

To all Members of the County Council

You are hereby summoned to attend the ordinary meeting of the County Council, to be held at **10.30 a.m.** on **Friday, 12 December 2014** at **County Hall North, Horsham RH12 1XA**.

Agenda

1. **Members' Interests**

Members are asked to disclose any personal or prejudicial interests in matters appearing on the agenda.

2. **Minutes**

The Council is asked to confirm the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the County Council held on 17 October 2014 (pages 257 to 282).

10.45 a.m.* 3. **Address by a Cabinet Member**

At the discretion of the Chairman, to receive any address by a Cabinet Member on a matter of urgency and/or significant interest to the County Council and which relates to the powers and responsibilities of the County Council or which affects the Council.

4. **Cabinet and Written Questions**

(a) **Written Questions**

A member who has submitted a written question is entitled to put one supplementary question arising from the circulated answer.

(b) **Cabinet Member Question Time**

Questions to Cabinet Members on the attached report on matters which have arisen in respect of their portfolios since the meeting of the Council on 17 October 2014 (pages 283 to 288) and any [supplementary report](#).

(1 hour 30 minutes is allocated for Cabinet Member questions)

(c) **Leader's Question Time**

Questions to the Leader on anything that is currently relevant to the County Council.

(15 minutes is allocated for questions to the Leader)

1 p.m.

Lunch (In the event that the morning business is finished before lunch the afternoon business will be brought forward as appropriate.)

2.00 p.m.

5. **[Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and Four-Year Financial Strategy 2015/19](#)**

The County Council is asked to consider an initial draft of the Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and the Four-Year Financial Strategy in the light of reports by the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Finance (page 289 and 290 to 306). Also enclosed is a schedule which describes proposals for balancing the budget for each Cabinet portfolio.

6. **[Governance Committee: Pension Advisory Board, Start of Life Partnership Board and terms of reference of the Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee](#)**

The County Council is asked to consider the establishment of a Pension Advisory Board and a Start of Life Partnership Board and a minor change to the terms of reference of the Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee, in the light of the report by the Governance Committee (pages 307 to 320).

7. **[Additional Ordinary Meeting of the County Council](#)**

The County Council is asked to consider a report by the Director of Law, Assurance and Strategy which seeks agreement to the holding of an additional ordinary meeting of the County Council on 19 January 2015 and the waiving of Standing Orders in relation to the business to be considered at that meeting (page 321).

8. **[Adult Safeguarding Panel](#)**

The County Council is asked to consider and note an overview of the recent work of the Adult Safeguarding Panel and to endorse an Adult Safeguarding Charter (page 322). A newsletter on the work of the Panel is enclosed.

9. **[Corporate Parenting Panel](#)**

The County Council is asked to consider and note an overview of the recent work of the Corporate Parenting Panel (pages 323 to 338).

10. **Notices of Motion**

- (a) To consider the following motion, submitted by Mr Acraman, notice of which was given on 29 September 2014. **Note: in line with agenda item 7 above, this motion will be referred for consideration by the Cabinet Member for**

Highways and Transport in advance of the meeting of the Council on 19 January 2015. A [briefing note](#) is now available.

^Gatwick was last debated by this Council 15 months ago in July 2013. Events since that time have clarified a number of things and make clear that net economic growth would at best be marginal whilst the environmental and infrastructure damage would be considerable.

In the last year the following have become clear:

- GAL has issued a second set of figures on the numerical consequences of a second runway. GAL state that 122,000 new jobs would be created, meaning immigration into the SE of 100,000 + people.
- 100,000 immigrants, 3 times the size of the proposed Mayfield new town, would put intolerable pressure on roads housing schools and hospitals with GAL's contribution to those costs would appear to be between zero and minima, with council tax payers left to fund the sizeable residue. GAL's estimate of 40,000 new homes is clearly a gross underestimate.
- 250,000 extra road journeys per day would result. Again GAL will only fund road IMPROVEMENTS CLOSE TO THE TERMINAL. Improvements to M23/A23, M25, A264, A272 and A27 would need to be county-funded as the only provider, since there will be no government financial support.
- The brief of Davies Airport Commission leaves a lot to be desired. His emphasis, like that of GAL, has been on the problems within the airport perimeter, taking no cognisance of problems such as hospital provision beyond the perimeter.
- Davis regards it as a given that runway capacity in the SE is a necessity and it is, to him, just a question of where. His short list of 3 does not include Stansted, which is excluded on flimsy grounds and thus the consideration is not being done on a level playing field.
- GAL has nonsensically stated that they can engineer a great increase in the train capacity on the London Brighton line. How can they do that with an immovable line capacity pinch point at East Croydon and limited train lengths on a network run by somebody else?
- At least 6 other MPs in the Surrey/Sussex area, including the Rt Hon Sir Nicholas Soames, Rt Hon Francis Maude and Rt Hon Nick Herbert, are opposed to a second runway.
- Any new runway anywhere cannot be reconciled with the UK's obligations under the Climate Change Act.
- A new runway will increase the county's Gross Economic Value. However there will be more people wanting that benefit and it will be a bigger cake but with more people wanting a slice so each

person's slice (Gross Economic Value per person) will be much the same. The same arithmetic applies to the county's tax revenue. It will be greater but there will be much more required expenditure on dealing with an ageing demographic and potential increase in problems like dementia.

- It is no longer realistic to imagine that Gatwick is just a north of the county problem which will have no effect in the coastal area. The pressure on housing roads and infrastructure will be county wide – from Shoreham to the Manhood peninsular as well as from East Grinstead to Horsham.

The environmental damage is without question, whereas the economic benefit is unproven and may well be negative. Therefore this Council should reserve its position on environmental grounds until such time as the definitive costs and possible benefits are much clearer than they are today.'

- (b) To consider the following motion, submitted by Mr Glennon, notice of which was given on 12 November 2014. A [briefing note](#) is now available.

'This Council recognises the significant financial burden faced by the residents of many of the 15,000 properties fronting the more than 3,000 unadopted and private roads in West Sussex.

We recognise that some residents value the privacy and control over their neighbourhood that owning their own road can bring. However, for many more the status of their road is the result of historical accident, when in reality they are an otherwise integral part of the wider network.

Unfortunately, the County Council does not have the means to bring all such roads up to an adoptable standard, as previous estimates by the County Council in the late 1990's put the figure for such works at £20m. Undoubtedly, this would have increased significantly since then.

However, this Council recognises that maintaining these roads is a major financial burden and communities can often struggle to ensure they are kept to a standard safe for all road users. This is exacerbated by the fact that these residents have no clear entitlement to a commensurate council tax rebate under current legislation.

This Council therefore agrees to ask the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to:

- (1) Establish a cross-party working group to complete an up-to-date analysis of the location, historical context, usage levels and

ownership of unadopted roads within the county;

- (2) Lobby the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to amend current legislation to enable rebates for residents living on unadopted roads, to be dependent on the context of the current road status.'

- (c) To consider the following motion, submitted by Mr G L Jones, notice of which was given on 12 November 2014. A [briefing note](#) is now available.

'In 2012 the County Council signed the Armed Forces Community Covenant, in which we committed to support the Armed Forces Community working and residing in West Sussex.

It is of paramount importance that we honour our pledges in the Community Covenant and continually strive to ensure that those commitments are translated into actions to improve the lives of all those who are either in active service or have served our country.

We recognise that veterans can find making the transition to civilian life extremely challenging, particularly in finding and securing lasting employment and believe that the County Council has a leading role to play in helping ex-servicemen and women to fulfil their potential outside of the Services.

This Council therefore asks the Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations to commit to signing up to the 'Veteran's Guaranteed Interview Scheme', created by the independent charity 'Soldier On!' and to fulfil the Scheme's two criteria:

- To interview all veterans who meet the minimum criteria for a job vacancy and to consider them on their abilities;
- To review this commitment annually and assess what has been achieved.

We also ask the Cabinet Member to commit to, wherever practicable, encouraging our suppliers and contractors to sign up to the scheme and also to promote the principles of the scheme to all employers within the county.'

- (d) To consider the following motion, submitted by Mrs Mullins, notice of which was given on 24 November 2014. A [briefing note](#) is now available.

'This Council notes that none of the towns, villages, or housing estates in the county were ever designed to accommodate the presently required parking

provision and no one could have predicted how parking problems would blight our communities today.

This Council believes that, although different parking issues affect communities in different ways, parking is a county-wide problem which will soon reach crisis point. Not only do parking issues cause frustration and tension between neighbours, they also lead to costly damage to the infrastructure, increased congestion and safety issues due to blocked access routes for emergency and service vehicles.

This Council resolves to tackle this issue by asking the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to set up a Parking Strategy Working Group involving district, borough, town and parish councils to proactively consider parking improvement schemes in all towns and villages to deal with this issue, ensuring that any profit from parking schemes and measures are re-invested into parking alleviation schemes throughout the county.

The Working Group should explore possibilities such as park and ride schemes; facilitating a reasonable cost one-stop service for residential driveway installation and focussing in particular on the issues around railway stations. Phase two of the strategic working group should look at longer term solutions to this problem such as (a) reviewing current planning requirements county-wide to ensure future developments for both commercial and residential properties include adequate provision for parking; and (b) the extent to which safe cycle tracks and lanes to link our towns and villages would have a positive impact on travel across the county and thereby reduce parking issues.'

- (e) To consider the following motion, submitted by Mr M G Jones, notice of which was given on 25 November 2014. A [briefing note](#) is now available.

'This Council recognises the valuable and important work that Food Banks are doing across West Sussex, and their contribution to helping local residents who are struggling with the cost of living and food bills.

This Council notes that in the last year Food Banks across West Sussex received over £20,000 from the Council's Local Assistance Network, together with an additional £15,000 given to local Food Banks in individual funding by County Local Committees.

This Council believes that the issue of food poverty in West Sussex is a matter of deep concern, and notes the Trussell Trust's figures which show that the number of people being referred to their Sussex Food Banks has doubled since 2013 to 25,000.

Given the proven need for these facilities, together with the continuing risk that the Government will withdraw funding entirely from the Local Assistance Network, this Council further believes that funding needs to be ring-fenced to ensure that voluntary organisations can continue to deliver Food Banks in the event that they need money for reasons which may include rent, storage costs and alterations to premises.

The Council therefore requests the Cabinet Member for Finance to include as part of the Council's budget for 2015/16 a sum of approximately £70,000 for the express purpose of expenditure towards the running of Food Banks in West Sussex.'

4.15 p.m. **County Council concludes.** Items not commenced by 4.15 p.m. will be deferred to the meeting on 13 February 2015.

Director of Law, Assurance and Strategy
3 December 2014

* The times stated indicate the latest end times for previous business and should not be relied on as start times for subsequent items