

West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

11th February 2011

At an Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 11th February 2011, at County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mr T M E Dunn (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Mrs A J Jupp
Mrs P A C Arculus	Mrs S Knight
Mr L H Barnard	Mr R A Lanzer
Mrs E A Bennett	Mr S E McDougall
Mr B K Blake	Mrs A F Mills
Mr G G Blampied	Mrs M E Millson
Dr H S Bloom	Mrs J S Mockridge
Mr P J J Bradbury	Mr J A P Montyn
Mr D N Britton	Mr J J O'Brien
Mr M J Brown	Mr C G Oxlade
Mr R G Burgess	Mr N F Peters
Mr R D Burrett	Mr A J E Quirk
Mr P C Catchpole	Mr A S Rice
Mrs C A Coleman	Mrs I C Richards
Mr M W G Coleman	Mr R Rogers
Mr B K Coomber	Mrs H J Ross
Mr D G Crow	Mr D P Sheldon
Mr D R Deedman	Mr D J Simmons
Dr N P S Dennis	Mr A R H Smith
Mr J E Doyle	Mrs B A Smith
Mr C P Duncton	Mr R J Smytherman
Mr R B Dunn	Mr C H Stevens
Mr P C Evans	Mr G M Tyler
Mrs C M Field	Mrs D L Urquhart
Ms M L Goldsmith	Mrs N J Waight
Mr P A Graysmark	Mr S G Waight
Mr P A D Griffiths	Dr J M M Walsh, RD
Mrs A B Hall	Mr B R A D Watson, OBE
Mr B Hall	Mr P C Wells
Mr M N Hall	Mrs E M Whitehead
Mr W J Hellawell	Mr D R Whittington
Mr M P S Hodgson	Mr F T Wilkinson
Mr P E Jones	Dr C E Wilsdon

Apologies and attendance

160 Apologies were received from Mrs Brunsdon, Miss Hendon, Mr Livermore and Mr Oppler. Mr Hellawell and Mr Jones gave apologies for the afternoon session and Mrs Bennett, Mr Crow, Mr Doyle and Mr Wells were absent.

Minutes

Crawley Town Football Club

- 161 The Chairman sent best wishes from the County Council to Crawley Town Football Club on the occasion of their match against Manchester United in the fifth round of the FA Cup on 19th February 2011.

Dr John Godfrey, Sussex Police Authority

- 162 The Chairman paid tribute to Dr John Godfrey who had recently retired as Chief Executive of the Sussex Police Authority. The Chairman sent him the Council's best wishes.

Interests

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

Minutes

- 164 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 17th December 2010 (pages 293 to 314) be approved as a correct record.

Review of Proportionality

- 165 The County Council was reminded of its statutory duty to review the proportionality on its committees following the resignation of Mr Doyle from the Liberal Democrat Group. A table, together with a brief explanation of the application of the proportionality rules, was set out at pages 315 and 316.
- 166 Resolved - that the review of proportionality on committees be agreed.

Appointments to Committees

- 167 The following changes to appointments by political groups were made which took effect from the end of the meeting:

Committee	Change/Confirmation
Children and Young People's Services Select Committee	Mr Burrett in place of Miss Hendon and to become Chairman
Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Mr Sheldon in place of Mr A R H Smith
Policy and Resources Select Committee	Mr Burrett in place of Miss Hendon
Strategic Environmental Services Select Committee	Mr Deedman in place of Mr Doyle

Committee	Change/Confirmation
Planning Committee	Mr Doyle
Rights of Way Committee - substitute	Mr Hellowell in place of Mr Doyle
Electoral Review Panel	Mr Rogers in place of Mr Doyle
Pensions Panel	Mr Doyle*
Staff Joint Committee	Mr Smytherman in place of Mr Doyle

* retained seat at the request of the Liberal Democrat Group

Appointment of an Independent Member to the Standards Committee

168 The Council considered a report on the appointment of an independent member to the Standards Committee (page 317).

169 Resolved -

That Mr David Longmore be appointed as an independent member of the Standards Committee for an initial period of four years.

Performance Framework and Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2011-15 and Treasury Management Strategy 2011/12

170 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.

171 The Leader moved the section of the report on the Performance Framework (pages 318 and 319) together with the draft Performance Framework, subject to some minor wording changes to the Performance Framework as set out below. The Leader also circulated a statement about personnel numbers.

'Think Family

Amend the first bullet point on page 4 to read as follows:

We will:

- Ensure our Children's Safeguarding Services ~~achieve an~~ **are judged to be** "adequate" ~~Ofsted rating~~ by March 2012 and a "good" ~~rating~~ by March 2014

Healthy Ambitions

Replace the second bullet point on page 5 with the following:

- ***Provide support for people in their own homes in order to contribute to the whole system objective to reduce hospital admissions.***

Building a Sustainable Future

Amend the first two bullet points on page 6 to read as follows:

- Reduce carbon emissions from activities directly controlled by the County Council (excluding schools) by ***10% each year (equivalent to 2,900 tonnes in the first each year)***
- Reduce West Sussex household waste to landfill by 75,000 tonnes (***44.5% 43%***) by March 2014'

- 172** The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources moved the report on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme (pages 318 to 341), together with the draft budget pack, subject to some minor changes to the budget as a result of the final local government settlement and an adjustment to borrowing costs as set out in italics below. He also moved the report on the Treasury Management Strategy (pages 342 to 370).

'Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2011-15

1. Change to Core Borrowing in 2011/12

As agreed by the Cabinet on 25th January it is proposed to reduce the level of core borrowing in 2011/12 from £20m to £19m. This reduction lowers the amount needed for capital financing charges by £100,000.

An extra £100,000 allocation towards the 'Big Society' initiative fund is proposed. This has no impact on the net budget requirement at £501.569m. This would increase the Big Society fund to £200,000 in 2011/12.

This extra sum is to support community-based participation in the delivery of services and to help ensure the County Council can play its part, in partnership with community groups, in encouraging the development of local self-help networks. Possible criteria to be applied to release the funding will be brought to the next Policy and Resources Select Committee in April.

2. Final Settlement

Papers were produced before the Final Settlement on 31st January. The changes are:

- A. *A lower reduction in grant from the transfer of responsibilities for the new South Downs National Park. Saving of £102k (provisional settlement was £241k, now £139k)*

- B. An extra reduction in grant on transport grants before they are rolled in to Formula Grant. Cost of £57k (provisional settlement was £939k, now £996k)
- C. A net cash gain of £45k (from A and B) is then subject to the 14.3% overall reduction on Formula Grant, leaving the County Council £39k better off.

It is proposed that this £39k net gain in grant be added to the Big Society Fund (and rounded up to £40k with a further £1k from contingency). This takes the Big Society Fund to £240,000. The extra grant does impact on the net expenditure as outlined below.

3. Impact on Budget report (page 330)

- Recommendation (2) Net Revenue Expenditure now £501.608m (was £501.569m)
- Recommendation 12(a) Budget requirement for the financial year 2011/12 should now read £501.608m (was £501.569m)
- Recommendation 12(b) Revenue Formula Grant now £121.041m (was £121.002m)

Summary of Budget Changes:

Budget pack - Key changes for 2011/12:

Ref	Description	Change £	New total £
1	Table 1 – Big Society	+ 140,000	240,000
1	Table 1 – Capital Financing Charges	- 100,000	30,523,000
2	General Contingency	-1,000	6,696,000
	Revised Net Expenditure	+39,000	501,608,000
2	Funded by: Inc in formula grant from Settlement	-39,000	121,041,000
	Overall Change in Precept		

4. Table 8b Capital Programme 2011/12 (page 23)

Under heading of 'Central Financing'

Capital receipts should read £13.256m (currently £12.256m)
 Borrowing – Corporate should read £19m (currently £20m)

- 173** The following amendment to the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme was proposed by Mrs Millson and seconded by Mr Deedman:

"No-one can be in any doubt that these are difficult times for public

Minutes

services and that the local Government finance settlement requires significant cuts. However, we believe it would be in the interests of the residents of West Sussex to re-profile the proposed savings over the 4 year life of the current Spending Review rather than the 3 years of the County Council's administration.

Doing otherwise will incur unnecessary redundancy costs, is unlikely to phase out or remodel services smoothly and will reduce opportunities to secure recurring savings in partnership with other organisations.

I therefore propose that the recommendations set out in the budget papers for 2011/12 be amended as follows.

	£m	£m
Total net expenditure in original recommendations		501.569
Reduced Saving AS 02 – Fair access to care services	1.547	
Reduced Saving AS07 - Mental health & Learning Disabilities	0.672	
Reduced saving CF05 -Youth Service	1.000	
Reduced Saving ES01- Support and Intervention	0.500	
Reduced Saving ES02 - Vulnerable Children	0.250	
Reduced Saving HT04-Transport 3-in-1 scheme	0.400	
Reduced Saving HT05 - Bus Subsidies	0.500	
Total reduction in savings		4.869
To be funded by:		
Reduction in earmarked reserve for insurance	-1.000	
Reduction in 2011/12 contribution to Special Revenue Reserve due to reduced costs of voluntary redundancies	-2.556	
Reduction in 2011/12 contribution to General Contingency	-1.313	
Total reduction in expenditure		<u>-4.869</u>
Revised total net		<u>501.569</u>

The amendment retains the same net expenditure of £501.569m for 2011/12, but reduces the savings needed by £4.869m, to be funded from the above mentioned reserves, which we believe are set at an over pessimistic level, in particular in view of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government's current position on local government reserves.

These £4.869m savings would be deferred to 2012/13. This should give time to find alternative savings that would not impact on front-line services, such as from greater partnership working. This would also enable that saving, and the current proposed savings for 2012/13/14 to be re-profiled over the period to 2015, as expected by the Coalition Government.

Capital Budget

Paragraph 20 on page 319 of the Council booklet states that the County

Council has an additional £51m of un-ringfenced capital grants but has lost £8m in ringfenced grants for schools, leaving a net £43m gain. Of this £4.88m has been added to the Highways capital programme under Structural Maintenance and £10m has been included in the Children's capital programme under 2 headings, £8.5m for schools maintenance and £1.5m for Basic Need provision which leaves a figure of £36.6m unallocated at this present time.

It seems to us that the government intends this additional capital funding to stimulate economic growth in the county. We therefore think it is wrong for the administration to bank this much needed funding, when there are so many overdue projects across the county and the local economy remains sluggish.

We propose therefore that investment begins immediately, with the priorities being new Fire Stations for Horsham and Crawley, both phases of the special school at Burgess Hill, a West Sussex mortuary and works to reduce the carbon footprint, including at some of our schools."

174 The amendment was lost.

175 The following amendment to the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme was proposed by Mrs B A Smith and seconded by Mr Oxlade:

"The Labour Group proposes that the cuts should be spread over the 4-year life of the current Spending Review rather than the 3 years of the County Council's administration. This approach would enable more time for the third sector organisations to prepare to take on youth provision. It would also mean that 3,550 vulnerable elderly people or people who have physical sensory impairment would continue to benefit from funding from the County Council for a further year.

The cost of the above proposal would be an impact on the County's reserves, estimated at around £7.7m over 4 years by the Executive Director Finance and Performance.

I therefore propose that the recommendations set out in pages 330 to 332 be amended to show the figures, included in the replacement pages attached. It retains the same net expenditure of £501.569m for 2011/12 but reduces the saving needed to £34.922m as set out below to be funded by a take from balances of £2.947m

The changes for the 2011/12 budget are summarised as:

	£m	£m
Total net expenditure in original recommendations		501.569
Reduced Saving AS 02 - Fair access to care services	1.547	
Reduced Saving HT 04 - Transport 3-in-1 scheme	0.400	
Reduced Saving CF 05 - Youth Service	1.000	
Funded by take from balances		<u>-2.947</u>
Revised Total net		<u>501.569</u>

In respect of Capital, page 319 of the Council booklet shows an additional £51m of un-ringfenced capital grants. This has been reduced by £8m in ring-fenced grants for schools, leaving a net of £43m gain.

£14.88m (including £8m above) has been added to Highways, and the Children's capital programme, leaving an unallocated sum of approx £36m. We propose that £6.123m should be used to bring forward the building of the long overdue Crawley Fire Station which would also provide a boost for the Crawley economy. We would also propose that investment is made in care homes and in Youth Centres and buildings used by Youth organisations, to bring these establishments up to a good standard before any transfer of service to the third sector, any remainder should be invested and held as a contingency."

176 The amendment was lost.

177 The report and recommendations on the Performance Framework and Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2011-15, as set out below, were approved subject to the minor wording changes to the Performance Framework and the minor changes to the budget as a result of the final local government settlement and an adjustment to borrowing costs, which had been circulated.

Resolved -

That, taking account of member priorities, the Performance Framework, Finance Strategy, final local government finance settlement and tax base and the results of internal and external consultation, and subject to the minor changes referred to above, the following items be approved:

- (1) the Performance Framework;
- (2) net revenue expenditure of £501.608m (Table 1 of the budget pack);
- (3) net changes in funding from central government not affecting spending power of £10.548m;
- (4) inflation allocations of £7.4m (Column 2 of Table 2 of the budget pack);
- (5) service commitments and net additional funding of £21.2m (Column 3 of Table 2 of the budget pack);
- (6) savings of £36.9m (Table 4 of the budget pack);
- (7) capital payments in 2011/12 of £196.4m (Table 8 of the budget pack);
- (8) proposed methods of financing capital payments between 2010/11 and 2013/14;
- (9) a maximum operational borrowing limit of £533.2m for outstanding debt and an authorised borrowing limit of £573.2m, including £40m of borrowing for temporary cash flow purposes (Table 7 of the budget pack);

- (10) a limit of 100% on borrowing at fixed rates and 25% on borrowing at variable rates (Table 7 of the budget pack); and
- (11) the assumptions underpinning the Executive Director Finance & Performance assessment of the robustness of estimates and the adequacy of reserves.
- (12) Subject to any changes made necessary by the final local government finance settlement and tax base, the following amounts be approved for the financial year 2011/12 in accordance with Sections 43 to 48 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

(a) That the budget requirement to meet net expenditure of the County Council for the financial year 2011/12 is £501.608m.

(b) That the following sums be payable for the year into the County Council's revenue fund:

Revenue Formula Grant	£121.041m
Area-Based Grant	£0.177m
Net surplus from District Council Collection Funds	£0.129m

(c) The council tax base for the year 2011/12 is the aggregate amount calculated by the billing authorities to which the County Council issues precepts totalling 327,250.0 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	£26,148,725.77
Arun District Council	£70,896,495.87
Chichester District Council	£61,580,241.05
Crawley Borough Council	£42,414,958.98
Horsham District Council	£67,410,409.67
Mid Sussex District Council	£66,672,313.62
Worthing Borough Council	£45,138,082.55

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

14 April 2011	19 May 2011	23 June 2011
28 July 2011	1 September 2011	6 October 2011
10 November 2011	8 December 2011	12 January 2012
16 February 2012		

- (h) Additionally, that payments be made by the district councils in respect of the estimated surplus on their collection funds on 31 March 2011:

Arun District Council	£658,000.00
Crawley Borough Council	£110,751.00
Mid Sussex District Council	£146,710.00

- (i) And payments be made to the district councils in respect of the estimated deficits on their collection funds on 31 March 2011:

Adur District Council	£323,053.59
Chichester District Council	£354,858.00
Worthing Borough Council	£108,202.58

- 178** The report and recommendations on the Treasury Management Strategy, as set out below, were approved.

Resolved -

- (1) That the revised CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice and the related amended treasury management clauses, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be formally adopted within the County Council's Financial Regulations; and
- (2) That the Treasury Management Strategy 2011/12, as set out at Appendix 2 to the report, be approved.

Cabinet and Written Questions

Written Questions

- 179** 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

- 180** Members asked questions on the Cabinet Members' reports (pages 371 to 376), and on a supplementary report (page 376A) which was circulated, as set out at Appendix 3. With regard to paragraph 4, it was noted that whilst the aim was to fill potholes within 28 days, in some circumstances it could take longer.

Leader's Question Time

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

West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-26

- 182 The Deputy Leader with portfolio for Highways and Transport moved the report on the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-26 (pages 377 to 379) together with the draft West Sussex Transport Plan.

- 183 Resolved -

That the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-26 (LTP3) be approved and adopted by the County Council.

Governance Committee: Review of Scrutiny

- 184 The Council considered proposed changes to scrutiny arrangements to accommodate a reduced resource for scrutiny and enhance the role of members in policy development (pages 380 to 391).

- 185 Resolved -

- (1) That the arrangements to enhance the role of members in policy development and the role of Policy and Resources Select Committee (detailed proposals set out at (a) to (l) of the report), be approved; and
- (2) That the amendments to the Protocol on Select Committees in the Constitution, as set out in Appendix B to the report, be approved.

Governance Committee: Scheme of Delegation for County Local Committees

- 186 The Council considered proposed changes to the delegated powers of County Local Committees (pages 392 to 402).

- 187 Resolved -

That the changes to terms of reference of County Local Committees in the Scheme of Delegation, as set out in the Appendix to the report, be approved.

Notice of Motion by Mr Acraman

- 188 The following motion was moved by Mr Acraman and seconded by Mr Watson:

'To move that the Protocol on [Planning] Committee Site Visits

Minutes

(paragraph 8 of Part 5 Section 4 of the Constitution) be amended to include the following:

'8. 3A The local county councillor and the chairman of the local parish council have the right to be invited to any site visit in the County Council division.'

and that paragraph 8.4 be amended appropriately.'

189 The motion was referred to the Standards Committee for consideration.

Chairman

The Council rose at 4.52 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 1 - Interests

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

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 6 - Performance Framework and revenue budget and Capital Programme 2011-15 and Treasury Management Strategy 2011/12	Mrs Knight	Governor of Mid Sussex Special School Temporary Governing Body and Oakmeeds School and Member of North and Mid Sussex Carers
	Mr Rice	Member of Worthing BC and Worthing BC member of Worthing Quality Bus Partnership
Item 7(a) Written Question 5 - Take over of County-run Youth Centres	Mr Oxlade	Member of Youth Centre Management Committee for Oriel High and Bewbush, Crawley and of Management Committee of Crawley Open House
Item 7(a) Written Question 6 - Alternative options to the closure of Youth Centres	Mr Tyler	Member of Rustington Parish Council
	Dr Walsh	Member of Littlehampton Town Council
Item 7(a) Written Question 9 - Crawley Schools and Special Educational Needs Grant	Mr Oxlade	Governor of Bewbush, Three Bridges and Waterfield Junior Schools
	Mr Quirk	Governor of Broadfield East Junior School
Item 7(b) CMQT paragraph 4 (Severe Weather)	Mr Blampied	Member of Felpham Parish Council
	Mr Evans	Member of Ferring Parish Council
Item 7(b) CMQT paragraph 10 (Academy Status)	Mr R B Dunn	Governor of Sir Robert Woodard Academy, Lancing (Deputy Chairman)
	Mr Evans	Local Authority Governor of the Littlehampton Academy

Minutes - Appendix 1

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 7(b) CMQT paragraph 15 (Delivery of support services)	Mr Rice	Member of Worthing Borough Council
Item 7(b) CMQT paragraph 16 (West Sussex Pension Fund)	Mr Blake	Member of West Sussex Pension Fund
	Dr Bloom	Member of West Sussex Pension Fund
	Mr Burrett	Member of West Sussex Pension Fund
	Mr Lanzer	Member of West Sussex Pension Fund
	Mrs B A Smith	Member of West Sussex Pension Fund
Item 7(b) CMQT paragraph 18 (fire and rescue control rooms)	Mr Bradbury	Member of the Local Authority Controlled Company
	Mrs Whitehead	Member of the Local Authority Controlled Company
Item 8 - West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-26	Mr Rice	Member of Worthing BC and Worthing BC member of Worthing Quality Bus Partnership
	Mrs B A Smith	Member of Crawley Borough Council and member of Crawley Cycling Forum
	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council
	Mr Tyler	Member of Arun District Council

11th February 2011

1. Written question from **Mr Acraman** for reply by the **Deputy Leader with portfolio for Highways and Transport**

Question

The runway agreement at Gatwick Airport expires in 2019 after 40 years. Although 2019 is still 8 years away, it will be a long drawn out process to achieve any successor arrangements.

Does the Cabinet Member agree with me that:

- (a) A start should be made now on how this major problem should be thought about and tackled and not just to leave the problem on the back burner for some years?
- (b) Thought should be given now as to whether a successor and similar agreement is the best route to pursue and to examine whether there are alternative approaches that might be more useful?
- (c) It should be confirmed that even after 2019 the goal of County Council must be to retain Gatwick as a single runway, two terminal airport for the foreseeable future?
- (d) It will be a useful exercise to set in train some research into the approach adopted in 1979 in achieving the previous agreement?

Answer

- (a) Although the legal agreement has eight years to run, it is important to keep up to date with developments and proposals relating to Gatwick Airport. The new owners have been clear about their intentions for running the Airport over the next few years. They have also set out their plans for investing £1bn in the Airport. However, there are many issues to consider that relate to the future of the Airport. These include:
 - (i) The Government's stated preference that there should be no additional runway capacity in the South East;
 - (ii) The Government's intention to prepare and publish an aviation policy framework, commencing with a scoping paper this year and a consultation paper in 2012, before publishing the final paper in 2013;
 - (iii) The need for economic growth and jobs in Crawley and more widely across West Sussex and the Coast to Capital Local Economic Partnership area;
 - (iv) The broader social and environment impacts of growth at the Airport and on surrounding communities; and
 - (v) The current and forecast scale of air travel.
- (b) Given the range of issues to consider, and the likelihood that these will evolve over the coming years, it is important to think about whether a successor agreement is possible and, if possible, the best way to pursue the

Minutes - Appendix 2

County Council's objectives. A County Council officer has been given a watching brief on this issue to ensure that the Cabinet is kept fully informed on developments and any possible alternatives to a second and similar legal agreement.

- (c) The County Council's policy is clear in that there is full support for the current legal agreement. Consideration of a policy to apply after 2019 is premature, at this stage, given the range of issues that might change and will need consideration.
- (d) The 1979 legal agreement was negotiated at a time when the County Council was the strategic planning authority and the Airport operator was seeking permission for a new terminal (the North Terminal), roads, taxiways, aircraft stands, landscaping, diversion of the River Mole, and widening of the existing taxiway and other works to allow for the emergency runway to be built. Whilst no longer the strategic planning authority, the County Council will look at the options for promoting and securing its objectives for the period after the current agreement expires.

Supplementary Question

In relation to the answer to part (d) of the question, how will this be done when the expertise on the airport on the officer side is being lost as part of the current service cuts?

Supplementary Answer

A member of the Policy Team has been asked to provide advice and this will increase towards the end of the current agreement. There is no point in trying to negotiate a new agreement at this stage. I can give the Council my assurance that a very close eye will be kept on Gatwick as it is very important both to West Sussex and to the Local Enterprise Partnership.

Additional Question by Mrs B A Smith

The answer to part (c) of the question appears lukewarm with regard to the Council's continuing support for the policy of one runway at Gatwick Airport - is the County Council weakening?

Answer to Additional Question

The Council is not weakening - the agreement in place until 2019 will be fully upheld. The current Government is committed to one runway. The airport also hopes to introduce larger aircraft to utilise the current airport capacity of up to 40 million passengers. The end of the agreement is still eight years away.

- 2. Written question from **Mrs Millson** for reply by the **Deputy Leader with portfolio for Highways and Transport**

Question

The Deputy Leader is aware that I recently raised concerns about the condition of

the cats' eyes and white lines on the A24. I was told that 'the Highway Authority does not have a statutory obligation to provide cats' eyes along single line lane markings, though we are advised through national guidance that road studs should be used on high speed roads as a safety feature'.

The Deputy Leader is further aware of the A24's accident record and that there is a possibility that the provision of the speed cameras on the road may be threatened in the future. Can the Deputy Leader re-assure me that money will be found to ensure that all safety measures on the A24 will continue to receive high priority in future maintenance programmes?

Answer

I am pleased to recognise the County Council's commitment to highway maintenance with a provisional £20m being made available for essential maintenance works this coming financial year. Road safety considerations will be one of the factors taken into account in determining where and how that funding is best spent. Consideration is currently being given to replacement of the self-illuminating cats-eyes at the southern Dial Post junction that were installed as part of the speed management scheme. A decision whether to replace with new self-illuminating or traditional reflection cats-eyes or to remove the cats-eyes completely will need to be made in the near future. Primarily this is a funding decision.

Funding of safety cameras has been secured for 2011/12. Discussions are currently ongoing with partners, including Sussex Police, with regard to developing a sustainable funding mechanism for safety cameras for the future.

Supplementary Question

Can the Deputy Leader give me an assurance that any changes to the cats' eyes on the A24 will be subject to full consultation with both the public and the Select Committee?

Supplementary Answer

The Select Committee will be told. Letting everyone along the A24 know would be difficult but parish councils will be informed.

Additional Question by Dr Walsh

Does the Deputy Leader not agree that the decision on how to replace cats' eyes should be primarily a road safety issue with finance a secondary consideration?

Answer to Additional Question

I agree that road safety is of great importance. I take the matter very seriously and will be keep it under review.

Additional Question by Mr Deedman

Will the Deputy Leader also look at the situation on the Findon bypass where at

night it is very difficult to see road markings?

Answer to Additional Question

I will undertake to ensure that the markings are legal.

3. Written question from **Mrs Millson** for reply by the **Deputy Leader with portfolio for Highways and Transport**

Question

The new street lighting maintenance contract came into operation in April 2010.

- (a) Can the Deputy Leader please update the Council on its effectiveness? In particular, can he tell us whether the contractor is meeting its targets to check all lights every fortnight and to repair all reported faults within five working days (unless the fault is due to a failure in supply or spare parts have to be obtained)?
- (b) Further, I understand that there have been unexpected issues around the locations of new columns in replacement schemes and also with the additional uses of lighting columns, e.g. to host our own highways signs and Christmas lights or other signs owned by town and parish councils. Can the Deputy Leader please explain how these issues are being dealt with? Are additional charges being levied for any supplementary uses?

Answer

- (a) Generally, the maintenance aspects of the new street lighting Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract are proving effective and are meeting the targets set out in the contract. The PFI contract does not specify the frequency of street lighting checks but rather a target of 99% of street lights working (performance at end December 2010 was 98.4%). The service provider, however, confirms in the method statement for achieving the target that street lights will be inspected at least fortnightly in the winter and monthly in the summer. As well as specifying three working days for normal faults the contract specifies a range of repair times varying from two hours for an emergency, 10 working days for complete replacement of a street light to 30 days for an Electricity Company connection.

Monitoring of the process and checks carried out on site indicate that the specified fortnightly checks are being carried out effectively. Repairs of normal faults are being completed well within five working days and are achieving the contract requirement of three working days.

- (b) The PFI contract specifies the required lighting levels for each road for replacement with the specific intention of achieving uniform lighting whilst reducing the County Council's energy consumption (carbon footprint). To achieve these contractual requirements, street light positions are being changed and in many instances, reducing the number of street lights in any

given road. Because of these changes queries were expected. The service provider is contracted to resolve any local issues as and when they arise.

With regard to third party (parish/town council) attachments to street lights, the matter is to do with the transfer of risk to the service provider of the structural integrity of the street lights. Because of this transfer the service provider is duty bound to ensure that relevant street lights and any proposed attachments (Christmas lighting/flower baskets) are fit for purpose. The service provider is not, and will not, charge for these attachments to street lights but parish/town councils may incur costs in proving to the service provider that any proposed attachment does not render the street lights unfit for purpose.

Supplementary Question

Could the Deputy Leader tell the Council how many lamp posts have previously been damaged? In addition, can he give any indication of how much the contractor is expecting parish councils to pay for this sort of safety examination?

Supplementary Answer

I do not know whether there has been any damage but I will endeavour to find out within the remit of what the Council has been told. In terms of costs, there will not be a charge for attachments but parishes may incur costs depending on the state of the lighting column and any safety checks required.

4. Written question from **Dr Walsh** for reply by the **Deputy Leader with portfolio for Highways and Transport**

Question

- (a) What has been the purpose of the recent earthworks on the A280 at Long Furlong, junction with Long Furlong Lane, Clapham?
- (b) Was planning permission required and sought or given?
- (c) What was the cost?
- (d) Since there are no apparent safety or highway improvements, how was any priority determined for these works?
- (e) What measures will be implemented to prevent continuing mud slippage in heavy rain onto the carriageway, contributing to an increased skid risk at this right angled bend?

Answer

- (a) The earthworks have been undertaken in connection with the formation of an agricultural access and closure of an existing access on land to south side of Long Furlong opposite Myrtle Grove Lane. The majority of the earthworks were undertaken to the existing embankments to provide visibility at the new point of access opposite Long Furlong Lane.

Minutes - Appendix 2

- (b) Planning permission was required given that a new vehicular access was proposed onto a classified road. As Highway Authority, the County Council was consulted by Arun District Council on the respective planning application (CL/7/09). Advice was given taking into account the potential safety improvement offered by the location of the new access compared with the position and substandard nature of the existing field access. Conditional planning permission was granted to Mr P Jenkin by the District Council on 28th October 2009. Consent for the new access was granted by the Highways Area Office.
- (c) No costs have been borne by the County Council with regard to the planning application or the works currently being undertaken by a third party.
- (d) The works have not been programmed or undertaken by the County Council. The works do offer a safety improvement as they will result in the closure of an existing substandard field access.
- (e) The works are in a 'raw' state having only been recently undertaken. As part of the planning permission, the regraded banks will be reseeded. While the excavations were being carrying out, the contractor (Landbuild) was contacted on a couple of occasions to ensure that they swept the carriageway during muck shifting. However, no complaints or queries have been received since the works were completed about soil being washed on to the road. If there are any problems in the future, the Highway Authority does have powers under the 1980 Highway Act to serve notice on the landowner to implement appropriate measures.

Supplementary Question

Is the Deputy Leader happy that a tarmacaded access has been created on the inside of the apex of a blind right-angle bend which appears to increase the road safety hazard at that point - will he visit the site to see for himself?

Supplementary Answer

I have visited the site and the works appear to me to be an improvement. However, I will ask officers to examine the access from a safety point of view.

5. Written question from **Mr Oxlade** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Children and Families**

Question

There seems to be some confusion on how many voluntary groups have stepped forward to take over county-run Youth Centres. Could the Cabinet Member provide details of how many groups are in discussions with the County Council and the financial support/package each group has been offered?

Answer

Progress on concrete proposals, the development of business plans and details of

support requested from the County Council have been awaiting the development of a community asset transfer policy (CATP). The Policy and Resources Select Committee considered this on 21st January 2011 and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources has now published a proposed decision containing details of the CATP. The Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources previously agreed that, where community groups may require transition assistance to become sustainable, there could be some consideration of additional financial support from the County Council. Details are being finalised. Similarly consideration is being given to improving the condition of buildings before any transfer to community organisations. At this time no financial/support packages have been requested by community organisations or agreed to by the County Council. Details of discussions that have taken place with partners in relation to individual centres are set out in the answer to question 6(a), below.

Supplementary Question

Can the Cabinet Member tell me what will happen if community groups do not come forward, particularly in Oriel or Ifield, and is there a cut-off time for discussions?

Supplementary Answer

There is no cut-off time for discussions although I would like them completed as soon as possible. I give you an assurance that I will talk to every unit available.

6. Written question from **Dr Walsh** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Children and Families**

Question

- (a) Would the Cabinet Member please advise what progress has been made to date with communities, partners and the voluntary sector in terms of alternative options to closure of the centres and projects detailed below as a result of the £2m taken out of the service at Budget time last year?
- (i) Crawley: Oriel or Ifield Youth wing
 - (ii) Horsham: Weald, and Holbrook
 - (iii) Mid-Sussex: Cuckfield, and Beacon Centre at Hassocks
 - (iv) Worthing: Sydney Walter Centre or The Place
 - (v) Arun: Yapton, Rustington/Ferring
 - (vi) Chichester: Witterings
- (b) Can he also indicate how and when the promised targeting for socially deprived areas promised at the same time will be forthcoming?

Answer

- (a) Youth Services have worked closely with partners to look at opportunities for engaging with groups and the voluntary sector. Progress on concrete proposals has been awaiting the development of a community asset transfer policy (CATP) that was considered by the Policy and Resources Select Committee on 21st January 2011.

Oriel - No community group has come forward to offer alternatives.

Ifield - The Ifield Parochial Church Council have done some work on developing a business plan for the future. They have decided that they could not lead any development but would be keen to be part of a consortium of community groups to develop youth provision. A consortium has not yet been established.

Weald Youth Wing - The development of community youth provision is being led by the Billingshurst Community Partnership 'EYE' project.

Holbrook - The management committee is interested in self-management and has started looking at options. However, they have not yet developed a business plan as they wanted to understand the implications of CATP.

Cuckfield - Progress has been made about plans to move the provision onto the school site and conversations with the Parish Council have begun to explore the options for funding. A faith organisation may be interested in developing the provision and meetings are taking place over the next few weeks.

Beacon Centre - The management committee has been very active in looking for alternative sources of funding and developing management arrangements for the provision. There are a number of options being considered including two voluntary organisations keen to use the building on a permanent basis. Meetings with the landlord, Children Country Holiday Fund, have also taken place.

Sydney Walter Centre - The management committee are preparing a business plan.

The Place - The management committee are not considering making a proposal. No community group has come forward.

Yapton - The management committee and Parish Council are considering options of combining provision with parish hall.

Rustington - A meeting with the Parish Council is planned to look at sustaining provision.

Ferring - A Youth Consortium is being considered to include Arundel, Arun District Council and Littlehampton Town Council. Ferring management committee have indicated an interest in taking over provision but awaiting further details from the County Council and the CATP.

Witterings - The management committee are interested and considering options following CATP.

- (b) Targeted Provision - Youth Services have always delivered preventative and targeted programmes as part of the core business. In developing the new service model it is proposed to retain open access provision aimed at early intervention and prevention in the areas of highest need, for example in Littlehampton, Crawley and Bognor Regis, and these will continue under the new service model. For those young people who are vulnerable or require additional support for example young carers. Youth Services are continuing to develop young carers groups throughout the county; the Lodge Hill Challenge programme undertakes development work with young offenders.

Recruiting young people to targeted youth support programmes is being piloted in areas of Worthing, Adur and Arun. The programmes have been well received by partners and are already oversubscribed. Targeted programmes have already been developed at Crawley through the Positive Activities for Young People programme and will be continuing under the

new service model. It is planned to offer targeted summer activity programmes during the summer holidays. Targeted programmes will be rolled out across the county from September 2011.

Supplementary Question

With regard to the Littlehampton area, is the Cabinet Member going to talk to the other local partners i.e. Littlehampton Town Council, which has not had an approach in the last year?

Supplementary Answer

I have been waiting for the recently issued community asset transfer document which will allow consideration of the transfer of buildings to the community. A menu of items to be offered to the services which come forward to run youth centres and what the County Council will do to support them is also currently being drawn up. Once that has been formulated, discussions can start.

Additional Question by Mrs Millson

I understand that Oriel and Ifield Youth Centres have been included in a PFI bid in Crawley. If no groups come forward to run the centres, will that not be a problem?

Answer to Additional Question

I have a meeting scheduled with Crawley Borough Council and the MP for the area to look at Crawley as a whole, which will include those two youth centres, to work out a way forward.

Additional Question by Mrs Arculus

As there is a problem of anti-social behaviour in smaller towns and bigger villages, will it be possible to keep targeted work in rural areas, even if it is out of hubs and not necessarily on one site?

Answer to Additional Question

The youth centres which are targeted will continue that work but there will also be outreach work including the 'purple bus' and mobile units.

Additional Question by Mrs Ross

Is the Cabinet Member concerned about how few people have come forward with expressions of interest to run the youth service?

Answer to Additional Question

I believe a number of youth centres are waiting to see what the County Council will offer. I will therefore visit groups and take a proposition to them.

Additional Question by Mr Tyler

There is a meeting with Rustington Parish Council next week. Will the Cabinet Member ensure that, despite a recent change of personnel, the Parish Council is made aware of the full menu of options as it is unusual in already owning the building?

Answer to Additional Question

I will ensure that the Parish Council is fully informed.

7. Written question from **Mr Deedman** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Education and Schools**

Question

Can the Cabinet Member confirm how many children were permanently excluded from schools in West Sussex during 2008/09 and of those:

- (a) How many were receiving 'school action' support?
- (b) How many were receiving 'school action plus' support?
- (c) How many had a Statement for Special Educational Needs?

Answer

Eighty-three pupils were permanently excluded within the academic year 2008/09, two of which were Looked After Children. For statistical purposes the County Council reports to the Department for Education on the number of students whose exclusions were completed within the academic year and this includes pupils whose exclusions were issued in 2007/08 and carried forward into 2008/09. Using this measurement there were 103 permanent exclusions. Of the 103 students, 31 had no special educational needs (30.1% of the 103 permanent exclusions) and:

- (a) 36 were at School Action (35.0%)
- (b) 33 were at School Action Plus (32.0%)
- (c) 3 had Statements of Special Educational Needs (2.9%)

Supplementary Question

Can the Cabinet Member comment on the suggestion that, since 70% of the permanent exclusions relate to SEN and those children needing extra support, this is an indication of the Council's failure to give sufficient support to those children and seriously questions the agreed cut in support for those vulnerable children in the budget savings?

Supplementary Answer

I can assure members that the Council has been taking a proactive approach and is working with schools to reduce the number of pupils who have not previously had properly tailored education courses. This has reduced the number of exclusions and the figure for 2009/10 is down to 94 which is a significant shift. Future support will be clearer following the outcome of the budget and once the Green Paper has been published.

8. Written question from **Mr McDougall** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Education and Schools**

Question

I understand that the Governors of the Regis School in Bognor Regis recently decided that they were no longer able to continue with the before and after school clubs and holiday play-scheme at the co-located Arena leisure centre. Can the Cabinet Member advise when this provision will cease to exist and what steps are being taken to ensure that a service continues for the many parents in Bognor Regis and the surrounding area who rely on this provision to enable them to work, particularly at this challenging economic time.

Answer

The Regis School recently made the decision to close breakfast and after school clubs at the Arena. We understand that this was because they failed to recruit a suitable manager, and because the clubs had been incurring financial losses. The provision will close on Friday, 18th February, prior to half term. The County Council's Early Childhood Service has been working closely with the school to help resolve the difficulties. I understand that the school is looking to find an independent provider, and that they hope replacement services will be available within a couple of months. The County Council understands the importance of these services to the local community and will continue to do everything possible to support the school to find a solution.

9. Written question from **Mr Oxlade** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Education and Schools**

Question

I understand that the Special Educational Needs Grant has undergone a change in its distribution. Can the Cabinet Member provide a detailed list of the financial amounts lost and gained for every Crawley school?

Answer

The allocation of additional educational needs, special educational needs and deprivation funding was made based on two data sets; firstly the three-year average attainment of a school's pupils at the end of each Key Stage and, secondly, the deprivation data based on the Index of Multiple Deprivation score

Minutes - Appendix 2

for each school. The latter index includes demographic data for adults as well as school-age children.

The formulae were last reviewed in 2004/05 and the current review assessed whether the previous formulae were fit for purpose based on the following criteria:

- they reflect the priorities of the Education and Schools Policy
- are compliant with national funding regulations
- use latest data to ensure resources are allocated appropriately.

The findings of the review were that smarter attainment and deprivation data are now available and better reflect the needs of pupils actually on roll at each school. The new data includes the use of the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile as an attainment measure for pupils at Key Stage 1 in infant, first and primary schools, the availability of attainment data for the majority of pupils in each year group, and the introduction of the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index score. This is a new deprivation measure uniquely focused on the child. Using this data would support the delivery of the Education and Schools Policy and comply with funding regulations.

Two formal written consultation documents setting out new funding proposals were sent to schools and two briefing sessions were arranged for governors and headteachers. As a result of the responses from schools and other consultative groups, the initial proposals have been adapted and refined. The proposals include arrangements that will help schools manage the change in funding over the next three years. The total funding variation by 2014/15 for the Crawley schools are summarised in the table attached.

Total funding variation by 2014/15 for the Crawley schools

Sector	School	Indicative variation between 11/12 model results and actual 10/11 funding
Primary	Bewbush Primary School	-88,867
	Broadfield East Junior School	-86,362
	Desmond Anderson Primary, Crawley	-47,002
	Three Bridges Junior School, Crawley	-21,907
	St Francis of Assisi Catholic Primary School, Crawley	-21,159
	Maidenbower Junior School, Crawley	-17,860
	Southgate Primary School	-17,419
	Turners Hill C E Primary School	-10,434
	Pound Hill Junior School, Crawley	-9,907
	Waterfield Primary School	-6,503
	Copthorne C E Junior School	-5,342
	Our Lady Queen of Heaven Catholic Primary School, Crawley	580
	Crawley Down Village C of E School	5,487
	St Andrew's C E Primary, Furnace Green, Crawley	8,905
	Three Bridges Infant School, Crawley	9,141
	West Green Primary School	11,469
Langley Green Primary School	12,460	

Sector	School	Indicative variation between 11/12 model results and actual 10/11 funding
	Maidenbower Infant School, Crawley	14,707
	Oaks Primary School, Crawley, The	15,298
	Fairway Infant School, Copthorne	15,407
	Hilltop Primary School	15,865
	Brook Infant School, Maidenbower, The	16,574
	Milton Mount Primary School	28,167
	Gossops Green Primary School	30,054
	The Mill Primary School	31,433
	Pound Hill Infant School, Crawley	31,982
	Northgate Primary School	38,408
	St Margaret's C E Primary School, Ifield, Crawley	39,458
	Seymour Primary School	56,517
	Broadfield East Infant School	137,379
Secondary	Oriel High School	-30,199
	Hazelwick School, Crawley	29,780
	Thomas Bennett Community College	79,810
	St Wilfrid's Catholic Comprehensive School, Crawley	93,990
	Ifield Community College, Crawley	141,129
	Holy Trinity C of E Secondary School, Crawley, The	185,174

Total variation for Crawley area schools

£686,216

Note: These indicative allocations are based on 2010/11 data. Actual allocations for 2011/12 will use new data and there will be transitional protection to phase in changes.

Supplementary Question

If the schools that are not actually in Crawley are taken out, the top two worst affected schools are in the most deprived areas in Crawley. Does the Cabinet Member think that this is fair?

Supplementary Answer

The new way of assessing need and support for schools in general is a fairer and much more accurate approach. If the resources are targeted much more accurately I am confident that it will raise standards including the schools to which Mr Oxlade has referred.

Additional Question by Mr Quirk

In relation to the note under total variation for Crawley schools, will the new data change the figures?

Answer to Additional Question

The new data will inevitably change the allocations - it is a three-year programme.

10. Written question from **Mr Hellowell** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources**

Question

On 2nd February the Cabinet Member published the Revenue Budget Monitor as at 31st December 2010 (Executive decision FR43 (10/11)). The report states that projected capital spending for that year is £202.0m, which is an increase of £2.6m on the figure reported in October. The explanation given is that planned costs of the Materials Resource Management Contract (MRMC) have increased by £5.7m, financed by external funding of £2.0m and additional service funded borrowing of £3.7m; which is offset by £3.1m of slippage to 2011/12. I believe this means the total planned spend for the MRMC contract has increased by £13.66m.

Would the Cabinet Member confirm:

- (a) the reasons for the significant increase of costs;
- (b) how much the additional borrowing required will cost the County Council; and
- (c) whether he is confident that the 25 year financial model for the contract projected costs remain within the overall affordability envelope.

If there are commercial sensitivities relating to aspects of the response can the Cabinet Member provide that detail to all members of this Council in a confidential briefing note before the end of February?

Answer

- (a) The planned capital spend for the MRMC contract has increased by £11.66m from £119.914m to £131.574m. The increase in costs relates to two factors:
 - (i) Land purchase costs. These are £4.1m higher than originally estimated; the final cost of the Micro Biological Treatment (MBT) site was £0.4m higher than originally estimated, whilst a further £3.7m was spent on purchasing an adjacent parcel of land for the Advanced Thermal Treatment (ATT) facility. Since the County Council is no longer looking to build the ATT facility, this land is now effectively surplus to requirements. Under the terms of the MRMC, Biffa has the right up until 30th June 2013 to exercise its option to buy back the ATT site.
 - (ii) Procurement costs. These have increased by £7.6m from £114.9m to £122.5m. A number of costs have increased due to indexation, in relation to:
 - Inflation: Where prices have increased from those originally included in the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) submission back in 2008 to when the contract was finally signed in June 2010; and
 - Foreign exchange movement: Much of the technology being used within the MBT facility is coming from Europe and therefore the

prices quoted in the BAFO were in euros. The County Council therefore carried the risk of any exchange movement between the pound and the euro.

- (b) Assuming a rate of 10% for borrowing costs, the increased capital spend of £11.66m would equate to additional borrowing costs of £29.15m over the assumed life of the MBT of 25 years.
- (c) Despite the increase in build costs for the MBT facility the projected costs of the contract as set out within the 25 year financial model remain within the overall affordability envelope. As part of the decision taken back in September 2010 not to build the ATT facility, but to look to procure a market for the refuse derived fuel instead, a number of market scenarios were costed through the financial model. These costings were based on an initial Market Sounding Report – this indicated that the potential saving from going to the market could be as much as £120m over the life of the 25-year contract, and therefore these savings would more than outweigh the increased build costs of the MBT facility.

11. Written question from Mr Oxlade for reply by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

Question

Could the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources provide the figures for:

- (a) How many posts are being lost per Service, including a breakdown of full and part-time positions, in the current financial year?
- (b) How many West Sussex County Council employees are losing or have lost their jobs in the current financial year?
- (c) The number of these per Service that were voluntary redundancies.

Answer

Projected Leavers 01/04/10 to 31/03/11	Voluntary Redundancy		Compulsory Redundancy		Other*	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
By Directorate:						
Adults' Services	0	0	0	0	5	4
Children's Services (incl. Learning)	12	63	27	22	3	25
Fire & Rescue (incl. Emergency Management)	12**	0	0	0	10	0
Communities & Infrastructure	0	0	0	0	0	4
Other Back Office	29	9	6	3	18	21
Total	53	72	33	25	36	55
Grand Total	125		58		91	

* Other - End of fixed term contract or other dismissal (conduct/capability)

** Retained Fire-fighters counted as full-time

Minutes - Appendix 2

Total Full Time	122
Total Part Time	152
Overall Total	274

NB: This information excludes voluntary leavers (e.g. resignations/retirements) and does not account for the vacancy management controls in place to support organisational change.

Supplementary Question

As it is often the more experienced members of staff who opt for voluntary redundancy, is the Cabinet confident of maintaining quality services despite the loss of knowledge and experience?

Supplementary Answer

Yes, I am confident. I will ensure there is no diminution of service and, whilst people will not be promoted above their natural level of ability, those appointed to the roles will do as good a job as their predecessors.

Additional Question by Mrs B A Smith

According to the table the highest number of leavers is due to voluntary redundancy. Can the Cabinet Member tell me how many were unsuccessful applicants for their own jobs?

Answer to Additional Question

Those figures were not requested in the original question. However, I will find out and let Mrs Smith know.

Additional Question by Dr Walsh

Is the Cabinet Member happy that management skills alone and not service competencies are sufficient?

Answer to Additional Question

I believe core management competencies and skills are to a degree to transferable although it is possible to go too far in some cases.

Agenda Item No. 7(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 paragraph 2, Local Enterprise Partnership, from Mrs Whitehead.

In response to a question from Mrs Whitehead, the Leader agreed to circulate to members a list of the members of the Transition Board.

Deputy Leader and portfolio for Highways and Transport

The Deputy Leader answered questions on the following paragraphs

Paragraph 4, severe weather, from Mr Blampied, Mr O'Brien and Dr Walsh.

In response to a query from Dr Walsh about whether all potholes were being filled within 28 days, the Deputy Leader said that this was the aim although in some circumstances they could take longer. He said he would therefore ensure that a note was included in the minutes to correct the statement in paragraph 4.

Paragraph 21, A24 Southwater-Ashington scheme, from Dr Walsh and Mr Wilkinson.

In response to a request from Dr Walsh that consideration be given to closing the remaining gaps in the central reservation, the Deputy Leader said it was a complicated matter but he would look at it and take whatever measures were possible.

In response to a question from Mr Wilkinson about whether the average speed management controls could be extended from Southwater to the Findon roundabout, the Deputy Leader said that he would ask the Safer Sussex Roads Partnership to see whether this could be done.

Cabinet Member for Adults' Services

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 6, reablement services linked to hospital discharge, from Mrs Arculus and Mrs Knight.

In response to a question from Mrs Knight, the Cabinet Member said he would check whether the reablement services were available to people in residential and nursing homes after discharge from hospital and let Mrs Knight know.

Cabinet Member for Children and Families (Lead Member for Children's Services)

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 9, Inspection of Children's Services, from Dr Wilsdon.

Minutes - Appendix 3

Cabinet Member for Education and Schools

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 10, academy status, from Mrs Field, Mr Smytherman and Dr Wilsdon.

Paragraph 11, Early Years Planning and Review Meetings, from Mrs Jupp and Mrs Knight.

Paragraph 12, young people's entrepreneurial skills and attitudes, from Mrs Field, Mr B Hall and Mr Stevens.

Cabinet Member for Environment and Economy

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 14, Carbon Reduction Commitment - Energy Efficiency Scheme, from Dr Walsh.

Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs.

Paragraph 15, delivery of support services', from Mr Rice.

Paragraph 16, West Sussex Pension Fund, from Mr Burrett.

Cabinet Member for Public Protection

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs.

Paragraph 17, joint working with East Sussex Fire Authority, from Mr Acraman, Mr Deedman, Mrs B A Smith and Mr Smytherman.

In response to a question from Mrs Smith in relation to Crawley Fire Station and how much had been spent on the work undertaken so far, the Cabinet Member said he would circulate the figure to all Crawley members. He also said he would keep all members informed of potential closer working with East Sussex Fire Authority and any other fire authorities.

In response to a comment from Mr Acraman about the need to ensure a potential joint fire authority was not too large, the Cabinet Member said that he would keep members fully informed as the negotiations continued.

Paragraph 18, joint working with fire and rescue control rooms, from Mr Acraman and Mr M W G Coleman.

Paragraph 20, disturbances at Ford Prison, from Mrs C A Coleman, Mrs A B Hall and Dr Walsh.

In response to a request from Mrs Coleman, the Cabinet Member said that he would pass on to the Fire Service the Council's thanks for the way in which they had dealt with the incident. He agreed to report to the next Council meeting on the outcome of meetings to discuss the incident.

Agenda Item No. 7(c) - Leader's Question Time

The Leader answered questions from members on the following topics:

The Corporate Parenting Panel, from Mrs C A Coleman.

The frequent changes in the Cabinet Member responsible for Children's Services and the County Council's poor Ofsted rating, from Mrs Millson.

EU budget increases, from Mr Acraman.

The requirement on local authorities to publish an organisational chart of names and responsibilities of all staff paid over £58,000, from Dr Walsh.

Worthing and Southlands Hospital's consultation on changes to services and the possible improvement to transport links, from Mrs Richards.

In response to a question from Mrs Richards about whether the County Council was in discussions with Worthing and Southlands Hospital about possible improvements to transport links as part of its consultation on changes to services, the Leader said she would ensure that the County Council was involved.

The number of charities offering to help with the 'Big Society' and what the County Council was doing to support them, from Mr Rogers.