Early Childhood Service		0.600
2. Children with Disabilities Service		1.000
3. Special Educational Needs and Inclusion		0.500
4. Quality Care		2.000
5. Prevention and Early Help Services		1.500
6. Exploratory work for Unitary restructuring		0.100
TOTAL ADDITIONAL SPENDING		5.700
One-off funding		
1. Reduction in budget for unclassified roads		5.700
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FUNDING		5.700
Revised total net expenditure		534.802

This amendment retains the same net revenue spending of £534.802m, with no impact on the overall scale of the budget, the council tax freeze or on levels of borrowing. It proposes downscaling some of the proposed budget cuts, as well as boosting spending elsewhere and all funded from one specific source. The benefits of the additional spending include:

- (1) A reduction of £0.6m in the proposed cuts on the **Early Childhood Service** would protect Children and Family Centres from inevitable cutbacks to this highly-valued, key component of our early intervention strategy;
- (2) An injection of an additional £1m into the **Children with Disabilities Service** would help sustain service levels in the face of rising costs, higher expectations and increasing demand (particularly relating to the increase in numbers around Direct Payments);
- (3) The injection of an additional £0.5m for **Special Educational Needs and Inclusion** will facilitate the effective implementation of measures to be introduced from September 2014, resulting directly from the Children's Act. Hitherto it has not been possible - due to parliamentary time constraints - to cost up these measures

accurately and make a sensible bid as part of our budget setting. The anticipated Government grant of £0.9m is unlikely to be sufficient for purpose, so additional provision will be prudent;

- (4) The supply of **Quality Care** would benefit from additional spending of £2m to sustain and improve the quality of both residential and care-at-home, which in turn would realise longer-term savings from retaining independence in later life. This will also allow us to implement the Care Outside Hospital review and work with the Clinical Commissioning Groups to release funds for transforming community health and social care services in West Sussex.
- (5) An additional £1.5m spent on **Prevention and Early Help Services** would enable us to build on the proven success of the three Prevention Assessment Teams, whose referrals have been increasing by an average of 100 cases per quarter. An expansion of this service would provide quick access to support for more residents not eligible for the County Council social care services.

Clearly, our proposed increases are not intended simply to negate proposed efficiencies, which are an essential aspect of improving the performance of the Council. They are primarily important enhancements to safeguard existing services in the immediately foreseeable future, though the on-going affordability of this needs to be kept under annual review.

The £5.7m of funding to pay for this package would come from a reduction in the proposed refurbishment expenditure on unclassified roads.

Whilst road improvements are necessary and desirable, a little more "make do and mend" is sensible. In any case, the proposed £15m capital expenditure for the year 2014/15 is only seen to generate a cumulative £400k p.a. maintenance saving, which effectively equates to a payback period of around 25 years. Just over a third of that budget should be put to better use in providing and protecting services for families and those in urgent need of healthcare.

Economic stimulation requires that our assets are nurtured and enhanced, but whilst our unclassified roads are an important component, let us not forget our need to invest in our young people. Giving them the best footing on their long path to the workplace brings huge longer-term benefits to our economy. At the same time, our moral duty to protect the County's vulnerable, ageing citizens must not be undermined.

Road upgrades can and should be given further priority at that point in the future when the County is benefitting from profits anticipated from our property development activities and more importantly the enormous savings, which would be derived from the establishment of a unitary authority, a vision which we support with an allocation of £100k for exploratory research and development.

Meanwhile the remaining £9.3m for road improvements must suffice during the coming year.'

144 The amendment was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the amendment - 10

Mr Clark, Mr Glennon, Mrs Hall, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr Parsons, Mrs Phillips, Mrs Rapnik, Mr Smith and Mr Sutcliffe.

(b) Against the amendment - 51

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mrs Brunson, Mr Buckland, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Dr Dennis, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Oppler, Mr Patel, Mr Petch, Mr Peters, Mr J L Rogers, Mr R Rogers, Mr Sheldon, Mr Smytherman, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Dr Walsh, Mr Watson, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(c) Abstentions - 6

Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oxlade, Mr Quinn and Mrs Smith.

145 The amendment was lost.

146 The following amendment to the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme was proposed by Dr Walsh and seconded by Mrs Millson:

	£	£m
Total net expenditure in original recommendations		534.802
Additional base spending from 2014/15		
Reduction in cuts/additional services comprising:		
• <i>Street lighting in urban areas after midnight</i>		
• <i>Access to Adults' Services</i>		
• <i>Mental Health Services</i>		
• <i>Pavement repairs</i>		
• <i>Youth Services</i>		
TOTAL ADDITIONAL SPENDING		5.000
Base budget		
Redirection of funding earmarked for 2015/16 Better Roads Programme in 2014/15		5.000
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FUNDING		5.000
Revised total net expenditure		534.802

The Liberal Democrat Group supports the budget proposal to invest £30m to improve the condition of urban and rural unclassified roads across the county over the next two years, including the proposed phasing of works. The Group also notes that the provision for the entire programme is included in 2014/15, in advance of the proposed cashflows. This is made up of £15m of accumulated underspending from 2013/14 and £15m of base budget revenue funding for 2014/15.

It is proposed that £5m of this latter sum is redirected to enhancing the base budget to provide on-going support for:

- *Street lighting in urban areas after midnight*
- *Access to Adults' Services*
- *Mental Health Services*
- *Pavement repairs*
- *Youth Services*

This will not affect the delivery of the first year of the programme as £25m will still be available. It is proposed that the final £5m is provided in the 2015/16 budget from the £10m base budget remaining after the service improvements recommended above.'

147 The amendment was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the amendment - 14

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Quinn, Mr R Rogers, Mr Sheldon, Mrs Smith, Mr Smytherman and Dr Walsh.

(b) Against the amendment - 53

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Clark, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Mr Glennon, Ms Goldsmith, Mrs Hall, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Ms James, Mrs Jones, Mr G L Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Parsons, Mr Patel, Mr Petch, Mr Peters, Mrs Phillips, Mrs Rapnik, Mr J L Rogers, Mr Smith, Mr Sutcliffe, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Mr Watson, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(c) Abstentions - 0

148 The amendment was lost.

149 The revised recommendations, as circulated, were put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the revised recommendations – 42

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Patel, Mr Petch, Mr Peters, Mr J L Rogers, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Mr Watson, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(b) Against the revised recommendations - 15

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Quinn, Mr Sheldon, Mr Smith, Mrs Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

(c) Abstentions - 10

Mr Clark, Mr Glennon, Mrs Hall, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr McAra, Mr Parsons, Mrs Phillips, Mrs Rapnik and Mr R Rogers.

150 The revised recommendations were approved as set out below.

151 Resolved -

That, taking account of member priorities, finance strategy, local government finance settlement and the results of internal and external consultation, the following items be approved:

- (1)** the Performance Framework 2014/15 (paragraphs 1 to 6 of the report);
- (2)** any increase or decrease in funding coming to light before the budget setting meeting are managed through the Volatility Reserve (paragraphs 7 and 25 of the report);
- (3)** net revenue expenditure of £535.8m (paragraph 31 of the report and Table 1);
- (4)** price rise allowance of £9.6m (paragraph 32 of the report and column 2 of Table 2);
- (5)** service commitments and net additional funding of £6.0m (paragraph 34 of the report and columns 3 and 6 of Table 2);
- (6)** savings of £14.7m (paragraph 60 of the report and Table 3);
- (7)** capital payments in 2014/15 of £139.7m (paragraph 75 of the report and Table 8);
- (8)** proposed methods of financing capital payments between 2013/14 and 2016/17 (paragraph 82 of the report);

- (9) a maximum operational borrowing limit of £558.633m for outstanding debt and an authorised borrowing limit of £598.633m, including £40m of borrowing for temporary cash flow purposes (paragraphs 86 and 87 of the report, and Table 7);
- (10) a limit of 100% on borrowing at fixed rates and 25% on borrowing at variable rates (paragraph 88 and Table 7);
- (11) the assumptions underpinning the Director of Finance and Assurance's assessment of the robustness of estimates and the adequacy of reserves (paragraphs 89 to 102);
- (12) The following amounts be approved for the financial year 2014/15 in accordance with Section 42A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
- (a) That the budget requirement to meet net expenditure of the County Council for the financial year 2014/15 is £535.837m, and the council tax requirement for 2014/15 is £353.657m.
- (b) That the following sums be payable for the year into the County Council's revenue fund:
- | | |
|---|-----------|
| Settlement Funding Assessment | £163.204m |
| Business Rates Local Growth | £1.656m |
| Business Rate Cap Grant | £0.749m |
| Education Services Grant (ESG) | £10.853m |
| New Homes Bonus Grant | £2.954m |
| Local Services Support Grant | £0.862m |
| Small Business Rate Relief | £0.265m |
| Net surplus from District Council
Collection Funds | £1.637m |
- (c) The council tax base for the year 2014/15 is the aggregate amount calculated by the billing authorities to which the County Council issues precepts totalling 304,355.00 Band D equivalents.
- (d) The amount of council tax being the budget requirement at 12(a) above, less the amounts receivable in 12(b) above, all divided by the council tax base at 12(c) above, shall be £1,161.99 to the nearest penny.
- (e) The amount of council tax payable for dwellings listed in a particular valuation band, calculated in accordance with the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, shall be as follows:

Valuation Band	Amount	Valuation Band	Amount
A	£774.66	E	£1,420.21
B	£903.77	F	£1,678.43
C	£1,032.88	G	£1,936.65
D	£1,161.99	H	£2,323.98

- (f) That the district councils be requested to make payments of sums due under precepts calculated in proportion to their council tax Band D equivalents as follows:

Adur District Council	£22,888,646.62
Arun District Council	£64,948,269.06
Chichester District Council	£57,824,805.56
Crawley Borough Council	£37,378,894.32
Horsham District Council	£64,180,542.27
Mid Sussex District Council	£65,384,363.91
Worthing Borough Council	£41,051,944.71

- (g) That the district councils be required to make payments of precept by equal instalments of the above sums due on or before:

17 April 2014	22 May 2014	26 June 2014
31 July 2014	4 September 2014	9 October 2014
13 November 2014	11 December 2014	15 January 2015
19 February 2015		

- (h) Additionally, that payments be made by the district councils in respect of the estimated surplus on their collection funds on 31 March 2014:

	Council Tax	Business Rates
Adur District Council	£238,769.09	£17,115.42
Arun District Council	£523,000.00	£114,967.30
Crawley Borough Council	£443,530.00	
Horsham District Council	£392,109.00	
Mid Sussex District Council	£345,230.00	£13,844.00
Worthing Borough Council	£16,552.85	£13,683.00

And payments be made to the district councils in respect of the estimated deficits on their collection funds on 31 March 2014:

Minutes

	Council Tax	Business Rates
Chichester District Council	£53,120.00	£7,884.70
Crawley Borough Council		£420,343.00

(13) the context of the Equalities Act 2010 in making budget proposals (paragraphs 105 and 106 of the report).

152 The report and recommendations on the Treasury Management Strategy 2014/15, as set out below, were approved.

Resolved -

- (1) That the Treasury Management Strategy 2014/15, as set out at the Appendix to the report, be approved; and
- (2) That the investment policies approved for 2014/15 be implemented with immediate effect for the remainder of 2013/14.

Cabinet and Written Questions

Written Questions

153 Questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 15(2), as set out at Appendix 2, were circulated. Members asked questions on the answers as set out at Appendix 2.

Cabinet Member Question Time

154 Members asked questions on the Cabinet Members' reports (pages 304 to 309), and on a supplementary report (page 309A) which was circulated, as set out at Appendix 3.

Leader's Question Time

155 Members questioned the Leader on matters currently relevant to the County Council, as set out at Appendix 3.

Governance Committee: Pay Policy Statement

156 The County Council was asked to approve the Pay Policy Statement 2014/15, in the light of a report by the Governance Committee (pages 310 to 320).

157 Resolved -

That the revisions to the Pay Policy Statement 2014/15, as set out at the Appendix to the report, be approved.

Notices of Motion

Notice of Motion by Mr Glennon

158 The following motion was moved by Mr Glennon and seconded by Ms James.

'As a consequence of the enormous financial pressure placed upon West Sussex by recent spending reviews, this Council is asked to acknowledge its duty to identify additional efficiencies to mitigate future cuts to front-line services.

It is not credible to pretend that massive reductions in the County Council annual budget are sustainable without major damage to front-line services. A rational approach to the organisation of local authorities in West Sussex needs to be adopted as the key to realising major savings while retaining adequate services.

There exists the potential for huge savings through fundamental re-structuring of local government, which could greatly reduce cutbacks in services. This is hardly revolutionary, as we have already experienced major re-structuring across the UK. Our challenge is whether we want to bring these benefits to West Sussex – or simply ignore them.

The co-existence of parish, district, borough and county councils is a luxury the people of West Sussex cannot afford as we move into an austere future.

This Council is asked to consider the savings achieved by counties, such as Shropshire and Wiltshire, where the district/borough-level of local government has been merged with the county-level to create an over-arching council.

Therefore, this Council calls on the Leader:

- (1) To acknowledge that huge financial efficiencies are achievable through the merging of District/Borough councils with the County Council;
- (2) To recognise that such efficiencies would help protect future services for residents;
- (3) To recognise that such efficiencies could help contain future council tax increases;
- (4) To recognise that residents would benefit from a more comprehensible, closely coordinated local government offering;
- (5) To adopt the principle of working collaboratively with Districts and Boroughs in West Sussex with the intention of moving proactively

Minutes

towards a unitary authority;

- (6) To enlist the help of West Sussex MPs in lobbying for central government support; and
- (7) To make financial provision in our 2014/15 budget to fund exploratory research into the practical steps required to achieve a unitary authority for West Sussex.'

159 The motion was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

- (a) For the motion - 10

Mr Clark, Mr Glennon, Mrs Hall, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr Parsons, Mrs Phillips, Mrs Rapnik, Mr Smith and Mr Sutcliffe.

- (b) Against the motion - 51

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Brown, Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Buckland, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Crow, Dr Dennis, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lamb, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mrs Mullins, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Patel, Mr Petch, Mr Peters, Mr Quinn, Mr J L Rogers, Mr R Rogers, Mr Sheldon, Mrs Smith, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Dr Walsh, Mr Watson and Mr Whittington.

- (c) Abstentions - 0

160 The motion was lost.

Notice of Motion by Mr M G Jones

161 The following motion was moved by Mr M G Jones and seconded by Mr Lamb:

'This Council recognises the trend for companies to employ workers on low pay, causing many to have the need to claim from the Housing and benefit systems.

West Sussex County Council resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations to sign up to the Living Wage campaign and its principles, by instructing council officers to take the steps necessary to be accredited with the Living Wage Foundation as a Living Wage Employer.

West Sussex County Council therefore also resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Finance to ensure that all contractors entering into future agreements with this Council agree to pay at least the level set by the Living Wage Foundation as the Living Wage.

In this we recognise the Council's current contracts will need to be investigated, with the intention to ensure that living wage levels are consistently achieved when those contracts are due to be renewed. All future contracts made by the Council will be subject to this policy.'

- 162 The motion was referred to the Cabinet Members for Corporate Relations and for Finance for consideration.

Notice of Motion by Dr Walsh

- 163 The following motion was moved by Dr Walsh and seconded by Mrs Millson.

'In view of the considerable reduction in local government income from central government, the reduction of the volume and nature of direct services from local authorities, the division of responsibilities between different tiers, and the resulting confusion among many local residents about who does what.

This Council resolves to ask the Leader to set up a Committee to investigate the service benefits and savings to local taxation of moving to one or two unitary authorities for West Sussex, and if and when appropriate, to press the Government to facilitate this.'

- 164 An amendment was proposed by the Leader and seconded by Mr Burrett as set out below.

'The County Council recognises that its immediate priority is to plan and execute its transition to a commissioning authority, thereby achieving the savings implicit in that transition.

The County Council welcomes recent joint working initiatives with District and Borough Councils and urges the Leader to explore more such initiatives. It also recognises that the current national political climate does not lend itself to the creation of new unitary authorities in the immediate short term.

However, in view of the considerable reduction in pressure on local government income public finances from central government, the reduction in of the volume and nature of direct services from local authorities, the division of responsibilities between different tiers of councils, and the resulting confusion among many local residents about who does what.

This Council resolves to ask the Leader to ***initiate a public debate on the issue of*** set up a Committee to investigate the service benefits and savings to local taxation of moving to one or two unitary authorities for West Sussex ***to involve residents, partners and interested stakeholders,*** and if and when appropriate, to press the Government to facilitate this.'

Minutes

165 The amendment was carried.

166 The amended motion was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the motion as amended – 47

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Brown, Mrs Brunson, Mr Buckland, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Crow, Dr Dennis, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mrs Hall, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Oppler, Mr Patel, Mr Petch, Mr Peters, Mrs Rapnik, Mr J L Rogers, Mr R Rogers, Mr Sheldon, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Dr Walsh, Mr Watson and Mr Whittington.

(b) Against the motion as amended - 0

(c) Abstentions – 14

Mr Clark, Mr Glennon, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oxlade, Mr Parsons, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mr Smith, Mrs Smith and Mr Sutcliffe.

167 The motion, as amended and set out below, was carried.

'The County Council recognises that its immediate priority is to plan and execute its transition to a commissioning authority, thereby achieving the savings implicit in that transition.

The County Council welcomes recent joint working initiatives with District and Borough Councils and urges the Leader to explore more such initiatives. It also recognises that the current national political climate does not lend itself to the creation of new unitary authorities in the immediate short term.

However, in view of the considerable pressure on public finances, the reduction in the volume and nature of direct services from local authorities, the division of responsibilities between different tiers of councils, and the resulting confusion among many local residents about who does what.

This Council resolves to ask the Leader to initiate a public debate on the issue of unitary authorities for West Sussex to involve residents, partners and interested stakeholders.'

Chairman

The Council rose at 5.05 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 1 - 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
9 Performance Framework and Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2014/15 to 2017/18 and Treasury Management Strategy 2014/15	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
	Mr High	Member of Worthing Borough Council
	Ms James	Member of Hambrook and Chidham Parish Council
	Mrs Jones	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
	Mr R Rogers	Chair of the Maybridge Keystone Club
	Mrs Smith	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Smytherman	Trustee of Coastal West Sussex Mind
10(a) Written Question 2 (removal of Littlehampton Academy governors)	Mr Evans	Former member of the board of governors and Council
10(a) Written question 4 (flooding)	Ms James	Member of Hambrook and Chidham Parish Council
10(b) CMQT paragraph 6 (future organisation of schools in Worthing)	Mr Bradbury	Director of Warden Park Academy
	Mr Cloake	Parent of children at school in Worthing
	Mr Evans	Governor of Ferring CE Primary School (area abuts the Worthing area)
	Mr High	Parent of a child at a school in Worthing
	Mr R Rogers	Governor of Durrington High School

Minutes - Appendix 1

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
10(b) CMQT paragraph 6 (future organisation of schools in Worthing) (cont)	Mr Wickremaratchi	Director of Warden Park Academy
10(b) CMQT paragraph 8 (Early Years Hubs)	Mr Bradbury	Director of Warden Park Academy
	Mr R Rogers	Governor of Durrington High School
	Mr Wickremaratchi	Director of Warden Park Academy
12(a) Notice of Motion on Unitary Authorities	Mr Burrett	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Circus	Chairman of Horsham District Council
	Mr M G Jones	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Lamb	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Lanzer	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Oxlade	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mrs Smith	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Dr Walsh	Member of Arun District Council
12(c) Notice of Motion on Unitary Authorities	Mr Burrett	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr M G Jones	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Lamb	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Lanzer	Member of Crawley Borough Council

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
12(c) Notice of Motion on Unitary Authorities (cont)	Mr Oxlade	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mrs Smith	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Dr Walsh	Member of Arun District Council
All items	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council

Minutes - Appendix 2

14 February 2014

1. Written question from **Mrs Mullins** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life**

Question

Modern-day school governors undertake a challenging and demanding role which requires professional skills and experience. Governing bodies are expected to make very important decisions affecting the running of their schools including deciding how the budget is spent, appointing and dismissing staff, hearing appeals and grievances and establishing standards for pupils' behaviour and discipline.

The scope of responsibilities now attached to the role of governor, especially those taking lead positions as Chair of Governors or Head of a Finance Committee, place a requirement upon governing bodies to recruit people with different skills including financial and educational skills. Every governor should actively contribute relevant skills and experience and undertake the role with professionalism. Given the commitment required, the expertise expected, the demands on time and the significant responsibilities experienced by governors please can the Cabinet Member confirm:

- (a) What challenges he is experiencing in the recruitment and retention of suitably qualified governors for each category of school?
- (b) What percentage of a school's budget is it recommended should be allocated to governor training and development?
- (c) How he is working with emerging free schools in West Sussex to encourage the appointment of County Council representatives to their governor bodies? Is he keen to establish a similar system of governor appointments to free school governing bodies to that which exists for the appointments to Academies by the local County Local Committee?
- (d) If compensation is provided from central government to reimburse the County Council for the cost of liaising with families and allocating pupils to alternative establishments from failed schools such as the Discovery Free School?
- (e) Also in supporting those placement schools, with the costs of settling these pupils, who may have experienced a very different school ethos and teaching environment.

Answer

- (a) The County Council holds information on the recruitment and retention of governors in maintained schools only (not academies or free schools). Governing body vacancies in maintained schools across the county are currently 9.7%. Categories that are currently proving most difficult to fill are parent governors and foundation governors in aided schools. There is a pool of authority representative governors. Schools and Diocesan authorities are active in recruiting parent and foundation governors.

The Cabinet Member has recently initiated a publicity drive through the Communications Team to raise awareness of the need for governors and to encourage employees from the County Council to become involved in their local schools by becoming governors.

- (b) There is no recommended level of spend on governor training within a school budget – this is a matter for governing bodies to decide. The County Council provides a Governor Support Service Level Agreement (SLA) at a cost of £35 per governor and clerk in 2013/14. This currently includes the following:
- Unlimited access for individual governors and clerks to all central training courses within the annual handbook which includes induction, role specific and school improvement training.
 - In-school training session, one per school per financial year, chosen from a menu of 16 available courses.
 - Access to an annual conference is also included as part of the SLA subscription to training.
 - Access to GEL (Governors e-Learning) online training modules and resources.
 - Access to Certificate of Governance award.
- (c) It is for the Board of Trustees of a free school to decide what, if any, local authority representation they require. If approached by free school trustees to appoint a local authority representative, the County Council would do its best to make a suitable appointment through the relevant County Local Committee.
- (d) There is currently no offer of reimbursement from the Government but the matter has been raised with Department for Education officials.
- (e) To date pupils admitted from Discovery New School have been managed in the same way as any other new in-year admissions to schools and costs have been absorbed within 2013/14 school budgets. The impact of this is being monitored and it is possible that the County Council will need to consider some financial adjustments later in the year.

Supplementary Question

After what has happened at the Littlehampton Academy, will it be possible to continue to attract people to stand as governors?

Supplementary Answer

As academies are independent of the County Council it is for their governing bodies to deal with governor recruitment. As far as West Sussex is concerned, a recruitment campaign is underway to find the best people.

Minutes - Appendix 2

2. Written question from **Dr Walsh** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life**

Question

In view of the Woodard Trustees actions in removing the Principal and the entire Academy Council ('Governors') at The Littlehampton Academy at the beginning of January, without any explanation to the Academy Council, and without the Ofsted inspection in December being published:

- (a) What position does that leave the County Council in as co-sponsors?
- (b) What legal powers do Woodard have to summarily dismiss the Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life (Peter Evans) and the Littlehampton East member (Dr James Walsh) from the Academy Council without explanation?
- (c) What steps have been taken/are being taken to ensure the publication of the Ofsted report as a matter of urgency?
- (d) What steps are being taken to allay the understandable concerns of parents, pupils and staff over the situation at the Academy?
- (e) Has any request been made to involve either the former Schools Minister (Nick Gibb MP) or current Minister (David Laws MP) in the matter, and if not why not?
- (f) Will the Cabinet Member or Leader in due course bring a fuller report to local members and or the full Council?
- (g) How does the County Council satisfy itself that academy sponsors are performing?
- (h) Is the Cabinet Member satisfied with the internal governance of Academy sponsors?
- (i) Is the Cabinet Member satisfied that the sponsors of Academies are not employing themselves for consultancy advice?

Answer

- (a) The Woodard Corporation and the County Council are co-sponsors of The Littlehampton Academy. Local authorities cannot be lead sponsors and consequently The Woodard Corporation is lead sponsor and as such has been leading on improvement and development. A Memorandum of Understanding between the County Council and academies has been drawn up to encourage a greater level of dialogue. However it is the role of Department for Education to ensure academies are being held to account for their performance.
- (b) Woodard Academies Trust, as a company limited by guarantee, entered into a Funding Agreement with the Secretary of State and annexed to it is the

company's Memorandum and Articles of Association which allow for any governor to cease to hold office if he or she is removed by the person or persons appointing him. When schools are judged to be inadequate, further steps can be taken by the Secretary of State or the sponsor to bring about the appropriate improvements and that may well be removing the Governing Body if it is found to be weak.

The Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life, was appointed in his capacity as a local member as a governor at Littlehampton Community School before it became an academy. He was nominated to the Academy Council, again in his capacity as a local member and prior to his appointment as the Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life, by the Joint Eastern Arun Area Committee on 20 October 2009 for a three-year term and again on 12 June 2012 for a three-year term. All the Academy Council were dismissed and not just the two county councillors.

- (c) Ofsted's policy on arrangements for publication of inspection reports for all schools applies equally to academies and is contained in the School Inspection Handbook, January 2014. Usually the final report is sent to the school within 15 days of an inspection being carried out and the school must take reasonable steps to provide a copy to parents of pupils at the school within a further five working days. The report is then published on Ofsted's website. This period is extended when a school is judged as 'inadequate' but in any event the school will receive the report within 28 working days of the end of the inspection and the report must similarly then be circulated and published in the same manner outlined above. The main reason for the difference in release date for schools identified as inadequate as it needs to be moderated and signed off by Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education, Children's Services and Skills (HMCI). The publication of the report is imminent.
- (d) It is the responsibility of the sponsor to address this and a parents' meeting will be held by the sponsor to outline the key points within the report and outline what further action will be taken to address the issues. An interim Headteacher has been put in place to move the school forward and they will be working with the sponsor to ensure the community i.e. parents, staff and pupils are clear on what needs to happen next.
- (e) Until the formal publication of the report, the outcome of the inspection remains confidential. Should there be issues concerning the report, it would be for the Woodard Academies Trust to involve Ministers or HMCI. Regarding the dismissal of the Governing Body, I understand a joint letter has been written to the Trust.
- (f) As part of the Memorandum of Understanding between the County Council and with Academy sponsors, it is anticipated that a fuller account will be sought from the sponsors by the Cabinet Member. It would be appropriate to share this through the usual reporting processes.
- (g) Fundamentally it is the DfE's responsibility to ensure that academies – Trust and Sponsors – are held to account and performing well. The Memorandum

Minutes - Appendix 2

of Understanding has suggested a structure whereby regular updates to the Cabinet Member will ensure he is appraised of concerns. Local officers will also be regularly updating Cabinet Members on the performance of all pupils in all schools at KS2 and KS4 as part of its statutory functions.

- (h) As part of the County Council's statutory functions, officers regularly monitor the progress of all schools, including academies. Many academies continue to play a full part in the local meetings of schools. Where a concern over any aspect of an academy performance or governance is raised, it will be addressed through the memorandum of understanding.
- (i) I am unaware of this as an issue. Any matters of 'connectivity', where an individual consultant is used in a context where they have accountability would be a concern, although the matter would again be for the Trust to address.

Supplementary Question

Does the Cabinet Member agree that since the Woodard Trustees took governor status from the Advisory Council in the autumn of 2012 and vested it in themselves, it is their governors who are subject to criticism from Ofsted and not the Advisory Council? Will the Cabinet Member press for an external review of the Woodard Trustees?

Supplementary Answer

I am very disappointed with the way in which Woodard has acted. The change of status took away responsibility for governorship from the body that is now called the Council and vested it in Woodard. In my view, Ofsted have made an incorrect judgement by blaming the Council when they had no powers to act. I will be writing to Ofsted with my concerns and also to Woodard. The Government has announced that they will be recruiting eight regional schools commissioners who will be responsible for monitoring performance and intervening to secure improvement in underperforming academies – I will be calling upon the new commissioner for the south east to look at the situation with Woodard.

Additional Question

An additional question was asked by Mr Buckland.

- 3. Written question from **Ms James** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance**

Question

- (a) Please can the Cabinet Member confirm the current capacity of the five main hubs in West Sussex for staff requiring access to desk facilities and can he provide details of the current level of occupancy?
- (b) As part of the 'Way We Work' project, what schemes are currently being undertaken to increase the capacity of the hubs and what will be the

projected capacity and occupancy after completion?

- (c) Can the Cabinet Member confirm if there is any remaining West Sussex County Council accommodation, from which staff can be wholly relocated to hubs?
- (d) What plans has the Cabinet Member considered for marketing such surplus accommodation either for rental or disposal?

Answer

- (a) 3,156 Desks with 3,353 staff, excluding Capita staff, at the main office buildings.
- (b) There are detailed plans to improve flexible working now that the roll-out of the new IT hardware and platform is in place. This involves:
 - (i) Adaptations on the County Hall Campus 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors of the main building – net gain of 46 desks – and better use of space on Ground, 1st and 2nd floors of the Northleigh building.
 - (ii) Better use of space at Durban House, Bognor.
 - (iii) Better use of space at County Hall North which will clear one floor (250 desks) to accommodate Horsham District Council from June 2015.

The revised number of desks in the main hubs will be 2,952 with a theoretic capacity of 4,428.

- (c) The 'Way We Work' project is currently planning to close the following sites as part of the buildings closure plan of the 43 office buildings (the County Council has already closed 40 buildings on the way to reducing to three main hubs – Horsham/Crawley, Worthing, Chichester/Bognor).
 - (i) Laburnum Lodge, Chichester – Early Childhood Service
 - (ii) East Row, Chichester – Office Building, 73 Desks
 - (iii) Willow Park in Chichester – Archive and Library Service, 20 Desks

In addition, the County Council is now developing a business case for a smaller building to house key staff delivering services to the coastal strip area from Littlehampton to Shoreham. This will allow it to vacate one of the largest hub buildings (595 Desks) at Centenary House, Durrington.

Once these buildings have closed the total number of office desks will be 2,508 with a theoretical capacity of 3,762.

- (d) The Estates team is actively engaged in the disposal of the County Council's surplus properties, as and when they become vacant. Where leases expire,

Minutes - Appendix 2

the County Council does not renew them and saves revenue costs. Where the County Council holds freehold interests, it will look at investment and development opportunities to maximise benefit for the local taxpayer.

Supplementary Question

Has the Cabinet Member undertaken any further discussions with borough and district councils in West Sussex regarding the possibility of co-location at County Council hubs?

Supplementary Answer

It is hoped that Horsham District Council will move their staff into County Hall North. The County Council is fully committed to sharing buildings whenever possible to drive down costs.

4. Written question from **Ms James** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

- (a) Can the Cabinet Member confirm the role of this Council in liaising with the Environment Agency, relating to its operations within West Sussex to ensure that homeowners receive adequate protection from river and coastal flooding?
- (b) Can he state how many meetings have taken place directly between Council officers and the Environment Agency over the last 12 months on the subject of river and coastal flood protection in West Sussex?
- (c) Can he confirm how priorities for flood defences in West Sussex are determined and what input this Council has in influencing these priorities?
- (d) Following the failure to extend the statement of principles between the Government and the insurance industry to guarantee flood risk cover, a new deal is being developed called 'Flood Re'. It is anticipated that 'Flood Re' will come into effect in summer 2015 at the earliest and 500,000 homes in the UK will be protected by its provisions. Can the Cabinet Member please confirm how many homes in West Sussex will be protected by the Flood Re provisions and can he provide details of how he is lobbying the Government to ensure that this new deal comes into force as soon as possible?

Answer

- (a) The Environment Agency has responsibility for flood risk management on main rivers and the coast; the County Council interacts with the Environment Agency on Flood defence issues on a number of levels:
 - Politically, two West Sussex county councillors sit on the Southern Area Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (SRFCC) as representatives of

the County Council as Local Lead Flood Authority. Lead local flood authorities (LLFAs) are county councils (and unitary authorities) and part of their responsibilities is to prepare a strategy for local flood risk management in their areas, and play a lead role in emergency planning and recovery after a flood event. Southern SRFCC members approve the Environment Agency Medium Term Plan which sets out which flood risk management projects are put forward for central funding each year.

- At a senior officer level, the County Council hosts the West Sussex Strategic Flood Risk Management Board (WSFRMB) where areas at risk and future flood protection schemes are discussed.
- At an operational level, the County Council hosts the West Sussex Flood Risk Management Group (WSFRMG). The working group is an officer-level working team that meets quarterly to solve county-wide and site-specific issues, progress actions and discuss future work and contributions.
- The County Council's Resilience and Emergencies Team works closely with emergency response partners through the Sussex Resilience Forum to co-ordinate any emergency flooding response as well as preparing emergency plans, participating in multi-agency training activities and reporting on previous event response.
- Officers work closely with the Environment Agency on a day-to-day basis and Environment Agency officers regularly work within County Council offices to facilitate liaison and reduce flood risk.

(b) Since January 2013 the following numbers of the meetings detailed above have taken place with the Environment Agency:

- SRFCC – four main meetings and a programme sub group meeting;
- WSFRMB – four meetings; WSFRMG - four meetings. Additionally, a meeting was held regarding the method of prioritising which projects should go forward for funding on the environment Agency Medium Term Plan. A further meeting is being organised for February/March to go through the potential list of projects for 2015/16.
- Sussex Resilience Forum – four Weather and Environment Group meetings, two Sussex Warning & Informing Group meetings, a Part 2 Flood Plan Briefing and other meetings as appropriate.
- Informal meetings and discussions regarding river and coastal flooding also take place on a site-by-site and incident-by-incident basis.

(c) Prioritisation for which river and coastal flood defence schemes can attract funding is carried out by the Environment Agency according to HM Treasury rules and Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' policy and each project is given a 'Outcome Score' based on cost and the benefits such as number of properties with reduced risk. The list of potential projects is scrutinised and the on-going medium-term plan list for each year is approved by the Southern Regional Flood and Coastal Committee, which includes County Council members.

The decision on which projects are put forward for funding is made by the relevant risk management authority (Environment Agency, County Council, borough or district council or water and sewerage company). Working in

Minutes - Appendix 2

partnership, these authorities are currently working on a joint prioritisation process across the county. This prioritisation will include the outcome score as well as other local benefits and priorities, such as regeneration potential.

- (d) At present the County Council is unable to provide data on the exact number of properties which would benefit from the future 'Flood Re' agreement. It has requested some of the information from the Environment Agency. However there are approximately 76,600 residential properties and 20,100 businesses identified as being susceptible to surface water flooding from a 1 in 200 year event (County Council Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment 2011) and 15,000 residential properties and 3,000 businesses are within areas at risk from rivers or sea flooding (Environment Agency National Flood Risk Assessment 2008/09, counting moderate and significant risk). The agreement will cap the cost of flood insurance for all properties at risk built before 2009 and below council tax band H.

The Association of British Insurers and the Government have agreed a Memorandum of Understanding on how to develop the Flood Re agreement. The proposals will be given legal backing through the Water Bill. The Bill has passed through the third reading of the House of Lords and is at the consideration of amendments stage prior to being given Royal Assent. The aim is for it to be operating in summer 2015.

Supplementary Question

Can the Cabinet Member confirm how the final version of the Flood Risk Management Strategy will clarify the responsibilities of local authorities and national organisations with respect to an emergency response to flooding i.e. where help can be obtained by householders and in what timescale?

Supplementary Answer

I am aware that the question of sandbags has arisen recently as a result of statements by national government. The County Council's policy is to supply sandbags only where there is a serious and imminent danger to life or property. Requests for help should be addressed to the Resilience and Emergencies Team, a partnership between highways staff, Fire and Rescue Service, Sussex Police, the Environment Agency and the Council's highways contractor.

Additional Question

An additional question was asked by Mr G L Jones.

5. Written question from **Mr Lamb** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

While recognising that the recent levels of rainfall has been unprecedented and that the county has been affected negatively as a whole, given the impact of flooding in Crawley in recent weeks incurring cost and massive inconvenience for

the area's residents and businesses, could I ask what current plans are in place to prevent future flooding in Haslett Avenue East, Ifield Green, River Mead, Strathmore Road, Ifield Brooks Meadows, Ifield Avenue, around Three Bridges Station and in the land adjacent to Crawley Rugby Club and Bonnetts Lane?

Answer

Many of the issues the County Council is currently experiencing across the Crawley area are due to the river and ditch networks running full to capacity. This, in many places, is stopping the highway drainage network from draining into the rivers and ditches.

Flooding in Ifield Green, River Mead, Strathmore Road, Ifield Brooks Meadows, and Ifield Avenue area is all associated with the River Mole and capacity issues at Stafford Bridge. The County Council, Crawley Borough Council and the Environment Agency (EA) are working together to resolve the issue. The project cost is currently estimated at £130,000 and is in the EA's forward plan for a start during 2016/17.

Flooding in Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges area is again caused by capacity issues in the local river network, this time the Gatwick stream. The high water levels and high levels of silt being carried in the rivers at present are causing the adjacent highway drainage systems to become heavily silted too. The County Council has had to jet the highway system in Haslett Avenue East a number of times this year to ensure it can drain effectively. It has also, when needed, pumped the flood water in Haslett Avenue East directly into the Gatwick stream.

Supplementary Question

Will the Cabinet Member assess the way in which highway drainage is currently maintained as there are parts of my division where flooding is a regular event even without the current level of rain?

Supplementary Answer

If there is a problem or a threat in an area it will be addressed. Mid Sussex District Council has recently approved a planning application for the third and final element of the Upper Mole Flood Alleviation Scheme which should help protect homes in the Crawley, Horley and Gatwick areas.

Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Mr Barling and Mrs Smith.

In response Mr Barling's question, the Cabinet Member said he would let members have a list of lessons learnt as a result of the recent flooding. He agreed to pass members' thanks to the Resilience and Emergencies Team and Council staff who had been working hard over recent weeks to deal with the problems arising from the flooding.

In response to a request from Mrs Smith for the start date of a project for flood

Minutes - Appendix 2

alleviation at Stafford Bridge in Crawley to be brought forward, the Cabinet Member said it was a matter for the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee but that he would see what could be done.

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

Question

The County Council provides a Housing Occupancy Rate table which accompanies its response to planning applications. This table forms the basis for assessing the likely population increase that will accompany new development, including the likely number of children and informs some local planning authorities' decisions on S106 contribution rates (e.g. for sport and leisure facilities).

While comparing the output from this table with the 2011 Census data for my District Council Ward of Tangmere, the table's predicted population appears to be significantly less than the actual population, even assuming all dwellings were houses (which the table assumes a higher occupancy rate) and a 4% vacancy rate. This may have significant implications in assessing the infrastructure needs for areas of higher population densities and low vacant (e.g. second and holiday) dwelling rates.

WSCC Housing Occupancy Rate Table

Bedrooms	House	Flat
1	1.7	1.2
2	1.8	1.3
3	2.2	1.7
4	2.7	2.4
5	3.0	2.0

Tangmere Ward 2011 Census

Total dwellings – 1,156

Total Households – 1,106

Total Population – 2,625

Total dwellings (houses and flats) with households by bedroom:

Bedrooms	Total dwellings with households	WSCC House Occupancy Rate	Resulting Population Estimate
1	112	1.7	190
2	323	1.8	581
3	399	2.2	878
4	228	2.7	616
5	44	3.0	132
Total	1,106		2,397

- (a) Could the method of calculation of the housing occupancy rate table be explained, including what source data it is based on?
- (b) Also on what source data is the 'child product' based which is used to calculate education capacity needs?

Answer

- (a) The existing Housing Occupancy Table above is based on data from the 2001 census. As this data is now very old, it is the County Council's intention to update this table. Data from the 2011 census will be used to replace the current occupancy rates, ensuring that the most recent information is used to plan infrastructure requirements as a consequence of new development.

However, currently the outputs from the 2011 census do not separate occupancy rates between houses and flats, which are required as they produce quite different occupancy rates. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has been releasing data since 2012, in phases, but not yet to the detailed level required to enable the County Council to undertake the updates it needs for this table.

The County Council has therefore commissioned the ONS to produce a bespoke table of data from the 2011 census for it which provides occupancy rates by housing type and number of bedrooms for West Sussex. Once the County Council receives the data from the ONS it will update the existing Housing Occupancy Rate table above.

- (b) The 'child product' is calculated by using all committed developments and adding together the expected number of children from these developments. Committed developments are all developments which either have a current planning permission or are considered committed housing because they appear, for example, in a district council's local plan as being allocated for housing.

From the list of committed housing developments it is possible to establish the numbers of houses/flats and the table that Mr Oakley has provided showing occupancy rates is used to add the numbers of new residents (if the permission is only an outline one, and the housing breakdown is not yet known, then an average occupancy of 2.5 persons per housing unit is taken).

Census 2001 data shows that there are 14 children per school year per 1000 people in houses, and five children per school year in flats (an average). This ratio can then be used to calculate the number of children moving into a development. This forms the 'child product'. Again, the County Council is awaiting information from the ONS to update this ratio using Census 2011 data.

Supplementary Question

Does the Cabinet Member feel it is appropriate to have a county-wide approach to the calculations given census data is supplied at a very local level?

Supplementary Answer

When more data below county-level is available officers will investigate whether it is worth differentiating between areas.

7. Written question from **Mrs Phillips** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

As the Cabinet Member reported to the County Council meeting on 18 October 2013, the County Council Action Plan to produce short-term improvements to the A27 was put on hold in the light of government announcements regarding the preparation of an A27 Corridor Feasibility Study and a Route-Based Strategy for the A27 by the Highways Agency. In 2013 a Route Strategy and Action Plan for the A27 was conducted by Atkins for the County Council, which contained a 'preferred package' for improvement schemes to the A27. Can the Cabinet Member please confirm:

- (a) The progress achieved in the preparation of the above strategies?
- (b) What work he has undertaken with the Highways Agency to ensure that the interests of West Sussex are central to these strategies?
- (c) Which of the schemes proposed in the Atkins report he would like to see incorporated into the strategies being produced by the Highways Agency and how he would prioritise these improvements?

Answer

- (a) Following the Government's announcements in June 2013, the following progress has been made:
 - A27 Corridor Feasibility Study – the scope and governance arrangements for the study are currently being discussed with stakeholders. The study is currently expected to conclude in autumn 2014.
 - South Central Route Based Strategy – Stage 1 (analysis of the issues) is nearing completion. A draft report is imminent.
- (b) To ensure the interests of West Sussex are central to these strategies:
 - On 9 October 2013, I met officials from the Highways Agency to discuss the South Central Route Based Strategy;
 - On 6 November 2013, I wrote to the Minister seeking clarification on the scope, timing and interaction between the A27 Corridor Feasibility

Study, South Central Route Based Strategy and A27 Chichester major scheme;

- On 17 January 2014, the Leader and I met local Members of Parliament to discuss our approach to the A27 and agreed to engage with the business community to build support for improving the A27; and
- On 22 January 2014, I attended a stakeholder workshop with officials from the Department for Transport to discuss the scope and governance arrangements for the A27 Corridor Feasibility Study.

- (c) The improvements identified in the Atkins report were required to be deliverable within five years to reflect Cabinet's desire to support economic growth in the short term. Although the schemes demonstrate benefits, some also had limitations which could be improved with additional funding or time. The report has been passed to the Highways Agency for its consideration in developing plans for future investment.

As a result of this work, I believe the Department for Transport and Highways Agency should consider, among other options for providing long-term improvement to the A27 in West Sussex; improving six junctions at Chichester; providing a bypass at Arundel; and improving five junctions at Worthing and Lancing. As the Government has committed to deliver the A27 Chichester major scheme in 2015-19, this scheme should be considered the priority. There will be an opportunity to consider other priorities upon completion of the A27 Corridor Feasibility Study and South Central Route Based Strategy.

Supplementary Question

Does the Cabinet Member share my frustration that the A27 Corridor Feasibility Study will not bear fruit until the autumn? What can be done to progress this vital project?

Supplementary Answer

The reason the A27 at Chichester is mentioned separately is as a result of its inclusion in the Chancellor's autumn budget statement. Most of the A27, except for Chichester, is part of the feasibility study by the Highways Agency and the County Council is therefore locked into the time table produced by the Highways Agency and the Department for Transport. The time table is a tough one but will lead to a decision on what is to be done about the A27 during the period 2015-19.

Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Ms James, Mr Smith and Dr Walsh.

8. Written question from **Mr R Rogers** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

In the A259 improvement study detailed in a report from consultants, Parsons Brinckerhoff, a number of junctions were listed that were recommended to be improved. Studies were carried out to show traffic volume east and westbound in the morning and evening rush hours. Two junctions scored 'red' in each sector. One was J14, the A259 Goring Street/A2032 Littlehampton Road known as the Goring Crossways.

I do realise that funding needs to be raised to implement these A259 improvements. However, I understand that after a recent meeting, J14, Goring Crossways has been deleted from the A259 Improvement Plan. Can the Cabinet Member reassure me that this junction will be reinstated for improvement and that it will be one of the first to be improved bearing in mind the high number of 'red' scores it received over other junctions?

Answer

The A259 improvement study identified a package of improvements to the A259 corridor between the new junction with the Lyminster Bypass and Goring Crossways in Worthing Borough. The package of improvements, costing approximately £12.2m, was identified as a priority in the County Council's Strategic Transport Investment Programme. In July 2013, the Coast to Capital Local Transport Body offered to contribute £7.5m towards the 'A259 East Arun Corridor Improvement' major scheme in 2015-19, subject to confirmation of deliverability and value for money being demonstrated through the preparation of a major scheme business case. Therefore, the funding shortfall is approximately £4.7m. Unless additional funding can be identified to cover the shortfall, it will be necessary to reduce the scope of the scheme to ensure that it remains deliverable.

The major scheme business case is being prepared for the entire package of improvements including improvements to J14, the A259 Goring Street junction with A2032 Littlehampton Road known as Goring Crossways. If additional funding is not forthcoming, it would be necessary to reduce the cost of the scheme by removing or delaying implementation of some elements of the scheme. However, no decisions have been taken about which improvements will or will not be delivered. Accordingly, the Goring Crossways (J14) remains part of the improvement scheme at this stage.

Supplementary Question

Does the Cabinet Member agree that the traffic problems are very severe and need to be addressed before additional housing is built in the area?

Supplementary Answer

The Council wants to move the whole scheme forward but needs to find the

remaining funds, preferably working with partners, and the timing is contingent on securing the funding.

Additional Question

An additional question was asked by Dr Walsh.

9. Written question from **Mr Sutcliffe** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Residents' Services**

Question

During the recent bad weather members were kept informed of weather warnings and adverse impacts upon services by regular updates. I understand that the updates are compiled and sent by the Resilience and Emergencies Team at the County Council, which is responsible for other activities including business continuity and emergency preparedness. I have been provided with information that the cost of the Resilience and Emergencies service is £432,600 per annum.

- (a) Can the Cabinet Member provide a breakdown of the manpower resources involved in the provision of this service and indicate where this money sits in his budget and what will be the percentage change in that budget for 2014/15?
- (b) Can he explain the role of this team during periods of calm and settled weather and at times when there is not any emergency?
- (c) Can the Cabinet Member provide evidence that the service does not unduly duplicate information that is available from other more economical sources?

Answer

- (a) The Resilience and Emergencies Team (and the budget for the team) sits within Fire and Rescue, and comprises one head of service, eight advisors and one administrator. The Service has just finished a three-year savings programme with a 30% reduction of its budget, and there are no anticipated changes to the budget for Resilience and Emergencies in 2014/15.
- (b) The Team is responsible for ensuring the duties of the County Council (including Fire and Rescue and Public Health) are met in respect of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, and associated legislation (Including legislation relating to contingency planning within the Fire Services Act and Health and Social Care Act). This involves:
 - Assessing risks to anticipate, and where possible prevent occurrence of emergencies;
 - Developing contingency plans, training and exercises to ensure the County Council is prepared to deal with emergencies, and respond to increased demands for service caused by emergencies. This includes severe weather (e.g. snow, floods, heat waves and droughts); public

protests (e.g. oil and gas); human disease outbreaks (e.g. pandemics/H5N1); animal disease outbreaks (e.g. foot and mouth); pollution events/industrial accidents (e.g. coastal pollution/hazardous sites); transport accidents (e.g. Gatwick airport); disruption to supplies (e.g. fuel shortages) etc.;

- Putting in place business continuity arrangements across all parts of the County Council to ensure vital services are maintained to most vulnerable when services are disrupted (e.g. loss of staff, property, systems, suppliers etc.);
- Maintaining arrangements to make information available to the public and warn and inform them in the event of an emergency;
- Operating an extensive community resilience programme, helping to build local community capacity and resilience and helping communities to help themselves in emergencies through the provision of information, training and resources. This includes provision of advice to businesses and voluntary organisations about business continuity management.

(c) All the above work is done in co-ordination with a variety of statutory and voluntary partners across the county through the Sussex Resilience Forum (partnership) to ensure joined up approaches.

The regular updates on the current weather situation, impacts and the County Council's response provided by the team summarise information from a whole host of sources including detailed weather data gained from the a specialist Met Office Hazard Manager Portal and Dedicated Public Service Weather Service Advisor, flooding reports and predictions from the Flood Forecasting Centre, inter-agency meetings and reports from services from across the Council.

The aim is to provide a consolidated picture of all the information in a management summary form to inform services in making decisions about service delivery e.g. meal on wheels deliveries etc., and how to respond to the emergency. The information about community impacts and the County Council's actions it is hoped also provides members with a clear picture of what is happening in their areas, to help engage with and support the public during times of disruption.

Agenda Item No. 10(b) - Cabinet Member Question Time

Members asked questions on the Cabinet Members' reports as set out below. In instances where a Cabinet Member undertook to take follow-up action, this is also noted below.

Leader

The Leader answered questions on the following paragraphs.

Paragraph 2, West Sussex Independent Economic Commission, from Mr Barling.

Paragraph 21, local responses to recent flooding events, from Mrs Millson.

Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 3, Community Equipment Service, from Mrs Jones.

Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs.

Paragraph 5, The New Discovery School, from Mr Crow, Mrs Mullins and Mr Oxlade.

Paragraph 6, future organisation of schools in Worthing, from Mr Cloake.

Paragraph 7, Early Years Hub, from Mrs Duncton and Mrs Jones.

Paragraph 22, children and family centre, from Mrs Arculus.

Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs.

Paragraph 11, Networked Councillor Project, from Mr R J Oakley.

Paragraph 13, procurement of two new Select Lists of Contractors, from Mrs Rapnik.

Paragraph 14, staff mutual and social enterprises, from Mr Burrett.

Cabinet Member for Finance

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 15, Members' Big Society Fund and Social Enterprise Fund for 2013/14, from Mr Acraman, Mrs Evans, Mrs Millson and Mr R Rogers.

In response to a request from Mr Acraman, the Cabinet Member agreed to provide all members with a list of bids which had been successful plus those which had been rejected, together with the reasons.

Minutes - Appendix 3

In response to a comment from Mrs Evans that the letter she had received did not say which project had been successful, the Cabinet Member said he would look into the matter.

In response to a comment from Mr Rogers that he had not heard the result of his bids to the Big Society Fund, the Cabinet Member for Finance said that he would ensure Mr Rogers received a response.

Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 18, West Sussex Highways response to flooding, from Mrs Millson and Mr Quinn.

In response to a request from Mrs Millson in relation to the clearing of gullies and the need to check adjacent gullies in the area of reported problems, the Cabinet Member said that that could be done. The Cabinet Member also said he would be happy to take up any particular examples.

Cabinet Member for Residents' Services

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs.

Paragraph 19, Public Services Summit, from Ms James.

Paragraph 20, South East Seven Leaders and Chief Executives meeting, from Mr Glennon.

Agenda Item No. 10(c) - Leader's Question Time

The Leader answered questions from members on the following topics:

Second runway for Gatwick, from Mr Bradbury.

Bus service cuts, from Mr Parsons.

In response Mr Parson's question about the policy for cutting bus services, the Leader said she was unaware of any plans to cut services in the next year but would check and, if there were any formal proposals, would let him know.

Charlton Chase, from Mrs Arculus.

Members' mileage claims, from Dr Walsh.

In response to a question from Dr Walsh in relation to mileage and parking claims in advance of a decision by the Governance Committee, the Leader said that no double claims for parking would be processed.

Street lights turned off at midnight, from Mr Smith.

In response to Mr Smith's question about street lights in Selsey being turned off at midnight and the possibility of leaving lights on at junctions, the Leader said that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport would speak to Mr Smith outside the meeting.