

## West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

---

**22nd July 2011**

At an Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 22nd July 2011, at County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mr M W G Coleman (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Mr R A Lanzer
Mr L H Barnard	Mr J Livermore
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 F R J Oppler
Mrs H A Brunsdon	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 B K Coomber	Mr R Rogers
Mr D G Crow	Mrs H J Ross
Mr D R Deedman	Mr D P Sheldon
Dr N P S Dennis	Mr D J Simmons
Mr C P Duncton	Mr A R H Smith
Mr T M E Dunn	Mrs B A Smith
Mr P C Evans	Mr R J Smytherman
Mrs C M Field	Mr C H Stevens
Ms M L Goldsmith	Mr G M Tyler
Mr P A Graysmark	Mrs D L Urquhart
Mr P A D Griffiths	Mrs N J Waight
Mrs A B Hall	Mr S G Waight
Mr B Hall	Dr J M M Walsh, RD
Mr M N Hall	Mr B R A D Watson, OBE
Mr W J Hellawell	Mr P C Wells
Miss N J Hendon	Mrs E M Whitehead
Mr M P S Hodgson	Mr D R Whittington
Mr P E Jones	Mr F T Wilkinson
Mrs A J Jupp	Dr C E Wilsdon
Mrs S Knight	

### Apologies and attendance

**33** Apologies were received from Mrs Arculus, Mr Doyle and Mr R B Dunn. Mrs Bennett, Mrs Brunsdon, Mrs A B Hall, Miss Hendon and Mr Wells gave their apologies for the afternoon session and Mrs Whitehead left at 3.00 p.m. Mr Duncton, Mr Livermore, Mr McDougall and Mr Oppler were absent for the afternoon session.

## Minutes

---

### Interests

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

### Minutes

- 35 It was agreed that the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the County Council held on 13th May 2011 (pages 61 to 81) be approved as a correct record.

### Review of Proportionality

- 36 Following the resignation of Mr B Hall from the Liberal Democrat Group, the County Council had a statutory duty to review the proportionality on its committees. Members noted a paper on the application of the proportionality rules (page 81A), together with a table showing the allocations of seats among Committees (page 81B).
- 37 Resolved - that the review of proportionality on committees be agreed.

### Appointments

- 38 Following the review of proportionality and recent changes to the Cabinet the following changes to appointments were made which took effect from the end of the meeting:

Committee	Change
Community Services Select Committee	Mr Blampied in place of Mr O'Brien
Policy and Resources Select Committee	Mr B Hall in place of Mr A R H Smith Mrs Urquhart in place of Mr O'Brien
Strategic Environmental Services Select Committee	Mr Doyle in place of Mr Hellawell
Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee	Mr Acraman in place of Mr Montyn
Adoption Panel	Mr Burgess to fill vacancy (post in receipt of a Special Responsibility Allowance)

### Cabinet and Written Questions

#### Written Questions

- 39 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**

- 40 Members asked questions on the Cabinet Members' reports (pages 82 to 89), and on a supplementary report (page 89A-B) which was circulated, as set out at Appendix 3.

### **Leader's Question Time**

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

### **Performance Framework 2010/11: End of Year Performance Report**

- 42 The Leader moved the report on the Performance Framework 2010/11: End of Year Performance Report (pages 90 and 91) together with the draft Performance End of Year Report.

- 43 Resolved -

That the Performance Framework 2010/11 End of Year Performance Report be approved.

### **Treasury Management Annual Report 2010/11**

- 44 In line with the new arrangements agreed by the Council in February, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources moved the report on the Treasury Management Annual Report 2010/11 (pages 92 to 104).

- 45 Resolved -

That the Treasury Management Annual Report for 2010/11, as set out at the Appendix to the report, be approved.

### **Governance Committee: School Transport Appeal Panel**

- 46 The Council considered a report recommending the establishment of a School Transport Panel (pages 105 and 106).

- 47 The Chairman agreed that, as the nature of the Appeal Panel would be different to other appeal panels, there would be training provided for members.

- 48 Resolved -

That the establishment of a School Transport Appeal Panel, as set out at the Appendix to the report, be approved.

### **Annual Report of the Standards Committee**

- 49 The Council considered a report from the Standards Committee (pages 107

to 108) on its activities over the last 12 months.

50 Resolved -

That the report be noted.

### Notice of Motion by Mr Acraman

51 At the County Council meeting on 11th February 2011 the following motion had been moved by Mr Acraman, seconded by Mr Watson, and referred to the Standards Committee for consideration. A report by the Standards Committee was included with the agenda (pages 109 to 111).

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

52 An amendment was moved by Mr Acraman and seconded by Mr Watson as set out below:

'To move that the Protocol on [Planning] Committee Site Visits (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~~ **has** the right to be invited to any site visit in the County Council division.'

and that paragraph 8.4 be amended appropriately.'

53 The amendment was carried.

54 The amended motion, as set out below, was put to the vote.

'To move that the Protocol on [Planning] Committee Site Visits (paragraph 8 of Part 5 Section 4 of the Constitution) be amended to include the following:

'8. 3A The local county councillor has the right to be invited to any site visit in the County Council division.'

and that paragraph 8.4 be amended appropriately.'

55 The amended motion, as set out above, was lost.

## Notice of Motion by Mr Smytherman

**56** At the County Council meeting on 13th May 2011 the following motion had been moved by Mr Smytherman, seconded by Mr Rice, and referred to the then Deputy Leader with portfolio for Highways and Transport for consideration. A report by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport was included with the agenda (pages 112 and 113).

'West Sussex County Council:

- (1) Welcomes the announcement in the Budget on 23rd March 2011 that councils in England will be given extra money, on top of the £100 million announced in February, to spend on repairing potholes, meaning an extra £2.6 million will now be available in this year's council budget for pothole repairs in West Sussex.
- (2) Notes the significant investment has already been made this year to improve road safety and maintain West Sussex highways infrastructure, including £2 million for pothole repairs and a further £753,000 for carriageway patching.
- (3) Resolves that, given the potential safety, health, congestion relief, noise reduction and quality of life benefits, the Deputy Leader and portfolio for Highways and Transport be requested to reserve some money to introduce 20mph speed restrictions in non-major routes in residential areas throughout Worthing as a pilot for West Sussex.
- (4) Asks the Deputy Leader and portfolio for Highways and Transport to:
  - (a) instruct officers to present options to speed up the identification and repair of potholes, using reports from residents and condition surveys to ensure that these funds are applied in an efficient and cost effective manner, with a view to ensuring that the defects and deteriorating roads are tackled at the earliest opportunity; and
  - (b) publish information on the Council's website by 30th September 2011 showing where this extra money has been spent.'

**57** Although the Cabinet Member was in broad agreement with Mr Smytherman, he could not accept the detail of the motion and had therefore proposed an amendment which Mr Smytherman had indicated he was willing to support.

**58** An amendment was moved by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport and seconded by Mr O'Brien as set out below:

'West Sussex County Council:

- (1) Welcomes the announcement in the Budget on 23rd March 2011 that councils in England will be given extra money, on top of the £100 million announced in February, to spend on repairing potholes, meaning an extra £2.6 million will now be available in this year's council budget for pothole repairs in West Sussex.
- (2) Notes the significant investment has already been made this year to improve road safety and maintain West Sussex highways infrastructure, including £2 million for pothole repairs and a further £753,000 for carriageway patching.
- (3) Resolves that, given the potential safety, health, congestion relief, noise reduction and quality of life benefits, ~~the Deputy Leader and portfolio~~ **Cabinet Member** for Highways and Transport be requested to ~~reserve some money to~~ **work with the County Local Committee and local stakeholders to introduce promote** 20mph speed restrictions in non-major routes in residential areas throughout Worthing as a pilot for West Sussex.
- (4) Asks the ~~Deputy Leader and portfolio~~ **Cabinet Member** for Highways and Transport to:
  - (a) instruct officers to present options to speed up the identification and repair of potholes, using reports from residents and condition surveys to ensure that these funds are applied in an efficient and cost effective manner, with a view to ensuring that the defects and deteriorating roads are tackled at the earliest opportunity; and
  - (b) publish information on the Council's website by 30th September 2011 showing where this extra money has been spent, **under the County Council's Safety Plus Policy.**

59 The amendment was carried.

60 An amendment was moved by Mr Waight and seconded by Mrs Field as set out below:

'West Sussex County Council:

- (1) Welcomes the announcement in the Budget on 23rd March 2011 that councils in England will be given extra money, on top of the £100 million announced in February, to spend on repairing potholes, meaning an extra £2.6 million will now be available in this year's council budget for pothole repairs in West Sussex.
- (2) Notes the significant investment has already been made this year to improve road safety and maintain West Sussex highways infrastructure, including £2 million for pothole repairs and a further £753,000 for carriageway patching.

- (3) Resolves that, given the potential safety, health, congestion relief, noise reduction and quality of life benefits, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport be requested to work with the County Local Committee and local stakeholders to promote 20mph speed restrictions, *where there is a majority of public support*, in non-major routes in residential areas throughout Worthing as a pilot for West Sussex.
- (4) Asks the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to:
  - (a) instruct officers to present options to speed up the identification and repair of potholes, using reports from residents and condition surveys to ensure that these funds are applied in an efficient and cost effective manner, with a view to ensuring that the defects and deteriorating roads are tackled at the earliest opportunity; and
  - (b) publish information on the Council's website by 30th September 2011 showing where this extra money has been spent, under the County Council's Safety Plus Policy.'

61 The amendment was carried.

62 An amendment was moved by Mr Watson and seconded by Mr Deedman as set out below:

'West Sussex County Council:

- (1) Welcomes the announcement in the Budget on 23rd March 2011 that councils in England will be given extra money, on top of the £100 million announced in February, to spend on repairing potholes, meaning an extra £2.6 million will now be available in this year's council budget for pothole repairs in West Sussex.
- (2) Notes the significant investment has already been made this year to improve road safety and maintain West Sussex highways infrastructure, including £2 million for pothole repairs and a further £753,000 for carriageway patching.
- (3) Resolves that, given the potential safety, health, congestion relief, noise reduction and quality of life benefits, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport be requested to work with the County Local Committee and local stakeholders to promote 20mph speed restrictions, where there is a majority of public support, in non-major routes in residential areas throughout ~~Worthing as a pilot for~~ West Sussex.
- (4) Asks the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to:
  - (a) instruct officers to present options to speed up the identification and repair of potholes, using reports from

residents and condition surveys to ensure that these funds are applied in an efficient and cost effective manner, with a view to ensuring that the defects and deteriorating roads are tackled at the earliest opportunity; and

- (b) publish information on the Council's website by 30th September 2011 showing where this extra money has been spent, under the County Council's Safety Plus Policy.'

**63** The amendment was lost.

**64** The amended motion, as set out below, was agreed.

'West Sussex County Council:

- (1) Welcomes the announcement in the Budget on 23rd March 2011 that councils in England will be given extra money, on top of the £100 million announced in February, to spend on repairing potholes, meaning an extra £2.6 million will now be available in this year's council budget for pothole repairs in West Sussex.
- (2) Notes the significant investment has already been made this year to improve road safety and maintain West Sussex highways infrastructure, including £2 million for pothole repairs and a further £753,000 for carriageway patching.
- (3) Resolves that, given the potential safety, health, congestion relief, noise reduction and quality of life benefits, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport be requested to work with the County Local Committee and local stakeholders to promote 20mph speed restrictions, where there is a majority of public support, in non-major routes in residential areas throughout Worthing as a pilot for West Sussex.
- (4) Asks the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to:
  - (a) instruct officers to present options to speed up the identification and repair of potholes, using reports from residents and condition surveys to ensure that these funds are applied in an efficient and cost effective manner, with a view to ensuring that the defects and deteriorating roads are tackled at the earliest opportunity; and
  - (b) publish information on the Council's website by 30th September 2011 showing where this extra money has been spent, under the County Council's Safety Plus Policy.'

### Chairman

The Council rose at 4.16 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 5(a) Written Question number 5	Mr Oxlade	Member of the Management Committees of Bewbush, Ifield and Oriel Youth Wings and Governor of Waterfield and Three Bridges Junior Schools
Item 5(a) Written Questions (number 6)	Dr Wilsdon	Member of the management committee of the Pupil Referral Unit at Links College North
Item 5(b) CMQT paragraph 1 (Public Health Plan)	Mr Blampied	Member of Felpham Parish Council
	Mr Evans	Member of Ferring Parish Council and Chichester City Council
Item 5(b) CMQT paragraph 12 (Inspection of the West Sussex Youth Offending Service)	Mrs Mockridge	Member of Adur District Council
Item 5(b) CMQT paragraph 15 (The creation of additional primary school places)	Mr Evans	Governor of Ferring Primary School
	Mr Rogers	Governor of Durrington High School
Item 5(b) CMQT paragraph 16 (Special Support Centre)	Mr Evans	Governor of Littlehampton Academy
Item 5(b) CMQT paragraph 17 (Links College)	Mr Griffiths	Governor on the Corporate Governing Body of Northbrook College
Item 5(b) CMQT paragraph 24 (Hippo bags to allow communities to salt local roads and pavements)	Mr Blampied	Member of Felpham Parish Council
	Mr Evans	Member of Ferring Parish Council Chichester City Council

## Minutes - Appendix 2

---

<b>Item</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Item 5(b) CMQT paragraph 31 (reductions in the County Council's financial support towards local bus services)	Mr Rice	Member of the Worthing Quality Bus Partnership
Item 6 (Performance Framework 2010/11: End of Year Performance Report)	Mr Rice	Member of Worthing Borough Council
Item 10(b) - Notice of Motion re Pot Holes and Safer Streets	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council
	Mr Waight	Member of Worthing Borough Council

**22nd July 2011**

1. Written question from **Mr B Hall** for reply by the **Leader**

### **Question**

West Sussex County Council announced last September that chief executive Mark Hammond was on extended leave until further notice. However, the Association of Local Authority Chief Executives (ALACE) accused council leader Louise Goldsmith of trying to sack him. The union's secretary, Mary Orton, said: "Mark rang us on Wednesday to say he had been summoned in from his holiday by the leader and told that he was to be sacked. He was told they had lost confidence in him."

Will the leader clarify whether Mr Hammond's departure was because "she had lost confidence in him" or was it because "posts were removed from the organisation as part of an exercise to reduce senior management headcount"?

Which version is true?

### **Answer**

All members were given a full briefing on 8th October 2010 on the circumstances surrounding the departure of Mr Hammond. The inaccurate statement made by the union's secretary was not corrected at the time as we had agreed to make no public statement. The post of Chief Executive has not been removed.

### **Supplementary Question**

There are discrepancies in quotes on the BBC website and the Leader's statement - does this raise questions about communication with the public and members?

### **Supplementary Answer**

The matter was fully discussed at Council and all members were given the opportunity for a private briefing. The matter has been fully dealt with and I do not intend to make a further statement.

2. Written question from **Mr Deedman** for reply by the **Deputy Leader and portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise**

### **Question**

The Environment Agency recently published a report that suggests disposable nappies do not have a better or worse environmental impact compared to reusable nappies. The County Council has promoted the use of real nappies for some time now. Can the Cabinet Member please:

- (a) Confirm what is on offer to new parents in West Sussex currently in terms of promoting the use of real nappies?

## Minutes - Appendix 2

---

- (b) Provide details of the costs involved and the financial benefits over the past three years?
- (c) Confirm whether in his view promoting the use of real nappies in West Sussex represents good value for money?

### Answer

The County Council delivers its waste prevention initiatives through the Materials and Resource Minimisation Contract (MRMC) which commenced in June 2010. Under this contract, waste prevention activities in West Sussex are delivered by the Community Interest Company (CIC) 'Better Tomorrows', who are subcontractors of Biffa West Sussex limited.

Under the terms of the contract between the County Council, Biffa and the CIC, the County Council agrees a programme of waste reduction initiatives to be delivered by the CIC and sets performance measures to assess their effectiveness in reducing waste arisings. This programme is reviewed annually in August each year and, where initiatives are assessed as not delivering value for money, they are either reduced or ceased in preference for more impactful ones.

The 'Real Nappies' initiative is currently one of the projects delivered by the CIC.

- (a) Under this scheme, parents are offered a 'starter pack,' which is delivered in two instalments consisting of cotton nappies and liners. The first of these is suitable from birth, the second pack for babies over four months old. Parents also receive vouchers worth £30 for additional cotton nappies. Full details of the scheme can be found at [http://www.westsussexwpa.org.uk/west\\_sussex\\_initiatives](http://www.westsussexwpa.org.uk/west_sussex_initiatives).
- (b) The County Council has operated a 'real nappies' initiative since 1999 and the initiative has resulted in an estimated 5,189 tonnes of waste being diverted from landfill, saving over £500,000 (an average of £41,666 per annum) in landfill charges. The scheme costs £20,000 per annum to administer and operate which represents approximately 5% of our Annual Waste prevention budget.
- (c) Whilst the environmental impact of reusable nappies is similar to that of disposable nappies in terms of their carbon footprint, promotion of the use of reusable nappies in West Sussex has resulted in a reduction in waste requiring disposal. The scheme appears to deliver financial benefits to the County in terms of reducing waste, the decision as to whether or not to continue with the scheme will be taken based on a comparison of its effectiveness at preventing waste in comparison to other waste prevention initiatives as part of the annual review of waste prevention initiatives under the MRMC contract in August.

### 3. Written question from **Mrs Knight** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Adults' Services and the Cabinet Member for Children and Families**

#### **Question**

A recent Panorama programme highlighted horrific abuse of people with learning difficulties at a 'care' home in Bristol, which has subsequently been closed. Can the Cabinet Members for Adults' Services and for Children and Families reassure me that everything possible is being done to ensure that a similar fate could not befall young people or adults for whom the County Council is responsible in care homes, particularly those placed in care homes out of county?

#### **Answer**

##### **Cabinet Member for Adults' Services**

The County Council has responsibility for about 560 adults with learning disabilities in care homes. Twelve of these are in secure hospital settings out of county. In total about 200 of these placements are out of county. Since the Panorama programme the 12 in settings comparable to the Castlebeck home have all been formally reviewed by their allocated West Sussex Care Manager. In most cases they are visited monthly. We have checked that everyone has an independent advocate, and that relatives and advocates understand how to raise any concerns with the Care Manager. We are also paying close attention to the standards in the hospitals concerned through contract monitoring and multi agency work with the Care Quality Commission and the host authority. Such multi-agency work, liaison with families, and regular reviews are also undertaken for the far greater number who are in more open residential settings.

In West Sussex the Adults Safeguarding Board, a multi-agency partnership, represents statutory agencies, carers, voluntary sector organisations and the independent sector provider service. It has responsibility for the governance of adults safeguarding in West Sussex in relation to the prevention of abuse, the empowerment of adults at risk and an effective response to any concern of suspected abuse.

The Care Quality Commission undertook a themed inspection of adults safeguarding work in the County in October 2009 with the outcome that West Sussex is doing well regarding this area of work and putting the County Council in the top quartile of local authorities in the country.

##### **Cabinet Member for Children and Families**

The regulation of children's homes was tightened up 20 years ago in response to the Warner enquiry following the conviction of Frank Beck for a catalogue of abuse in children's homes over many years. Measures in place to safeguard children include:

- All children placed in residential care are looked after children and have an allocated social worker who has a statutory duty to visit at least every six weeks. The social worker has a duty to see the child alone unless there is a

good reason why this is not in the child's best interests. The primary duty to monitor the care of the child lies with the social worker;

- Contact between children and their families is encouraged and supported, and any concerns raised by family members are addressed promptly. Where children do not have family members who are involved on a regular and supportive basis, they can have an Independent Visitor who will also raise any concerns;
- All looked after children have regular statutory reviews; six monthly in all but short-term placements. The Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO) has a duty to meet the child alone and satisfy himself that the child is safeguarded;
- The IRO service also undertake Regulation 33 visits to homes on a monthly basis, accompanied by members. Last year some 100 visits were made. The visitors check the home's recording over a range of subjects and make themselves available to any young people at home. These visits are unannounced;
- All looked after children have access to the advocacy service run by Participation, Advocacy and Rights. It is recognised that most advocacy referrals come from older children but this is the group most likely to be in residential care;
- All looked after children also have access to the County Council's complaints process, and are often helped to use the process by their advocate;
- All children's homes are subject to regular inspections by Ofsted. The new inspection regime involves a day of every two-day full inspection being spent with the young people in the home, listening to all they have to say about their care. All inspections are unannounced giving the home no notice of arrival;
- The County Council also commissions from The Children's Society, in partnership with Brighton and Hove, a Young Assessors Project which involves care leavers in inspecting children's homes. Experience shows that some children have been more comfortable talking to young people than adults;
- All agency providers of residential care purchased by the Access to Resources Team are subject to monitoring visits. Some of these visits are unannounced;
- Children's Services managers have done Safer Recruitment training which promotes the use of all the information known about a candidate when making a decision about offering a job;
- All candidates have an enhanced Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) check and all those working in regulated services have a three-yearly update of their CRB check;
- The County Council has a Whistle Blowing policy and concerns about safeguarding in children's homes are always followed through, to disciplinary if appropriate.

### Supplementary Question

Can the Cabinet Members for Adults' Services and for Children and Families to please ensure that vulnerable people with learning difficulties are provided for in-county?

### Supplementary Answer

#### Cabinet Member for Adults' Services

Adults' Services have a number of channels to test the way the services are operated and extra effort is made for people with learning difficulties to ensure all those avenues are used, as well as feedback from those working with people with learning difficulties.

#### Cabinet Member for Children and Families

Residential care for children is monitored carefully by outside agencies. In addition the County Council makes unannounced visits under Section 33 on homes. I urge members to take part in these visits.

#### 4. Written question from **Mr Smytherman** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Adults' Services**

##### Question

Under the Health and Social Care Act 2001, local authorities can make loans to homeowners entering residential care in order to defer payment of care home fees by taking a charge on an individual's property. Can the Cabinet Member advise how many such arrangements have been entered into during the past financial year, whether the need for such arrangements have increased substantially in the past 12 months as a result of the economic downturn and the financial implications for this authority?

##### Answer

The number of Deferred Payment Arrangements (DPA) agreed during 2010/11 was 283; the comparative number for 2009/10 was 219. The most likely explanations for the increase are:

- The aging population;
- The policy measures taken by the County Council to keep people independent in their own homes for a maximum period of time delaying, but not negating, the need for residential care.

There is no evidence that this increase is attributable to the economic downturn. Loans are not physically provided to homeowners, but the County Council funds the cost of care until the DPA is settled. In many cases that happens relatively quickly. Of the 283 agreements made in 2010/11, 117 were repaid within the year.

All the while that an individual is receiving care, the Health and Social Care Act 2001 prevents interest from being charged. Consequently the longer the care period, the larger is the cashflow loss, even during an era of historically low interest rates. After death the County Council is able to charge interest in line with the County Court Judgement rate (currently 8%).

### Supplementary Question

Does the Cabinet Member support the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's Home Cash Plan pilot, currently being run by Kent County Council, which enables home owners to free up capital from their property to pay for their care at home?

### Supplementary Answer

I am not familiar with the scheme although such schemes are generally helpful as long as there is a choice of provider. I will speak to Mr Smytherman to see if it is something the County Council can explore.

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

#### Question

At the last County Council meeting I expressed concern about the impact another round of redundancies is likely to have on the youth support and development service. You undertook to advise me and let other members know once the early intervention grant figure was known together with details of the likely impact this would have. I understand that details of the grant have still not been provided by Government but that staff in the youth support and development service are nevertheless bracing themselves for a further round of redundancies in September.

Can the Cabinet Member advise me when he expects to learn about the grant and whether the impact of any funding shortfall is likely to affect predominantly those staff providing the Connexions service or whether it will also affect youth workers?

#### Answer

The current indicative Early Intervention Grant allocation of £24.4m will be 'firmed up' as part of the financial settlement from central government in December 2011. Specific allocations are not confirmed until agreed by the County Council in February 2012.

Work is underway with Babcock Enterprise to manage the transition required by April 2012. Any financial reductions will have an impact on the whole service including youth workers, personal advisors and youth justice workers.

The consultation starting in October with Youth Support and Development Service staff about further service reductions is specifically in relation to the £2m savings over three years that was agreed by the County Council in February 2011.

### Supplementary Question

Could the Cabinet Member clarify the role that Babcock Enterprise will play in managing the transition and the cost involved, and if more youth centres will be at risk of closure?

### Supplementary Answer

The County Council has a contract with Babcock Enterprise for delivering targeted services. However, the whole remit is changing. The funding will come from the dedicated schools grant which has not yet been announced. The grant is not ring-fenced and therefore it is up to the County Council to decide where the money is spent. In addition it will now be for schools to provide the service rather than 'Connexions'. In terms of the youth service there will be further impacts following the budget savings agreed in February. Consultation on that process will start in September.

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

### Question

At the County Council meeting in February you kindly provided me with details of the number of children permanently excluded from school and of those how many had additional needs in 2008/09 (showing those who were receiving school action, school action plus support and those who had a statement for special educational needs).

- (a) Could the Cabinet Member please provide the same information for 2009/10 and the figures as they stand for 2010/11 given that we are almost at the end of the academic year?
- (b) I understand that of the pupils with additional needs that were permanently excluded in 2008/09, some went on to receive a statement of Special Educational Need and some were subsequently categorised as having no special educational need. Can the Cabinet Member advise to what extent the data is analysed to ensure that schools are taking a consistent approach to such exclusions and that any lessons are learnt as a result of pupils being subsequently re-categorised?
- (c) I understand that targeted funding is provided to support pupils at risk of being permanently excluded. Can the Cabinet Member advise how many pupils with additional needs in 2009/10 and in 2010/11 received this support but went on to be permanently excluded and how many did not receive this support but were permanently excluded?
- (d) Furthermore can the Cabinet Member provide an update on progress with the Special Educational Needs (SEN)/Out of School Learning (OSL) Rapid Improvement Programme, which aims to address weaknesses in the way the Local Authority and schools carry out their statutory function in relation to vulnerable children, maximises maintained provision, devolves resources and decision making and increases parental engagement in SEN/OSL provision?

### Answer

- (a) Permanent Exclusion data:

### 2009/10

94 pupils were permanently excluded within the academic year 2009/10. For statistical purposes the County Council reports to the Department for Education (DfE) on the number of students whose exclusions were completed within the academic year and this includes pupils whose exclusions were issued in 2008/09 and carried forward into 2009/10.

23 pupils had no special educational needs (24% of the 94 permanent exclusions)

12 pupils were at School Action (13%)

55 pupils were at School Action Plus (59%)

4 pupils had Statements of Special Educational Needs (SSEN) (4%)

### 2010/11

89 pupils were permanently excluded within the academic year 2010/11, as at 19th July 2011. This figure does not reflect a complete academic year and the data have not yet been reported to the DfE. The figures quoted include pupils whose exclusions were issued in 2009/10 and carried forward into 2010/11.

15 pupils had no special educational needs (17% of the 89 permanent exclusions)

16 pupils were at School Action (18%)

51 pupils were at School Action Plus (57%)

7 pupils had statements of Special Educational Needs (SSEN) (8%).

- (b) Any analysis of data relating to permanent and fixed period exclusions must take account of the factors which contribute to a headteacher making the decision to permanently exclude. Permanent exclusion can be as a result of cumulative incidents of inappropriate behaviour and fixed period exclusions or it can be for a one off serious event, such as the supply of an illegal drug or a serious threatened or actual assault on a pupil or member of staff. Exclusion of a pupil with Special Educational Needs (SEN) may, therefore, be for an offence which is not necessarily related to their SEN.

In reaching their decision to exclude headteachers are required to apply the DfE guidance on exclusion and their own Behaviour Policy and relevant other policies e.g. SEN policy and Drugs Policy. Headteachers have also used the Area Partnership meetings of Secondary Schools to provide them with opportunities for discussion about the appropriateness of decisions to permanently exclude pupils and review the area data provided. This has allowed headteachers and local authority staff to consider the consistency of approaches to exclusions. Schools are responsible for the identification of a pupil's SEN in line with the DfE SEN Code of Practice.

- (c) In 2009/10, two pupils with additional needs who received targeted financial support were subsequently permanently excluded. 97 pupils in the time period, who did not receive this support, were permanently excluded. In total 63 pupils received targeted funding during this period. In 2010/11 no pupils who received targeted financial support were permanently

excluded. There were 94 permanent exclusions in the time period. In total 60 pupils received targeted funding during this period.

The targeted funding does not replace a school's responsibility to meet the needs of children at School Action or School Action Plus. It is a short-term supplement to the support a pupil is already receiving in order to focus specifically on preventing the need for exclusion. The funding is not available for pupils with statements of SEN, whose needs are monitored through reviews of their statement. Targeted funding is only one of a range of strategies available to support a pupil at risk of exclusion. Other strategies may include the involvement of other local authority services such as Educational Psychologist, Advisory Teachers, The Links College Inclusion Team, short-term placement at a Pupil Referral Unit and multi-agency involvement such as through a Common Assessment Framework.

- (d) Progress has been achieved in all seven initiatives included within the rapid improvement programme. The main focus of work has been on the development and restructuring of the planning process for children with special needs at pre-school and primary/secondary ages.

The SEN/OSL Board meets monthly to progress the items which were identified for action last year. Schools in Worthing and Mid Sussex are linking this development to the strategy to improve the experience children have when moving between different parts of the service, particularly when moving from primary to secondary schools. Additionally, we have also improved the way in which information on both school and pupil data is being used to provide more information for Local Authority staff working on area delivery. The work on improving parental confidence is progressing well since the launch of the agreed Home/School protocol at the Communication Conference held between the Local Authority Parent Partnership Team and the West Sussex Parents Forum in March. School information files are being taken to individual schools by Partnership Officers who explain the protocol and how schools can gain support for their work with parents.

### **Supplementary Question**

I am concerned about the increase in the number of excluded children with additional needs - will the Cabinet Member for Education and Schools do more to reduce the figures?

### **Supplementary Answer**

I expect the trend nationally will increase as more attention is paid to those with special needs and therefore demand increases. I will keep members informed of progress.

### **Additional Question by Mrs Knight**

I am particularly concerned about the seven pupils with SEN who were expelled as out of county placements are expensive - will the Cabinet Member look at the issue?

### Answer to Additional Question

I am not aware whether the children have been placed out of county but I accept that when that happens it is a very expensive process.

### Additional Question by Dr Wilsdon

Would the Cabinet Member bear in mind the impact of staffing levels in pupil referral units on the likelihood of exclusions where, if there were more staff, difficult situations could sometimes be avoided?

### Answer to Additional Question

I am heartened by Links College North's response to its Ofsted inspection. The lead officer is looking into the whole process and the staffing levels and I am sure there will be a positive outcome.

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

#### Question

I understand that there is now, and also for next year's intake, a significant problem regarding school places in the Horsham area.

Can the Cabinet Member please tell me:

- (a) How many young people from the Horsham area are travelling to secondary schools outside the Horsham area and what effect does he anticipate there will be on the situation as a result of the recent decision taken on transport to Faith Schools?
- (b) How many of the primary schools in the Horsham area are oversubscribed and the maximum distance being travelled to school by Horsham primary age children?

#### Answer

- (a) The total number of pupils travelling from the Horsham area to schools outside the town cannot be easily identified. However, at the time allocations were made (1st March 2011) for a secondary school place for September 2011 there were 890 children applying for school places from within the Horsham Community Designated Area i.e. those living within the catchment area of Millais, The Forest and Tanbridge House. Of these, 57 were offered a place at a church aided school outside Horsham and a further 29 were offered a community or a special school outside Horsham.

Many pupils living in Horsham travel to church aided schools in Crawley and pay their bus fares using the 3in1 card, which offers relatively cheap travel. The number of pupils paying their own fares has increased over the past three years since charging for transport to church aided schools was

introduced in September 2008. This is because the cost of travel using the 3in1 card is cheaper than the charge. It is not anticipated that the church school transport decision will have any significant effect on the number of pupils travelling. Parents who wish their children to attend alternative schools are generally happy to pay the fares. In respect of the church school transport decision, those on low income are protected and will continue to receive free transport.

- (b) For September 2011 admissions at allocation on 1st April 2011, 10 of the primary schools in the Horsham area were oversubscribed. However, at the time of allocation, no school in Horsham was oversubscribed with applicants living within their catchment area who applied on time. The oversubscription came from parents expressing a preference for a school other than that for their catchment. Since the day of allocation on 1st April, a significant number of families have requested a reception place in a Horsham school and all central Horsham primary schools are now full for this year group where the Infant Class Size legislation requiring maximum classes of 30 applies.

For September 2011 admissions, the current maximum distance to a primary school that will be travelled by a pupil where the school was not one their parents requested is 2.75 miles. This application relates to a family who applied after the closing date and has been offered a place in Warnham Primary. The family have the opportunity to go on the waiting list for the schools of their preference. It should be noted that some parents may have requested schools further away when expressing their preferences.

### Supplementary Question

Given the information provided about the pupil places in Horsham and Worthing, and the future prediction for school places, would the Cabinet Member agree to set up a Task Force to look at the issue?

### Supplementary Answer

I will consider the suggestion.

8. Written question from **Dr Walsh** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Education and Schools**

### Question

The contract between West Sussex County Council and Woodard Corporation included a £2m endowment fund for The Littlehampton Academy, as a vital provision for delivery of many of the aims of this exciting new venture. Indeed for many of the original signatories it was a 'sine qua non'. Can the Cabinet Member explain why this solemn undertaking has been reneged on?

### Answer

Academy endowment funds of £2m per Academy were introduced for new academies in 2007 to replace the former requirement on the sponsor to meet 10% of capital costs. Endowments were not designed for 'vital provision' - which is funded on the same basis as other schools - but for non-essential or supplementary aspects of the project. The rules were then changed again by the previous government following the banking crisis to remove the requirement to provide an endowment fund, as academy sponsors were finding it extremely difficult to raise the sums required from charitable donations. The Woodard Academy Trust and other affected sponsors have raised this issue with the Department for Education (DfE) in light of the perceived inequality in the way that sponsors have been treated. The County Council's commitment was to match Woodard's endowment.

The DfE has informed the County Council that Ministers are currently reviewing the general position for sponsorship and work is underway with the Charity Commission to review changes and further flexibilities. That would seem to indicate that there is still a commitment to the principle of funding supplementary aspects, not a revocation.

In the meantime, the published County Council Capital Programme has an allocation of £500,000 for each Woodard Academy as the County Council's initial contribution, should the endowment fund be established. The Sir Robert Woodard Academy and The Littlehampton Academy are benefiting from investment of £32m and £29m respectively. Neither scheme was affected by the Secretary of State's decision in July 2010 to cease the vast majority of 'Building Schools for the Future' and Academy capital projects.

### Supplementary Question

If the endowment money promised by Woodard is not forthcoming, will the Cabinet Member commit to providing additional money in order to give the pupils what they have been promised and will be keep me fully informed?

### Supplementary Answer

I cannot make a commitment but I have spoken to the Principal and have agreed that the County Council will try where possible to help. There have also been discussions with the Department of Education over the need to deliver previous funding commitments.

9. Written question from **Mr B Hall** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources**

### Question

What is the total amount spent on consultants fees in the past 5 financial years ending in April 2011?

### Answer

Total spending on consultants for the years in question is:

	<b>2006/07</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>
	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>
Revenue	9.8	12.2	8.4	7.8	8.6
Capital	0.7	1.6	0.9	0.4	0.4

### Supplementary Question

Would the Cabinet Member agree that the amounts quoted are excessive?

### Supplementary Answer

I do not agree - the number of senior officers has reduced significantly in recent years. In a number of instances consultants are used rather than employing skilled staff in-house. Most of the expenditure on consultants is in relation to IT specialist knowledge.

### Additional Question by Dr Walsh

Is there a policy governing the engagement of consultants and how is it monitored and audited to ensure that value for money is being obtained?

### Answer to Additional Question

The use of consultants is tested against a business case and is mainly related to investment in the short term to save money in the long term.

### Additional Question by Mr Acraman

Would the Cabinet Member agree that the phrase 'professional services' would be more meaningful than consultants?

### Answer to Additional Question

Yes, I agree it would be.

### Additional Question by Mr T M E Dunn

Would the Cabinet Member agree that, in areas of technical expertise, consultants can save the County Council millions of pounds and the Council should use them where necessary?

### Answer to Additional Question

Yes I agree it can.

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

**Question**

It is reported in the media that £1.5m was paid in redundancy and compensation to five senior officers. The payments by the county council include £397,232 to former chief executive Mark Hammond, who left last year after a period of extended leave. It is stated Mr Hammond's payments included £232,408 in salary, fees and allowances and £140,000 in compensation for loss of employment. The total remuneration included pension contributions. It is further reported that two other senior West Sussex officers received redundancy packages of over £300,000, while one received £298,500 and another £150,894.

It is reported that the County Council said in a statement: "These posts were removed from the organisation as part of an exercise to reduce senior management headcount. The figures reflect the seniority and length of public service of the officers taking redundancy. Mr Hammond received his contractual six months' salary in lieu of notice together with a payment of compensation for the contract's termination."

What proportion of these payments was contractual and what proportion discretionary?

**Answer**

All of the payments made to the four officers are in accordance with contractual conditions relating to redundancy. The details relating to the terms of the departure of the former Chief Executive were given to all members in October 2010. The payments were contractual or in lieu of contractual entitlements.

**Supplementary Question**

Could the Cabinet Member comment on the discrepancy in the figures given compared with those that were supplied in the October statement and could he also send me details of how the other redundancy packages were calculated?

**Supplementary Answer**

The figures are accurate and were the minimum possible. If Mr Hall writes to me setting out the additional information he requires then, provided it is not confidential, I will supply it.

**11. Written question from Mr B Hall for reply by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources**

**Question**

Will the Cabinet Member tell this Council how many staff have annual remuneration including pension contributions in excess of £100,000?

### Answer

For the year ended 31st March 2011, 19 staff had remuneration of £100,000 or more. One further member of staff fell into this category if redundancy costs are included. Only 10 staff have an annual salary in excess of £100,000.

### Supplementary Question

Could the Cabinet Member give me the mean average for the 10 members of staff mentioned?

### Supplementary Answer

I will arrange for the figure to be calculated and sent to Mr Hall.

### 12. Written question from **Mr Oxlade** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources**

#### Question

I have been contacted by various local suppliers recently who have been eliminated from contracts which have subsequently been awarded to contractors outside the county. I also understand there have been calls from Sussex Enterprise to break up the tender for office support services in order to provide opportunities for local companies. This would seem to go against the commitment in the Performance Framework to improve economic performance in our coastal towns, rural West Sussex and the Gatwick Diamond.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm he is doing all he can to ensure wherever possible that the tendering processes provide local businesses with opportunities to provide these services?

#### Answer

The County Council is committed to exploring and providing opportunities for Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs), especially those local to West Sussex, to bid for and win contracts for goods, services and works awarded by the Council. The County Council's corporate procurement strategy requires that all procurements ensure equality of opportunity to the diverse range of businesses and organisations available and able to provide the requirements of the contract, e.g. it requires a consideration of whether SMEs are prevalent in the market in which they seek to buy goods or services before defining the procurement strategy.

The County Council's economic development officers work in partnership with a number of local businesses and business support organisations (e.g. Sussex Enterprise, Action for Rural Sussex, Coastal West Sussex 21st Century, etc.) to support, on an ongoing basis, the growth and development of the county's economy. The County Council's procurement officers work with local business in, for example, seeking to ensure appropriate market development to meet the County Council's changing contractual needs, providing support to enable local

businesses to submit acceptable tenders, providing bidder workshops and training sessions to help bidders build necessary bidding skills. An example of these activities is the ongoing procurement process for transport services (taxis, mini-buses and coaches). This is a clear SME and local provision policy. However, this is only one of a number of other factors the County Council must, of necessity, consider in defining the strategy for any particular contract opportunity. Others include consideration of any environmental or social impacts, ensuring that the fundamental requirements for which the contract is to be let can be met and any legally binding obligations.

With regard specifically to the ongoing Support Services Outsourcing, on which the County Council has already been in correspondence with Sussex Enterprise, set out below is a paraphrased excerpt from that correspondence.

'There are two main objectives we are seeking to achieve. The first is to modernise and improve our support service. To do this we believe we need organisations to demonstrate a proven track record and to be able to commit a level of investment as part of the contract. The second is we are looking to transfer the responsibility of running our support services and transferring our staff to the contractor(s) and to ensure risks are appropriately managed. Our preference would be to have one point of contact and responsibility although obviously the prime contracting organisation may choose to subcontract if they wish.

Both of these objectives would suggest a supplier or consortia of some size. To attempt to contract for these services on a piecemeal basis would add significant complexity and risk, which the Council can ill afford with the very clear objectives for the outsourcing.'

The Council is, as always, very eager to support the local economy and will be giving as much weight as is permissible, within the relevant public procurement rules, to matters such as local delivery of the services, continued local employment, and sub-contracting with local sub-contractors.

### **Supplementary Question**

Would the Cabinet Member agree that more needs to be done to ensure that local businesses are best placed to bid for County Council procurement exercises?

### **Supplementary Answer**

Whilst the County Council does as much as it can to help businesses in West Sussex, it is not in the Council's interest to exclude businesses outside the county. However, the County Council does put pressure on businesses from outside West Sussex which win contracts to sub-contract to a West Sussex company where possible and also runs courses for small businesses to assist with the complicated European tendering processes.

**13. Written question from Mrs Millson for reply by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

**Question**

- (a) Can the Cabinet Member please tell me how many Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) scheme requests are on the lists of each County Local Committee (CLC)?
- (b) Can he please state how many county councillors sit on each CLC and the approximate population and area of each CLC?

**Answer**

CLC	Number of Members	Area (sq. miles)**	Population***	Number of TRO requests 2011/12
South				
Chichester	7*	138	79,400	50
North				
Chichester	4*	176	33,200	15
North Horsham	8	100	84,500	49
Chanctonbury	4	105	45,300	26
West Crawley	5	9	64,300	4
East Crawley	4	9	41,000	4
Worthing	9	13	102,400	60
Adur	6	17	61,300	38
West Arun	6*	14	65,300	10
Downland	4*	60	26,200	12
East Arun	6*	13	58,500	26
North Mid				
Sussex	5*	32	39,700	19
Central Mid				
Sussex	6*	59	46,900	13
South Mid				
Sussex	4*	39	45,100	41

\* Denotes CLCs with one or more members sitting on more than one CLC

\*\* Rounded to the nearest square mile.

\*\*\* Rounded to the nearest 100

**Supplementary Question**

Given the disparity in the number of requests, can the Cabinet Member review the way in which TROs are allocated between CLCs?

**Supplementary Answer**

It is difficult to strike a balance between local needs and those across the county and the current policy was for three per CLC area. However, I will have a further look at the issue with officers.

### Additional Question by Mrs Knight

When Crawley has run out of TROs, can Mid Sussex use its allocation?

### Answer to Additional Question

I am sure that Crawley will not run out of schemes.

### 14. Written question from **Mrs B A Smith** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

#### Question

The County Council took over responsibility for the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS) on 1st April. From this date the County Council ceased to provide additional concessions that allowed users of the scheme in Crawley, Horsham, Mid-Sussex and Arun to travel from 9.00 a.m. rather than 9.30 a.m. This has had a negative impact on those residents who wish to access services prior to 9.30 a.m., such as health appointments, paid or voluntary work, or where services are limited and the main morning journey is before 9.30 a.m.

- (a) I understand the second phase of ENCTS to be carried out later this year will look at streamlining processes and procedures and review additions and enhancements to the basic statutory scheme implemented on 1st April. Can the Cabinet Member advise me what the cost implications for this authority would be to enable residents in Crawley to utilise their passes to travel between 9.00 a.m. and 9.30 a.m.?
- (b) The Cabinet Member is expected to make a decision regarding reduced financial support for the non-commercial bus network soon which is likely to lead to many bus services no longer running in the evenings and on Sundays. If that is the case it may well lead to fewer people being able to use their bus passes to travel in the evenings and on Sundays which in turn will lead to bus companies seeking less funding for reimbursement. Can the Cabinet Member advise me what level of savings he anticipates would be achieved as a result of West Sussex residents no longer being able to utilise their bus passes as a result of the decision he is proposing to make to reduce financial support for the non commercial bus network? Can he provide the countywide figure and a separate figure for Crawley please?

#### Answer

- (a) Information is not available to enable an answer to the question.

Variations by district/borough can only occur if the County Council identified and evidenced a specific local need, which would not be met by the existing scheme. Such evidence needs to be sufficient to stand scrutiny in the context of challenge from residents in other areas. It was therefore decided that the County Council implement a consistent scheme countywide. The estimated cost for extending the scheme to a 9.00 a.m. start countywide is £250,000 and this figure is not subdivided by district or borough. The

County Council employs a specialist consultant to advise on what is a very complex scheme. In addition, reimbursement levels to bus companies have not yet cleared the appeals and claims process so to answer the question with any degree of accuracy would require us to fund a further study in some detail by the consultant, once appeals and claims are agreed.

- (b) No estimate has been made in respect of any savings associated with the ENTCS scheme as a result of reduced financial support for the non-commercial bus network at either a county or district level.

This is because the focus of the recent decision on bus subsidy is to make savings where usage is very low, where there are alternative services available (possibly at different times or on different days) or where a reduction of service rather than a complete withdrawal is the likely outcome. This means that a good proportion of the concessionary passenger journeys currently made on affected services may be able to be made at another time. This is particularly true of leisure and shopping journeys, bearing in mind that most bus pass holders are beyond retirement age. Estimating the number of journeys that will not happen at all and therefore any savings that may be made, is not realistically possible.

### **Supplementary Question**

At a recent meeting of Crawley Borough Council's Scrutiny Committee, it was suggested that a sum of £35,000 to £40,000 would be needed to implement the additional half an hour of the concessionary bus passes for people within Crawley. Would that figure make a difference and could a district purchase the additional times?

### **Supplementary Answer**

It is not possible to give an accurate figure for the cost. There is no possibility of implementing a 9.00a.m. start-time county-wide and it would not be wise to do so locally. If another party were to provide funding there could be problems in future years in terms of sustainability.

### **Agenda Item No. 5(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, Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board, from Dr Walsh.

In response to a request from Dr Walsh that all the meetings of the Board should be in public, the Leader said she would consult the Board to seek its agreement. The Leader also said she would provide regular updates to members on the work of the Board.

Paragraph 3, Coast to Capital (Local Economic Partnership) Executive Board, from Mr Watson.

#### **Cabinet Member for Adults' Services**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 8, 'A Place To Live', from Mrs Millson.

Paragraph 10, Dementia Crisis Service, from Mrs Jupp.

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

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 13, Corporate Parenting Panel, from Mrs Coleman, Mrs Mills and Mrs Ross. The Cabinet Member was supported by Mr Simmons, Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Panel in his responses.

#### **Cabinet Member for Education and Schools**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 15, the creation of additional primary school places, from Mr Quirk, Mr Rice, and Mrs Richards.

Paragraph 18, strike action, from Mr Lanzer.

Paragraph 29, Academies, from Mr Hellawell, Mr McDougall, Mr Rogers, Mrs Ross, Dr Walsh and Dr Wilsdon.

In response to a request from Mr McDougall, the Cabinet Member agreed to let him know how much debt the County Council had written off for the four schools that transferred to academies under the previous government.

In response to a request from Mr Rogers, the Cabinet Member said that, if legally possible, he would in future give members a breakdown of the costs when each school became an academy.

In response to a request from Mrs Ross, the Cabinet Member gave an assurance that he would keep all members informed about academies.

### **Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 23, community asset transfer, from Mr Blampied.

Paragraph 30, Contact Centre, from Mr Graysmark.

### **The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 31, reductions in the County Council's financial support towards local bus services, from Mr Deedman and Mr Jones.

### **Cabinet Member for Public Protection**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 27 from Mr B Hall and Mrs Waight.

## **Minutes - Appendix 3**

---

### **Agenda Item No. 5(c) - Leader's Question Time**

The Leader answered questions from members on the following topics:

Bus provision and subsidies, from Mr M N Hall.

The Leader agreed to include items on the agendas for the next meetings with MPs and the South East Strategic Leaders to lobby for changes to the present legislation in relation to bus subsidies to allow local authorities to award contracts by competitive tendering for the times and routes specified in the contract rather than the operator deciding what services they should provide and the County Council then deciding what additional services it would subsidise. The Leader said she would report back to Mr Hall in due course.

Big Society Vanguard - Care Bank Project, from Mrs Millson.

The Leader agreed to look into a Big Society Vanguard project being explored by Windsor and Maidenhead called the 'Care Bank' project where people who volunteered to do tasks to help people in need getting time credits for future support or other benefits, to see whether such a scheme could work in West Sussex.

Fact finding tour of Broadfield, from Mr Quirk.

Increase in dementia sufferers, from Mrs B A Smith.

The former Chief Executive, from Mr B Hall.

IT policies and cost of SAP, from Mr Hellawell.