

West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

19 October 2012

At an Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 19 October 2012, at County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mr M W G Coleman (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Mr R A Lanzer
Mrs P A C Arculus	Mr J Livermore
Mr L H Barnard	Mr S E McDougall
Mrs E A Bennett	Mrs M E Millson
Mr G G Blampied	Mrs J S Mockridge
Dr H S Bloom, OStJ	Mr J A P Montyn
Mr P J J Bradbury	Mr J J O'Brien
Mrs H A Brunsdon	Mr F R J Oppler
Mr R G Burgess	Mr C G Oxlade
Mr R D Burrett	Mr N F Peters
Mr P C Catchpole	Mr A J E Quirk
Mrs C A Coleman	Mr A S Rice
Mr B K Coomber	Mrs I C Richards
Mr D G Crow	Mr R Rogers
Mr D R Deedman	Mr D P Sheldon
Dr N P S Dennis	Mr D J Simmons
Mr J E Doyle	Mr A R H Smith
Mr C P Duncton	Mrs B A Smith
Mr R B Dunn	Mr R J Smytherman
Mr T M E 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, CStJ, 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 M P S Hodgson	Mr D R Whittington
Mr P E Jones	Mr F T Wilkinson
Mrs A J Jupp	Dr C E Wilsdon

Apologies and attendance

75 Apologies were received from Mr Blake, Mr Britton, Mr Brown, Mr Hellawell, Mrs Knight, Mrs Mills and Mrs Ross. Mrs Richards gave her apologies for the afternoon session. Mr Rice left at 12.55 p.m. and gave his apologies for the remainder of the meeting. Mr Bradbury left at 2.30 p.m. and Mr Oxlade and Mrs Smith left at 3 p.m. and all gave their apologies for the remainder of the session. Mr Wells gave his apologies and left at 3.20 p.m. Mr Livermore was absent for the afternoon session.

Minutes

Death of Mr William Keymer

- 76 The Chairman reported the death of Mr William Keymer, a former member of the County Council, who had represented the Worthing Rural No. 2 electoral division from 1981 to 1985 and the Arun East electoral division from 1985 to 1989. The Council stood for a minute's silence.

Interests

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

Minutes

- 78 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 20 July 2012 (pages 171 to 204) be approved as a correct record.

Appointments

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

Committee/Panel	Change
Environmental and Community Services Select Committee	Mr Deedman to fill vacancy
Electoral Review Panel	Mr Quirk in place of Mr Crow

Petitions

- 80 The Council debated the following petition.

Don't Cut Us Out Campaign: Petition against Cuts in Care

'We the undersigned protest against the deeply damaging cuts West Sussex County Council has imposed on disabled and elderly people.

While cutting £31million from adult social care, WSCC has salted away a massive £38million into Reserves, which now stand at a record £146million. To stockpile Reserves at the expense of the vulnerable is not only unfair, it is immoral.

WSCC has the money available to reinstate care for vulnerable people and to re-invest in vital Council day centres.'

- 81 Mr Peter Adams, the lead petitioner and a user of the Council's social care services, addressed the Council for five minutes in support of the petition.

- 82 The Leader responded to the petition on behalf of the County Council.

- 83** The Council debated the petition.
- 84** Mrs Margaret Guest, on behalf of the petitioners, and the Leader were each given three minutes to make a closing statement.
- 85** A proposition was moved by Dr Walsh and seconded by Mrs Millson as set out below:

'This Council notes the petition organised by the Don't Cut Us Out campaign and recognises the difficulties caused to many elderly, infirm and young people with disabilities in West Sussex by the raising of the eligibility criteria in 2011.

It resolves to:

- (1) Commission an independent assessment of the effects on those now ineligible for some or all of their previous care funding and of those who may be seeking care packages in the near future;
 - (2) Set up truly representative user and carer-led policy forums, to help formulate future policy alongside officers and councillors; and
 - (3) Consider partial or full re-instatement of the 'Fair Access to Care Services' Moderate eligibility threshold.'
- 86** The proposition was lost.
- 87** A proposition was moved by Mr T M E Dunn and seconded by Mr Lanzer as set out below:

'That this Council continues its work initiated by the Cabinet Member and the Health and Adults' Social Care Select Committee to provide yet more focussed and effective continuing care for those in greatest need of community support.'

- 88** The proposition was carried.

Cabinet and Written Questions

Written Questions

- 89** 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

- 90** At the request of the Governance Committee which was reviewing the operation of Cabinet Member question time, the Council agreed to waive Standing Orders to allow a trial of time limits of two minutes for the asking of each question and five minutes for each answer.

- 91 Members asked questions on the Cabinet Members' reports (pages 205 to 212), as set out at Appendix 3.

Leader's Question Time

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

Proposed Submission Draft of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (Regulation 19 Stage)

- 93 The Deputy Leader and portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise moved the report on the Proposed Submission Draft of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (pages 213 to 229) together with the Draft West Sussex Waste Local Plan, subject to some minor drafting changes to paragraph 4.5.10 on page 25 of Appendix B as set out below:

4.5.10 The County Council's landfill contracts for the disposal of municipal waste expired at the end of 2009. In order to provide a waste disposal *capacity prior to route* ~~during the period before the MBT plant becoming~~ is operational, *an interim arrangements have been made to dispose of waste at Brookhurst Wood Landfill Site north of Horsham. There is, in addition, an interim* contract to December 2014 *that provides for some* ~~involves the disposal of waste in Hampshire and Berkshire.~~

- 94 Resolved -

- (1) That the Proposed Submission Draft of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan, subject to the minor changes set out in minute 93, replaces the approved West Sussex Waste Local Plan: Revised Deposit Draft (July 2004) as the most up-to-date statement of the County Council's land-use planning policy for waste and that it be approved for development management purposes;
- (2) That the Proposed Submission Draft of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan be approved for publication, consultation on its soundness, and, provided that no substantive changes are required, submission to the Secretary of State in accordance with Regulations 19, 20 and 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012; and
- (3) That the Strategic Planning Manager, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise, be authorised to agree with the South Downs National Park Authority, any non-substantive changes that are necessary to make the Plan sound and suitable for adoption.

Governance Committee: Revised Pay Policy Statement

95 The County Council was asked to consider a revised Pay Policy Statement to take effect from 1 January 2013 following changes to the senior management structure, in the light of a report by the Governance Committee (pages 230 to 237).

96 Resolved -

That the proposed revisions to the Pay Policy with effect from 1 January 2013, as set out at the Appendix to the report, be approved.

Governance Committee: Adoption Panel Terms of Reference

97 The Council considered changes to the terms of reference of the Adoption Panel, in the light of a report by the Governance Committee (pages 238 and 239).

98 Resolved -

That the proposed amendment to Appendix 9 of Part 3 of the County Council Constitution relating to the Adoption Panel, as set out in paragraph 4 of the report, be approved.

Notice of Motion by Mrs Knight, moved by Dr Wilsdon

99 At the County Council meeting on 20 July 2012 the following motion by Mrs Knight had been moved by Dr Wilsdon, seconded by Mrs Millson, and referred to the Deputy Leader and portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise for consideration. A report by the Deputy Leader was included with the agenda (page 240).

'This Council is concerned that 40% of young people nationally live in homes containing 10 books or fewer and believes children should be encouraged to develop their reading skills as early as possible and not be constrained by social or family financial limitations.

This Council values the free book gifting scheme known as 'Bookstart' in conjunction with the charity Booktrust which provides free books to children living in West Sussex and resolves to ask the Deputy Leader and portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise to explore ways to enable all children starting and joining school in West Sussex to be automatically enrolled at their local library and provided with a library card.

Furthermore, this Council asks the Deputy Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Education pledging support for the Bookstart scheme and asking him to ensure sufficient funding is made available for Booktrust to continue their highly valued book gifting scheme during 2014/15 and beyond.'

Minutes

- 100 An amendment was moved by the Deputy Leader and seconded by Mr Acraman as set out below.

'This Council is concerned that ~~40%~~ **it is reported that a number** of young people ~~nationally~~ **in West Sussex** live in homes containing 10 books or fewer and believes children should be encouraged to develop their reading skills as early as possible and not be constrained by social or family financial limitations.

This Council values the free book gifting scheme known as 'Bookstart' in conjunction with the charity Booktrust which provides free books to children living in West Sussex and resolves to ask the Deputy Leader and portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise to explore ways to **develop an affordable and effective promotion with schools that will encourage library membership by reception-age children and their parents so that as many families as possible can experience the positive impact that access to a wide range of books and stories can provide** enable all children starting and joining school in West Sussex to be automatically enrolled at their local library and provided with a library card.

*Furthermore, this Council asks the Deputy Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Education pledging support for the **principles of Bookstart and seeking confirmation of central funding beyond March 2013 to ensure continued local delivery** scheme and asking him to ensure sufficient funding is made available for Booktrust to continue their highly valued book gifting scheme during 2014/15 and beyond.'*

- 101 The amendment was agreed.

- 102 A further amendment was moved by Mr Doyle and seconded by Mr B Hall as set out below.

'This Council is concerned that it is reported that a number of young people in West Sussex live in homes containing 10 books or fewer and believes children should be encouraged to develop their reading skills as early as possible and not be constrained by social or family financial limitations.

This Council values the free book gifting scheme known as 'Bookstart' in conjunction with the charity Booktrust which provides free books to children living in West Sussex and resolves to ask the Deputy Leader and portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise to explore ways to develop an affordable and effective promotion with schools that will encourage library membership by reception-age children and **the their** parents **and carers of reception and pre-reception-age children** so that as many families as possible can experience the positive impact that access to a wide range of books and stories can provide.

Furthermore, this Council asks the Deputy Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Education pledging support for the principles of Bookstart and

seeking confirmation of central funding beyond March 2013 to ensure continued local delivery.'

103 The amendment was lost.

104 The amended motion, as set out below, was agreed.

'This Council is concerned that it is reported that a number of young people in West Sussex live in homes containing 10 books or fewer and believes children should be encouraged to develop their reading skills as early as possible and not be constrained by social or family financial limitations.

This Council values the free book gifting scheme known as 'Bookstart' in conjunction with the charity Booktrust which provides free books to children living in West Sussex and resolves to ask the Deputy Leader and portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise to explore ways to develop an affordable and effective promotion with schools that will encourage library membership by reception-age children and their parents so that as many families as possible can experience the positive impact that access to a wide range of books and stories can provide.

Furthermore, this Council asks the Deputy Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Education pledging support for the principles of Bookstart and seeking confirmation of central funding beyond March 2013 to ensure continued local delivery.'

Notice of Motion by Mr Deedman

105 At the County Council meeting on 20 July 2012 the following motion by Mr Deedman was seconded by Dr Walsh and referred to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport for consideration. A report by the Cabinet Member was included with the agenda (page 241).

'This Council recognises the detrimental effect that congestion on the A27 has on the economy of West Sussex, particularly at the three main bottlenecks around Arundel, Worthing/Lancing and Chichester. This also causes many drivers to 'rat-run' through rural villages such as Storrington to avoid the congestion on the A27.

At the present time the Department for Transport does not propose bringing forward funding to address these issues before 2015 although a feasibility study considering options for bringing private investment into the national road network is expected to be published in the autumn.

The Council resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport in the meantime to:

- (1) Investigate all possible options for funding improvements to the A27, including making a contribution from the County Council towards the Arundel Bypass; and

Minutes

- (2) Write to the Minister for Transport, suggesting that the A27 be used as a pilot for a new owner and financial model.'

106 An amendment was moved by the Cabinet Member and seconded by Mr Peters as set out below.

'This Council recognises the detrimental effect that congestion on the A27 has on the economy of West Sussex, particularly at the three main bottlenecks around Arundel, Worthing/Lancing and Chichester. This also causes many drivers to 'rat-run through rural villages such as Storrington to avoid the congestion on the A27.

At the present time the Department for Transport does not propose bringing forward funding to address these issues before 2015 although a feasibility study considering options for bringing private investment into the national road network is expected to be published in the Autumn.

The Council resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport in the meantime to:-

- ~~(1) investigate all possible options for funding improvements to the A27, at Chichester, Arundel and Worthing, including funding options. making a contribution from the County Council towards the Arundel Bypass; and~~
- ~~(2) write to the Minister for Transport, suggesting that the A27 be used as a pilot for a new owner and financial model.'~~

107 The amendment was agreed.

108 The amended motion, as set out below, was agreed.

'This Council recognises the detrimental effect that congestion on the A27 has on the economy of West Sussex, particularly at the three main bottlenecks around Arundel, Worthing/Lancing and Chichester. This also causes many drivers to 'rat-run through rural villages such as Storrington to avoid the congestion on the A27.

At the present time the Department for Transport does not propose bringing forward funding to address these issues before 2015 although a feasibility study considering options for bringing private investment into the national road network is expected to be published in the Autumn.

The Council resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport in the meantime to investigate all possible options for improvements to the A27, at Chichester, Arundel and Worthing, including funding options.'

Notice of Motion by Mrs Millson

109 The following motion was moved by Mrs Millson and seconded by Dr Walsh:

'This Council supports Jessica's campaign which aims to raise awareness about the extent of the problem of scam mail across the UK. According to statistics published by the Office of Fair Trading, only 1 in 5 cases are reported and therefore the likelihood is there are many vulnerable people across the county who have suffered in this way.

This Council resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Health and Adults' Services and the Cabinet Member for Public Protection to:

- (1) Publicise information about the dangers of mass marketing fraud widely to West Sussex residents with a particular emphasis on raising awareness among elderly residents and carers; and
- (2) Write to the Minister for Employment relations, consumer and postal affairs at the Department for Business and Industry pledging our support for the campaign and asking him to take action to prevent vulnerable residents of West Sussex and beyond falling prey to these scams like Jessica did.'

110 The motion was referred to the Cabinet Member for Public Protection, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health and Adults' Services, for consideration.

Report of Urgent Action

111 The report of urgent action taken under regulation 16 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 (pages 242 and 243) was noted.

Chairman

The Council rose at 4.08 p.m.

Minutes - Appendix 1

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 - Petitions	Mr Smytherman	Trustee of Worthing and Arun Mind
Item 6(a) Written Question 2 - Kickstart	Mr Rice	Member of Worthing Borough Council
Item 6(a) Written Question 3 - Youth Services	Mr Oxlade	Member of Bewbush and Oriel Management Committees and Ifield Community Youth Service
Item 6(b) CMQT Paragraph 2 (Armed Forces Community Covenant)	Ms Goldsmith	Son is a serving member of the armed forces
Item 6(b) CMQT Paragraph 6 (Commission on Climate Change)	Dr Walsh	Member of Arun District Council
Item 6(b) CMQT Paragraph 7 (South Downs National Park)	Mrs Urquhart	Member of South Downs National Park Authority
Item 6(b) CMQT Paragraph 13 (Youth Support and Development Service)	Mrs Brunsdon	Member of East Grinstead Town Council
	Mr Evans	Chairman of East Preston Youth Centre and a Trustee of Ferring Youth Club
	Mr Lanzer	Member of Oriel Youth Wing Management Committee
	Mrs Millson	Director of 4TheYouth, based at Forest Youth Wing
	Mr Oxlade	Member of Bewbush and Oriel Management Committees and Ifield Community Youth Service
	Mr Rogers	Vice-Chair of the Maybridge Keystone Club

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 6(b) CMQT Paragraph 13 (Youth Support and Development Service) (cont)	Mr Sheldon	Chief Executive of Horsham Matters (part of Horsham community group)
Item 6(b) CMQT Paragraph 15 (academy status in West Sussex)	Mr Bradbury	Vice-Chairman of Board of Directors of Warden Park Academy Trust and Governor of St Mark's Church of England Primary School, Staplefield and spouse is a Governor of Woodland Meads Special School, Burgess Hill and employed by the County Council as a teacher
	Mr Rogers	Governor of Durrington High School
Item 6(b) CMQT Paragraph 16 (improvements to exam results for West Sussex students students)	Mr Bradbury	Vice-Chairman of Board of Directors of Warden Park Academy Trust and Governor of St Mark's Church of England Primary School, Staplefield and spouse is a Governor of Woodland Meads Special School, Burgess Hill and employed by the County Council as a teacher
	Mr Rogers	Governor of Durrington High School
Item 6(b) CMQT Paragraph 17 (additional school places)	Mr Bradbury	Vice-Chairman of Board of Directors of Warden Park Academy Trust and Governor of St Mark's Church of England Primary School, Staplefield and spouse is a Governor of Woodland Meads Special School, Burgess Hill and employed by the County Council as a teacher
	Mr Rogers	Governor of Durrington High School

Minutes - Appendix 1

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 6(b) CMQT Paragraph 25 (DfT consultation on the combined Thameslink, Southern and Great Northern rail franchise)	Dr Dennis	Annual rail season ticket holder between Horsham and London
	Mr Rogers	Holder of an All Regions Rail Pass
Item 7 - Proposed Submission Draft of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (Regulation 19 Stage)	Mr Bradbury	Chairman of Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council
	Mr Rice	Member of Worthing Borough Council
All items	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council

19 October 2012

1. Written Question from **Mr McDougall** for reply by the **Deputy Leader and portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise**

Question

In these current economic times, access to affordable credit for families on low income is imperative. Can the Deputy Leader:

- (a) Provide an annual breakdown of the funding provided or loans given by this authority to the West Sussex Credit Union since its inception;
- (b) Confirm how much funding the authority intends to commit or loan the credit union over the next three years; and
- (c) Confirm when the credit union is expected to be financially self- sustaining?

Answer

- (a) The County Council has provided £258,208 to support the West Sussex Credit Union: 2008/09 - £113k; 2009/10 - £123k; 2010/11 - £22k; 2011/12 – £0; and 2012/13 - £0.
- (b) There are no commitments for further funding although the Credit Union continues to discuss opportunities for support with us as it does others in West Sussex.
- (c) This really is a question that needs to be asked of the Credit Union.

Supplementary Question

Does the County Council actively promote the Share and Save Scheme run by the Credit Union and, if so, can all members be given details of how it is promoted?

Supplementary Answer

The Council does some publicity - I will share details with members.

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

Question

In December the Deputy Leader made a decision to undertake a programme of investment to support economic growth (now known as the Kick Start programme). Of that investment programme, £3.5m was allocated to support district and borough projects. The decision to allocate funding to these projects was delegated to the Executive Director for Finance and Performance, once he had seen a business plan, evidence that the project was eligible to be treated as

Minutes - Appendix 2

capital expenditure, evidence of financial investment from other sources and clearly defined outcomes. Can the Deputy Leader:

- (a) Specify how much funding has been provided to date in respect of the £3.5m allocated to local projects;
- (b) Provide details of the expected economic benefits and when they will be realised for each district or borough according to the business cases received; and
- (c) Confirm he is satisfied that the approach outlined above will yield the best possible outcomes for the local economy as a result of the £3.5m investment made by this authority?

Answer

- (a) Projects with a total value of £2.35m have to date been approved and a funding timetable in line with the projects activities agreed. Table 1 below shows the current forecast as to when the funds will be requested by the District and Boroughs'. Table 1:- Forecast spend profile for each District and Borough project:

District or Borough	Project	Forecast Spend profile	
		FY12/13	FY13/14
Crawley Borough Council	Manor Royal developments	200	400
Mid Sussex District Council	Starter units in Haywards Heath	50	550
Horsham District Council	Street Scene Horsham	150	350
Horsham District Council	Starter units @ Brinsbury College	0	75
Chichester District Council	Local Produce Outlet	75	0
Chichester District Council	Business Support	50	0
Arun District Council	Bognor Regis Growth Zone	100	270
Arun District Council	Bognor Regis Town centre street scene enhancement	80	100
Arun District Council	Business support facility		50
Worthing College	Support for new college site	250	250
Adur District Council	Shoreham footbridge	200	0
Worthing Borough Council	To be advised	0	300
	Sub Total (£k)	£1,155	£2,345
	OVERALL TOTAL (£k)	£3,500	

- (b) The £2.35m (highlighted in the previous answer) has 'unlocked' in excess of £22.8m of additional funding¹.
- (c) Further investment of in excess of £8m is likely as these projects become a catalyst for additional investment².

These projects incur approximately 248 fte years of work to deliver³. The District and Borough submission's estimate that these projects will help to create 893 new jobs within 4 years of the projects being delivered. Most of the projects included within this estimate would not have started without County Council Kick Start funding. Table 2 below shows the details for each project.

District or Borough	Project	Amount of other funding unlocked (directly)	Amount of other funding unlocked (indirectly)	Estimate Fte created in delivery (man years)	Estimate Fte forecast in 4 years	Would project have started or not
Crawley Borough Council	Manor Royal developments					
Mid Sussex Distric Council	Starter units in Haywards Heath	£1,270,000	£0	19	28	No
Horsham District Council	Street Scene Horsham	£150,000	£2,000,000	6	35	No
Horsham District Council	Starter units @ Brinsbury College					
Chichester District Council	Local Produce Outlet					
Chichester District Council	Business Support					
Arun District Council	Bognor Regis Growth Zone	£400,000	£6,000,000	3	800	No
Arun District Council	Bognor Regis Town centre street scene enhancement	£100,000	£300,000	6	30	No
Arun District Council	Business support facility					
Worthing College	Support for new college site	£20,950,000	£0	214	Not known	No
Adur District Council	Shoreham footbridge	£0	£0	tba	tba	Yes
Worthing Borough Council	To be advised					
	Sub Total(£k)					
	OVERALL TOTAL(£k)	£22,870,000	£8,300,000	248	893	

As can be seen by the data provided by the borough and district councils the investment by the County Council under the Kick Start programme is on track to deliver the required economic outcomes identified by the County Council within the two-year period. This has only been achieved by working closely with the borough and district teams since all of projects required robust planning to get them to their current stage. I am satisfied the current approach will deliver an excellent return for our investment.

¹ Worthing Borough Council Planning application for Worthing College move identified the total relocation project was estimated at £21.45m. Other data has been supplied as part of the District and Borough project proposals.

² Within the Growing Places £6m loan it was identified early planning preparation work was essential. Additional sums identified as part of the District and Borough project proposals.

³ Estimated using the industry guidance that £100k of construction costs generally will create 1 fte year of work.

Supplementary Question

There does not appear to be a scheme for Worthing listed in table 1 of the answer - how will residents in Worthing benefit from Kick Start in the next year?

Supplementary Answer

Worthing residents will benefit significantly from the redevelopment of the old Aviva site. The County Council is also in discussions with the Borough Council about schemes in the precinct which will hopefully lead to developments which will help the economy.

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

Question

One of the recommendations made by the Youth Support and Development Service Task and Finish Group (July 2012) was that 'A small fund of money should be allocated to YSDS to enable external funding to be obtained – such as where match funding can generate considerable investment'.

Earlier this month the Cabinet Member wrote to the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Select Committee with his response to those recommendations. In respect of funding, the response he provided was that 'YSDS have been asked to set aside a sum of £5,000 annually to be used to support match funding opportunities'.

Given that this only equates to a few hundred pounds per Borough or Parish each year, does the Cabinet Member believe this will really make a difference and would he consider a larger sum as this money would be match funded which could offer much bigger returns in the future?

Answer

I have asked the Youth Support and Development Service to advise me if the sum set aside is insufficient and will review this if an opportunity arises where additional funds would draw in additional resources. Currently there have been no requests for match funding.

This question was also raised by Mrs Millson at the Policy and Resources Select Committee where I agreed to look into the matter. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources has now agreed to match funds for individual applications which should provide ample resources to drive this initiative.

Supplementary Question

Would it not have been better for the Cabinet Member to ask the Youth and Development Service what would be appropriate before responding to the Task Force? Could the Cabinet Member ensure that local members are informed when allocating money for projects in their areas?

Supplementary Answer

£5,000 is in place as Kick Start funding and it will be matched by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources. There have been no applications so far but the funding will be advertised and I will ensure local members are kept informed.

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

Question

With regard to the Think Family programme, can the Cabinet Member:

- (a) Advise how many of the 1,165 families that the Government estimated were eligible for the Troubled Families initiative in West Sussex have been identified to date;
- (b) Confirm he is satisfied that the programme is on track to meet the milestones set for year one of the programme;
- (c) Clarify the issues with the two providers of the Think Family programme and what action is being taken to resolve them;
- (d) Explain the rationale for identifying lower super output areas within Districts and Boroughs; and
- (e) Clarify the next steps for the project and the intended vehicle for service delivery?

Answer

- (a) The identification of families who match the Think Family Initiative (TFI) criteria is complex. It requires the triangulation of up to five data sets from different organisations - anti-social behaviour data and crime data from Sussex Police, non-school attendance data, Department for Work and Pensions' (DWP) data on worklessness, address data and household data to identify children under five. The details of 600 individuals who potentially match the criteria are with DWP.
- (b) The challenge for West Sussex is the volume of families requiring a service. West Sussex is one of only 22 areas (out of 152) required to turn around 1,000 families. However I am satisfied that the Council has a clear direction over and broad plan, the details of which are still being worked up to deal with this number by March 2015 and to start work with 388 families during this financial year. We will expand Think Family in West Sussex and start work with the 388 families by augmenting, and in some cases refocusing, a range of existing services (Phase 1) and developing new services in Phase 2.
- (c) Family Nurse Partnership (FNP) now has 95 young women recruited to this innovative and internationally evidence-based project. The final five

participants are being identified by our provider. Our West Sussex Family Intervention Projects (FIP) has three sites across West Sussex working with 33 households. We are working closely with our delivery partners to see how we can extend these existing services to meet the demands of TFI.

(d) The Think Family Board and executive has agreed to adopt two priorities as 'local criteria' for the Think Family Initiative (TFI):

1. Families with a pregnant mother or child under five years;
2. Families living within a 'Think Family Neighbourhood'.

It is more effective and efficient to provide family intervention to families who live in the same locality. West Sussex can be divided into Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA), neighbourhoods of approximately 1,500 people, which can then be ranked in terms of child poverty. Those neighbourhoods with high levels of child poverty also score high in other indices of multiple deprivation in areas of health, housing, education, employment and crime. Whilst some boroughs and districts have areas which rank higher in terms of child poverty, it is accepted that all districts and boroughs have areas of need.

To ensure the programme is focused on neighbourhoods of most need, whilst including all districts and boroughs, it is proposed that approximately 30 Think Family Neighbourhoods are identified across West Sussex. Consultation has already started with each district and borough to identify which areas should be designated as Think Family Neighbourhoods, ensuring that each district and borough is fairly represented. Although these neighbourhoods will be linked to LSOAs the boundaries of them will be around a 'natural community' rather than an artificial line on a map drawn up to define LSOAs this means that some Think Family Neighbourhoods will be smaller or larger than an LSOA. It is critical for families engaged in the programme to live in neighbourhoods which reinforce the positive changes being made at home. As the programme is focused on the poorest neighbourhoods within each district and borough, additional or enhanced services in housing, policing, health and youth services would create synergy, resulting in an overall greater positive impact for the area. As an example Sussex Police will commit additional neighbourhood policing resources to the Think Family Neighbourhoods to support safer environments.

(e) The model for delivery of the expansion of Think Family in West Sussex is being finalised but will:

- Build on the services we already have;
- Develop a key worker system. The key worker will be lynchpin to bringing about the change in each family and will also calibrate and co-ordinate services in a team around the family approach;
- See the expansion of FIP to every district in West Sussex;
- Ensure a series of Think Family Neighbours across West Sussex;
- Be commissioning new providers as well as extending existing providers;
- Progress to Work Back to Work Programme will be a key element of the delivery model; and

- Have two phases of delivery - 388 in Phase 1, the remainder of families in Phase 2.

Supplementary Question

Would the Cabinet Member confirm that of the 15 'risks' only two are green, the rest being either amber or red? Would he would share the risk register with me? Also, with regard to paragraph (c), are there currently issues with the providers?

Supplementary Answer

I will share the risk register with Dr Walsh. The entries in the risk register are not all green as the three-year project has only just started and intelligence is being collected to ensure the project succeeds. I can reassure the Council that the recruitment issues with the providers have been resolved.

Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Mrs Arculus, Mrs Millson and Mrs Smith.

5. Written question from **Mrs Smith** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Education and Schools**

Question

I understand that schools were invited to sign up for the Sainsbury's School Games competition which has been funded until 2015. Would the Cabinet Member:

- (a) Confirm what percentage of West Sussex schools in each district or borough participated in the 2012 School Games this year;
- (b) Acknowledge the benefits that sport can bring for health and well-being and indeed as a means of improving the lives of young people; and
- (c) Confirm that he will do everything possible to encourage schools to participate in the School Games competition to ensure the 2012 Olympics and Paralympics provide a lasting legacy for young people across West Sussex?

Answer

- (a) The County Council does not organise the School Games and does not hold information about the number and/or percentage of schools in West Sussex schools in each district or borough that participated in the School Games.
- (b) The Council fully supports the health and wellbeing effects of participating in regular sporting and physical activity and for enriching the quality of young people's lives. The School Games play an important part in helping to motivate and inspire young people to participate in more competitive sport and physical activity.

- (c) The Council encourages all schools in West Sussex to provide a broad and balanced physical education curriculum and a range of opportunities to take part in sport and physical activity, including the School Games. To embed the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic legacy for young people, West Sussex schools are supported by local partnerships, School Games Organisers and secondary school physical education teachers, released for one day per week, to provide more competitive sport through the four levels of competition of the School Games (i.e. intra-school, inter-school, area and national competition).

Supplementary Question

Would the Cabinet Member find out how many schools take up the offer of Sainsbury's sporting games and ensure that the Council actively encourages schools to take part?

Supplementary Answer

Yes I will.

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

Question

Ofsted recently published a report expressing concern that Pupil Premium funding is being used to plug the gap in budget cuts as a survey of 262 schools found that more than half said the Premium was making 'little or no difference' to the way they were being managed and operated.

- (a) Does the Cabinet Member welcome the Pupil Premium as one way of addressing the objective in our performance framework which aims to narrow the gap between the lowest performing 20% of pupils and the median of the rest;
- (b) How confident is the Cabinet Member that the Pupil Premium is benefitting the individual children in West Sussex it is intended to benefit;
- (c) Will the Cabinet Member agree to lobby the Government to ensure steps are taken to make sure the Pupil Premium does benefit the children who it is intended to benefit; and
- (d) Is there any other action the Cabinet Member can take to urge schools to ensure the Pupil Premium benefits the children for whom it is intended particularly given that this would help narrow the attainment gap?

Answer

- (a) It has been the policy in West Sussex for many years to differentiate the allocation of school funding to support vulnerable and underachieving groups to recognise the impact of social deprivation and poverty on learning

and outcomes for children and young people. This has been supplemented by various government initiatives and grant funding including 'One-to-One Tuition' and the Pupil Premium which was introduced from April 2011. The Pupil Premium is targeted towards pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM) whose parents are on low income, pupils with a parent in the armed services, and looked after children (LAC) who have been in continuous care for six months or more. The Pupil Premium in 2012/13 is £600 per FSM and LAC pupil and £250 per service pupil, and will increase further in the next two years.

- (b) The Pupil Premium is allocated to schools and is clearly and separately identifiable in the annual school budget statement. The use of the Pupil Premium is not ring fenced or limited by conditions of grant. It is for schools to decide how the Pupil Premium allocated for FSM or service pupils is spent, since they are best placed to assess what additional provision should be made for the individual pupils within their responsibility. However, expenditure of the West Sussex LAC Pupil Premium is linked closely to the objectives of the Personal Education Plan for individual looked after children and is spent in a variety of ways including one to one tuition, music lessons, purchase of laptops etc. Officers from the Virtual School for Looked After Children work with Designated Teachers for LAC on intervention strategies to improve outcomes. Approximately 75% of West Sussex LAC pupils are making satisfactory or good progress to achieve above or at the nationally expected levels at Key Stage 2 and at GCSE; those not making expected progress have lower levels of attendance and that is another target for support and intervention of the designated teachers and the Education Welfare Service.
- (c) The Government has introduced a general requirement for schools from September 2012 to publish online details of their Pupil Premium allocation, spend and impact. New measures have also been included in the performance tables that capture the achievement of those disadvantaged pupils covered by the Pupil Premium. This will ensure that parents and others are made fully aware of the attainment of pupils covered by the premium in a school year. Schools will soon be reporting outcomes for the 2011/12 academic year.
- (d) The Government has written to schools and has published information about beneficial strategies to improve outcomes for vulnerable and challenging pupils. In addition to the work of the Virtual School for LAC in improving outcomes for LAC, the Learning Service focuses its intervention strategy on schools where groups of pupils are underachieving and this work includes discussion of the use of delegated funding and the Pupil Premium to improve pupil achievement. The Pupil Premium is most likely to improve outcomes when it is used as an integral part of an effective intervention strategy to raise attainment in schools. This is illustrated by the improved outcomes in schools targeted by the Learning Service for support to help address underperformance at KS2. In the academic year 2011/12 these schools improved performance at Level 4+ in English and mathematics by an average of 15% - well above the national and West Sussex averages.

Supplementary Question

Is the Cabinet Member concerned that the pupil premium may not be making a difference to those in most need? What more can the Council do to make sure it is targeted at those who need it most?

Supplementary Answer

As I have already said it is for the schools to decide how the pupil premium is used. However, the Council is pressing and helping them to ensure that parents and families who are entitled to the premium take it up.

Additional Question by Mr B Hall

Is it true that the legislation relating to pupil premiums is rather lax? Will the Cabinet Member make representations to tighten up the legislation to ensure those most in need benefit?

Answer to Additional Question

Yes I will although I am not aware of any spurious use in schools.

7. Written question from **Mrs Millson** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources**

Question

I understand that Cabinet Members at East Sussex County Council receive regular updates about the progress of the South East Seven Partnership and the proposed next steps. A recent update refers to estimated overall savings for East Sussex as £100m in the short term, £500m in the medium term and £1.5bn for the longer term.

Furthermore I understand that East Sussex has contributed £50k to the waste workstream, that there will be further exploration of administrative collaboration of the local government pension scheme, that an SE7 conference is planned for early 2013 and that options for the future direction of the partnership could include becoming a formal or trading organisation. According to the Chief Executive of East Sussex, lead members across SE7 will raise these discussions within their individual councils.

Can the Cabinet Member tell me:

- (a) What are the estimated overall savings for this authority as a result of this partnership arrangement;
- (b) How much this authority has committed to date or is intending to commit to the each of the active workstreams the partnership is currently progressing;
- (c) What is the intention for the future direction of this partnership; and

- (d) How he intends to ensure that the work and funding of this partnership is transparent to both members and residents in future?

Answer

- (a) No firm estimates for savings to this Council have been made. However, the budgets for the services which are subject to joint investigation are very large and it is reasonable to assume that savings arising from joint working might be significant. SE7 is chaired by the Leader of ESCC who is a strong advocate of the partnership and he believes that very substantial efficiency savings are achievable - the figures quoted by Mrs Millson are for the seven partners rather than East Sussex alone. An example of the savings from one workstream is the estimate of £300M on waste, by 2020.
- (b) The only financial contribution by this Council to date has been the £50,000 for the development of a business case for a more commercial, regional, approach to waste management, which is expected to be completed in the New Year. Officer time is provided for each of the five workstreams, the others being: ICT, Special Educational Needs and Disability, Highways and Property. Additional areas of joint interest also arise and the pensions example noted by Mrs Millson is one of those. Whilst looking at the potential for major changes in ways of working these groups also provide an excellent means for the exchange of information and experience in current service provision. I believe the partnership will continue as long as it can identify benefits from joint work, though there is no specific commitment required. Each council can choose to be involved or not with each workstream and in any proposal that emerges. The consideration of formalising the partnership, such as by forming a trading company, is at a very early stage, with the principle floated for the first time at the SE7 meeting in June. An options paper was presented to the September meeting, prior to which I and my Cabinet colleagues gave it our consideration.
- (c) The partnership also allows the councils to have a collective voice with government and to promote the interests of the region. The Government is equally interested in what such a partnership of councils can achieve, a good example being the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and the Department for Communities and Local Government's close interest and assistance in the waste management work. The conference planned for the New Year is intended to raise awareness on all the SE7 activities.
- (d) To date members have not been informed routinely on the SE7 initiatives as there has been no concrete proposal to consider. However, as suggested by East Sussex, there is now sufficient progress with the work to share the news of this more widely. The partnership meets quarterly with a newsletter following each meeting; to date there are nine newsletters which have been made available to Mrs Millson and can be provided to other members. The newsletters provide a comprehensive record of the work and discussions that take place and in future these will be circulated to all members as a matter of course. Any significant proposal for West Sussex

Minutes - Appendix 2

arising from the work of SE7 would, of course, be the subject of member consideration and scrutiny in the normal way.

Supplementary Question

Is it expected that members from all parties will be invited to the SE7 conference to be held in the New Year?

Supplementary Answer by the Leader on behalf of the Cabinet Member

The conference will be held in February and there will be an invitation to all groups to send representatives.

8. Written question from **Mrs Millson** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources**

Question

The organisation 'Fields in Trust' seeks to permanently safeguard outdoor recreational spaces in perpetuity. Its current flagship UK-wide programme is the Queen Elizabeth II Fields Challenge which aims to permanently protect as many outdoor recreational spaces as it can by the end of 2012.

I understand that a request for Muggeridge Field, south of Athelstan Way in Horsham to be nominated as a Queen Elizabeth II Field was made earlier this year. I believe in response to the request the Leader advised in January that the site would be reviewed by Horsham District Council as part of their evolving local planning work to ensure that all opportunities are explored to maximise the benefits for the communities of West Sussex.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm:

- (a) How far the review of the Muggeridge Field site has progressed;
- (b) How the local community is being involved in decisions relating to that site; and
- (c) To what extent there have been further discussions with the applicants regarding the future of Muggeridge Field.

Answer

In acknowledging the valued work and aspirations for the QE2 Fields challenge, it should be highlighted that the land south of Athelstan Way, known locally as Muggeridge Field, is not recreational land, and the County-owned land remains outside that definition. It is land used for grazing purposes and has no public rights of access.

The future of the site has not progressed and the County Council still await Horsham District Council as it reviews land uses as part of its Planning Framework.

Earlier this year Horsham District Council consulted on options for different rates of future building and land usage in the district as part of a wide ranging public consultation. Since then, they have been looking at how they should take the results forward into a new planning framework for the district. Their original timetable envisaged that they would have fully completed their discussions by the end of October and to have a draft document ready to take to their Council. However, given the considerable amount of detail and discussion required, they decided to allow several more weeks to complete this exercise so their council could debate on the draft framework document and this is now be re-scheduled to a meeting early in the New Year. Following that meeting, there will be a public consultation on their Framework document. The results of that exercise will then be considered and a final version produced which will be submitted to an independent planning inspector who will conduct a public examination. Horsham District Council anticipates that this process should enable them to have an adopted statutory framework in place by the latter part of 2014.

Supplementary Question

Does the Cabinet Member agree that there should be a field somewhere in West Sussex which is dedicated to the Queen Elizabeth II Fields Challenge? What will he do to ensure that that happens?

Supplementary Answer by the Leader on behalf of the Cabinet Member

I will pass the question to the Cabinet Member to respond.

9. Written question from **Mrs Smith** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Health and Adults' Services**

Question

I understand the County Council has bid for funding to enable communities in West Sussex to become more dementia friendly. Can the Cabinet Member please tell me:

- (a) The value of the proposed bid submitted by this authority;
- (b) What proposals for developing dementia friendly communities were submitted to support the bid; and
- (c) When members will be made aware of the outcome and content of the bid?

Answer

The bids have been led by clinical commissioning groups in partnership with the Joint Commissioning Unit, Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust, Sussex Community Trust, the County Council's Adults' Services, district council representatives, acute hospital representative, Sussex Police and third sector providers.

- (a) The bids have come from the three clinical commissioning groups:

Minutes - Appendix 2

Crawley	£819,000
Horsham, Mid Sussex	£239,000
Coastal West Sussex	£236,700

- (b) The following gives an outline of each of the projects included in the bids:

Crawley

Crawley neighbourhood dementia alliance – to make communities more aware of dementia, confident in offering support to their friends and neighbours living with dementia, and ensuring that people living with dementia can play an active role in the community.

Dementia buddy scheme – to develop a network of volunteers to help people living with dementia carry on with their everyday lives – i.e. undertake hobbies, outings, everyday things such as GP appointments, trips to the supermarket.

Dementia friendly Crawley – providing programme management and overall leadership for all Crawley dementia challenge initiatives.

Dementia innovation fund – to help local groups support people with dementia, enable fundraising initiatives and provide advice and support to people living with dementia on statutory help they may be able to receive.

Joyful moments – to set up activities and opportunities for people living with dementia, for example – reading groups, singing clubs, pampering events.

Dementia Voice – setting up a specialist group of people living with dementia in order to understand how best to make services work for them.

Horsham and Mid Sussex

Antipsychotic medication – providing two NHS practice support specialists to GPs in order to review patients taking antipsychotic medication and to deliver training on alternative interventions to medication.

Increasing diagnosis – to capitalise on the availability of memory assessment services by providing peer to peer training for GPs on dementia and the importance of early diagnosis, as well as identifying and upskilling dementia leads in practice clusters.

Admiral nurses – to recruit two admiral nurses for the Horsham & Mid Sussex area in order to work with people living with dementia to maintain their health and wellbeing.

Advance care planning – a training programme for primary care staff which will increase the number of GPs who feel able to effectively undertake advance care planning for people with dementia.

Community support – to start up initiatives such as singing for the brain and art therapy in the Horsham & Mid Sussex area.

Coastal West Sussex

The Stitches in time initiative – a programme which will bring together health, social care and third sector and care home professionals in order to share and facilitate training in quality dementia care. It will be co-produced and co-delivered by people with dementia, and led by specialist nurses.

This initiative will also work with urgent and proactive care teams and will ensure that community healthcare teams are also included in training programmes and that integrated working is promoted.

- (c) The County Council will find out by the end of October if it has been successful in securing funding for the above initiatives. Members will be informed of the outcome. The detailed project proposals for each scheme can be made available to members on request.

Supplementary Question

Would the Cabinet Member inform members of the process for the bids and the outcomes?

Supplementary Answer

Yes.

10. Written question from **Mrs Smith** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

I understand the Leader recently stated that she supports the continued growth and expansion of Gatwick Airport as a single-runway, two-terminal airport until 2019. The Leader stated that any case for a second runway after 2019 would need to be justified by compelling evidence that its economic benefits to the Gatwick Diamond outweigh the disadvantages and would need to be persuaded that the environmental impact of any second runway would be mitigated sufficiently.

Can the Cabinet Member tell me what he considers the worthwhile environmental and human costs that could justify a second runway to be and how they might be evaluated by this authority?

Answer

The County Council has a legal agreement in place that prevents the start of construction work for a new runway at Gatwick Airport before 13 August 2019. The relevant planning permission and any other necessary consent can be obtained, but building work cannot start before that date. The County Council's policy is clear in that it fully supports the 1979 legal agreement, and the efficient running of the Airport with one runway and two terminals. The legal agreement has seven years to run. In the meantime, it is important to keep up to date with developments and proposals relating to Gatwick Airport. There are many issues to consider that relate to the future of the Airport. These include the:

- need for economic growth and jobs in Crawley and more widely across West Sussex and the Coast to Capital Local Economic Partnership area;
- broader social and environment impacts of growth at the Airport and on surrounding communities;

Minutes - Appendix 2

- the Airport's owner's intentions for running the Airport over the next few years, including their plans for investing more than £1bn in the Airport; and
- current and forecast scale of air travel.

Given the range of issues to consider, and the likelihood that these will evolve over the coming years, it is important to consider the best way to pursue the County Council's objectives and the interests of local communities. The County Council needs to consider the implications of having, or not having, a second runway. As the Leader has stated, the case for a second runway would need to be justified by compelling evidence that its economic benefits to the Gatwick Diamond outweigh the disadvantages. As a County Council, we would also need to be persuaded that the environmental impact of any second runway would be mitigated sufficiently.

We will look at the options for promoting and securing our objectives for the period after the current agreement expires. 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.

The Government is shaping aviation policy and considering airport capacity through three different routes, which are the:

- on-going consultation about aviation policy and its intention to prepare and publish an aviation policy framework in 2013;
- expected call for evidence to the Government on the future capacity of UK airports; and
- setting up an Independent Commission on Aviation Connectivity to be chaired by Sir Howard Davies.

The Government intends this Commission to be part of a process that is fair and open, and that takes account of the views of passengers and residents as well as the aviation industry, business, local and devolved government and environmental groups. A decision on whether to support any of the recommendations contained in the final report will be taken by the next Government.

The owners of Gatwick Airport have recently announced their intention to explore the possibilities for a second runway. This might be expected of an efficient private business looking to make the best use of its assets - the Airport, associated infrastructure, workforce and suppliers. It does not mean that the Government will necessarily look to Gatwick Airport to increase airport capacity. It is a sign that the owners want to be in a position to participate fully in the Commission's work.

The airport company has confirmed that it will stand by the commitments made in its recently published airport master plan which states that there are no current plans to build a second runway and that it will honour the 1979 legal agreement between GAL and the County Council, not to build a second runway before 2019. It is essential that decisions are made in the light of up to date evidence, and the views of interested parties.

Supplementary Question

Will the Cabinet Member keep members whose divisions could be affected by a bid by GAL for a second runway at Gatwick informed of the progress of the bid and any initiatives that the Council takes regarding discussions with the airport and the Government?

Supplementary Answer

The Council will respond to both the inquiry and to the airport directly and through participation in Gatcom and members will be kept fully informed.

Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Dr Dennis and Dr Walsh.

11. Written question from **Mr Oxlade** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Public Protection**

Question

I understand that earlier this year the Department for Work and Pensions launched a new 'Tell us Once' service. This enables families dealing with the death of a loved one to report that death only once and saves them having to notify 28 local and central government services. According to the Department for Work and Pensions as of June this year 80% of local authorities were making this service available and they were expecting to achieve 95% coverage.

Can the Cabinet Member tell me why the 'Tell us Once' service is not being offered to residents of West Sussex at present?

Answer

The County Council completely understands the benefits of a reliable 'Tell us Once' (TUO) service and is regularly engaging with the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) and local authorities to ensure that there is less stress placed on the next of kin at such a delicate time. The County Council constantly reviews offering TUO in West Sussex, by attending meetings with DWP, seeing reports that other local authorities produce, both for those who are offering this service, and 'next steps' from those who have chosen to postpone implementing it. As West Sussex is not a unitary authority, offering TUO involves not only the County Council, but the boroughs and district councils. We need to ensure that all departments are using the information so the 'Tell Us Once' message is truly realised.

Regular engagement with local authorities, locally and nationally, is undertaken to establish, not only the advantages, but also any disadvantages, to their customers. From other authorities experiences, set out below are the issues the County Council considers when reviewing offering TUO:

Minutes - Appendix 2

- As the appointment time for registering a death takes approximately 15 minutes longer (45 minutes) under the current way TUO is serviced, I need to be sure this can be offered without it having a detrimental effect on our availability, which could result in customers having to wait longer to gain their death registration appointment. When DWP and GRO can integrate their two operating systems, this would ensure appointment times are not affected.
- With these two operating systems currently not being linked, there is duplication of questioning of the informant, which can be equally distressing.
- The TUO system's stability, reliability and availability are a concern, as problems occur almost daily, with timing out after 20 minutes being a real issue. This reflects badly on the registration/TUO experience. Difficult processes of reporting error messages and poor response times also impact on the customer.
- Some customers are unhappy with being contacted by back-office services following TUO, as there is inevitably further information required to finalise the deceased accounts i.e. council tax requires probate information and Housing Benefits will require further information to reassess entitlement following a death of a member of the household.
- District and borough partners highlighted further duplication. As TUO is not mandatory, they could receive some notifications on a daily basis, and would also receive all notifications on a weekly basis as part of the registration service statutory return.

In summary, integration of the software is key in the Council's decision to wait, along with the duplication of information gathered by the district/borough councils. We would like to see a more robust system that is reliable and truly a 'Tell Us Once' experience.

I would like to commence offering TUO when we can ensure a stable, reliable and fully integrated service from beginning to end, for our customers at the very difficult time of registering a death.

Supplementary Question

Hampshire, Kent and Surrey County Councils all offer the very valuable 'Tell Us Once' service - would the Cabinet Member look closely at how they have managed to overcome the alleged difficulties and offer the service?

Supplementary Answer

I am pleased that the initiative has been given prominence and I will pursue the issue raised and report the outcome to members.

Agenda Item No. 6(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, Armed Forces Community Covenant, from Mrs Coleman, Mr T M E Dunn, Mrs Smith, Mrs Whitehead.

Paragraph 5, Greater Wessex Economic Leadership Group, from Mrs Millson, Dr Walsh and Mr Wells.

Paragraph 6, Commission on Climate Change, from Dr Walsh.

Paragraph 7, South Downs National Park, from Mr T M E Dunn and Mr Smith.

Deputy Leader and portfolio for Communities, Environment and Enterprise

The Deputy Leader answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 8, Paralympic Flame, from Mr Watson.

Paragraph 9, new Chairman of the West Sussex Environment and Climate Change Board, from Mrs Millson.

The Deputy Leader agreed to keep Mrs Millson informed about the proposals in the Climate Change Board's Action plan to introduce 20mph speed limits on every urban road by 2015.

Paragraph 10, Broadband Project, from Mrs Arculus and Mr B Hall.

Paragraph 12, Ordinary Watercourse Regulation, from Mrs Mockridge, Mr Rice and Mrs Urquhart.

Cabinet Member for Children and Families

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the paragraph 13, Youth Support and Development Service, from Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Lanzer, Mrs Richards and Dr Walsh.

Cabinet Member for Education and Schools

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 16, improvements to exam results for West Sussex students, from Mr Duncton and Mr B Hall.

Paragraph 17, additional school places, from Mr Blampied, Mrs Millson, Mrs Waight and Mr Watson.

Minutes - Appendix 3

Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 18, Business Rate Pooling, from Mr Acraman and Mr Crow.

Paragraph 20, Capita and the Council's Support Services, from Mrs Coleman and Mr B Hall.

In response to a question from Mr Hall about the cost of the management consultancy leading up to the changeover, the costs or savings in each of the next three years and what any savings would be used for, the Leader on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, said a response would be sent to Mr Hall.

Paragraph 21, Sidney Walter Centre, from Mrs Mockridge and Mr Stevens.

Cabinet Member for Health and Adults' Services

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 24, West Sussex Health day for People with Learning Difficulties, from Mrs Jupp.

Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 25, Department for Transport consultation on the combined Thameslink, Southern and Great Northern rail franchise, from Dr Bloom.

Paragraph 26, Network Rail Operating Centre, from Dr Walsh.

Paragraph 32, Countryliner (Sussex) bus company, from Dr Dennis.

Cabinet Member for Public Protection

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 30, savings by the West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service, from Mr Burrett and Mr Deedman.

Agenda Item No. 6(c) - Leader's Question Time

The Leader answered questions from members on the following topics:

Leader's meeting with Greg Barker in relation to the Green Deal, from Mr Crow.

School Safety Zones and enforcement, from Mr Rogers.

In response to Mr Rogers' comment about the unenforceable nature of school zigzag lines, the Leader said she would ensure that the Council pushed for plans to make them enforceable and provide a briefing note to members.

Award of £3.2m to Ricardo's from the RGF fund and the involvement of the County Council, from Mrs Mockridge.

Balfour Beattie and breach of contact re use of depots, from Dr Walsh.

Request to publish the reports of all Select Committee Task Forces and Cabinet Policy Development Groups on the Intranet, from Dr Wilsdon.

The Leader agreed to take forward the request that the reports of all Task Forces should be made available to all members via the intranet.

Closer liaison and collaboration with utilities and Balfour Beattie, from Mr T M E Dunn.

Lobbying the Government re social care policies, from Mrs Millson.

In response to an offer by Mrs Millson the Leader said she would take up any opportunities for cross-party lobbying in relation to the Government's social care policy.

Contingency plans re cuts to Adults' Services, from Mr B Hall.

Gold award to Rustington in entente florale competition, from Mr Tyler.