

## West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

---

### 24 March 2017

At the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 24 March 2017, at the County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mrs P A C Arculus (Chairman)

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

### Lee Harris

**200** The Chairman welcomed Lee Harris, the new Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment, to his first Council meeting.

### Westminster Incident

**201** The Council joined the Chairman in marking a minute's silence in memory of those who had tragically lost their lives during the attack at Westminster on Wednesday, 22 March 2017.

## **Minutes: Item 5**

---

### **Presentation to Mr Acraman**

- 202** The Chairman presented a small memento to Mr Acraman to mark his 20 years' service as a county councillor.

### **Apologies and attendance**

- 203** Apologies were received from Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr G L Jones, Mr McAra, Mr Peters, Mrs Smith, Mr Sutcliffe and Mr Wickremaratchi. Dr Dennis gave his apologies and left at 12.50 p.m. Mrs Hall and Mr Smith gave their apologies for the afternoon session. Mrs Brunsdon was absent for the afternoon session. Mr Hillier arrived for the afternoon session at 2.10 p.m., Mr Lamb and Mr Petch at 2.50 p.m. and Mr Sheldon at 3.00 p.m. Mr Metcalfe left at 2.45 p.m., Mr J L Rogers at 3.45 p.m., Mr Buckland at 3.50 p.m. and Mr Griffiths at 4.15 p.m. Mr Brown, Mr Crow and Mr Oxlade left at 4.30 p.m.

### **Interests**

- 204** Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

### **Minutes**

- 205** It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 17 February 2017 (pages 467 to 499) be approved as a correct record. Members noted that the answer to written question 8 had been revised due to an inaccuracy in the data originally published.

### **Petition: Save the future of Woodlands Meed Special School**

- 206** The Council debated the following petition. A statement from the petitioners and a briefing note from the Executive Director Children, Adults, Families, Health and Education had been circulated with the agenda.

#### **Save the future of Woodlands Meed Special School**

'West Sussex County Council – do not treat our special needs school as the poor relation.

This petition calls on the County Council to reconsider the urgency of the development of this school and deliver the expansion of Woodlands Meed as a priority.'

- 207** Mrs Marion Wilcock, on behalf of the petitioners, addressed the Council for five minutes in support of the petition.
- 208** The Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing responded to the petition for five minutes on behalf of the County Council.
- 209** The Council debated the petition.

**210** Mrs Wilcock, on behalf of the petitioners, and the Cabinet Member were each given three minutes to make a closing statement.

**211** A proposition was moved by Mr High and seconded by Mrs Jupp as set out below:

'This Council is fully committed to work with the governing body of Woodlands Meed Special School to deliver as soon as possible the improvements to the school.'

**212** The proposition was carried.

**213** A proposition was moved by Mr Petch and seconded by Dr Walsh as set out below:

'The Council accepts the strong case made by the petitioners and calls on the Cabinet to work with the school to deliver a new school building now on the Newick House site as previously promised.'

**214** The proposition was lost.

### **Notice of Motion by Mr M G Jones**

**215** Mr M G Jones's motion had been deferred at the meeting of the County Council on 17 February 2017 due to lack of time. As the circumstances surrounding the motion had changed since the meeting at which it was due to be considered, a revised version of the motion, as set out below, was moved by Mr Jones and seconded by Mrs Mullins:

'This County Council recognises the enormously difficult task that West Sussex School Governing Bodies and head-teachers are currently facing trying to manage their 2017/18 budget against a backdrop of historical low funding, and new burdens such as the general duties education support grant.

This Council regrets the impact that school funding cuts may have on the ability of West Sussex pupils to achieve their full potential, and calls on the Cabinet to:

**(1) *Set aside £1m from the contingency fund to make available an emergency fund accessible to those maintained schools in the County who demonstrate they are faced with no alternative but to make staffing cuts in order to avoid setting a deficit budget;***

**(2)** Put greater pressure on lobbying the Government to ensure that West Sussex schools have the funding they need to provide an excellent education for every one of its pupils; and

**(3)** Ask every member to express their support for the continuing efforts of the Worthless campaign in calling on the Government to bring forward transitional funding in lieu of the outcome of the current Government consultation on the proposed national funding formula,

## Minutes: Item 5

---

to ensure that every pupil across West Sussex knows they are 'Worth Much More'.

- 216** An amendment was moved by Mr Cloake and seconded by Mr Acraman as set out below:

'This County Council recognises the enormously difficult task that West Sussex School Governing Bodies and head-teachers are currently facing trying to manage their 2017/18 budget against a backdrop of historical low funding, and new burdens such as the general duties education support grant.

This Council **recognises** ~~regrets~~ the impact **the additional unfunded cost pressures** that ~~school funding cuts~~ may have on the ability of West Sussex pupils to achieve their full potential, and calls on the Cabinet to:

- ~~(1) Set aside £1m from the contingency fund to make available an emergency fund accessible to those maintained schools in the County who demonstrate they are faced with no alternative but to make staffing cuts in order to avoid setting a deficit budget;~~
- (12) Continue with the considerable pressure including working with our MPs to make the case for the De Minimis funding** ~~Put greater pressure on lobbying the Government to ensure that West Sussex schools have the funding they need to provide an excellent education for every one of its pupils; and~~
- (23) Ask every member to continue to express their support for the continuing efforts of the Worthless campaign in calling on the Government to urgently assess the results of the recent consultation with a view to the rapid introduction of a fair** ~~bring forward transitional funding in lieu of the outcome of the current Government consultation on the proposed national funding formula, to ensure that every pupil across West Sussex knows they are 'Worth Much More'; and~~
- (3) This Council applauds the Cabinet Member for Finance's announcement at the Council meeting on 17 February to set aside up to £1m to grant maintained schools for counselling in respect of CAMHS, together with supporting schools by picking up the cost of the apprenticeship levy (£1.1m) and the first £15,000 payable by the 13 schools with payroll over £3m.'**

- 217** The amendment was carried.

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

'This County Council recognises the enormously difficult task that West Sussex School Governing Bodies and head-teachers are currently facing trying to manage their 2017/18 budget against a backdrop of historical low funding, and new burdens such as the general duties education support grant.

This Council recognises the impact the additional unfunded cost pressures may have on the ability of West Sussex pupils to achieve their full potential, and calls on the Cabinet to:

- (1) Continue with the considerable pressure including working with our MPs to make the case for the De Minimis funding to ensure that West Sussex schools have the funding they need to provide an excellent education for every one of its pupils;
- (2) Ask every member to continue to express their support for the continuing efforts of the Worthless campaign in calling on the Government to urgently assess the results of the recent consultation with a view to the rapid introduction of a fair national funding formula, to ensure that every pupil across West Sussex knows they are 'Worth Much More'; and
- (3) This Council applauds the Cabinet Member for Finance's announcement at the Council meeting on 17 February to set aside up to £1m to grant maintained schools for counselling in respect of CAMHS, together with supporting schools by picking up the cost of the apprenticeship levy (£1.1m) and the first £15,000 payable by the 13 schools with payroll over £3m.'

### Question Time

**219** Members asked questions of members of the Cabinet on matters relevant to their portfolios and questioned the Leader on matters currently relevant to the County Council, as set out at Appendix 3. This included questions on those matters contained within the Cabinet report (pages 500 to 509 and a supplementary report (page 509A to C)) and written questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 15(2) (set out at Appendix 2). The Council noted that on page 8 of the written questions the last bullet point should read 'A259 – 'Bognor to Littlehampton', not 'Bognor to Chichester'.

### Governance Committee: Pension Fund Pooling – Governance Arrangements

**220** The County Council considered proposed governance arrangements for Pension Fund pooling, in the light of the report by the Governance Committee (pages 510 to 520).

**221** Resolved –

- (1) That the arrangements for the pooling of pension fund investments be endorsed as set out in this report, including the establishment of a joint committee as described in Appendix 1 to the report, and that authority is delegated to the Director of Finance, Performance and Procurement and the Director of Law and Assurance, in consultation with the Chairman of the Pensions Panel, to finalise and agree the terms of an Inter Authority Agreement to implement the proposed model;

## **Minutes: Item 5**

---

- (2) That the pension fund functions as specified in Appendix 2 to the report be delegated to the ACCESS joint governance committee, with effect from the date of execution of the Inter Authority Agreement; and
- (3) That authority be delegated to the Director of Law and Assurance to make consequential amendments to the County Council's Constitution to reflect the agreed approach to pooling and the creation of the Joint Governance Committee.

### **Governance Committee: Disclosure and Barring Service checks for Members (Criminal Records Checks)**

**222** The County Council considered proposals for Disclosure and Barring Service checks for members, in the light of the report by the Governance Committee (pages 521 to 525).

**223** In addition to the specific member roles to receive enhanced checks set out in the Appendix to the report the Chairman proposed that the County Chairman and Vice-Chairman also be included.

**224** Resolved –

- (1) That standard DBS checks for all members and enhanced DBS checks for members who undertake the specific roles set out at the Appendix to the report, subject to the addition of the County Chairman and Vice-Chairman, be introduced with effect from the elections in May 2017;
- (2) That the checks be renewed every four years to coincide with the quadrennial elections; and
- (3) That the Director of Law and Assurance be authorised to make changes to the terms of reference of the Standards Committee to include the resolution of issues concerning the discharge of member roles in light of DBS check responses.

### **Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee: Risk Management**

**225** The County Council considered the approach to the allocation of responsibilities for corporate risk management, in the light of the report by the Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee (pages 526 to 531).

**226** Resolved –

- (1) That the approach to the allocation of responsibilities for corporate risk management set out in Section 3 of the Risk Management Strategy, as set out at Appendix 2 to the report, be approved; and
- (2) That the Director of Law and Assurance be authorised to amend the Risk Management Procedures in the Constitution to reflect the

revised Risk Management Strategy and, in particular, the risk categories and the roles and responsibilities set out at Appendices 1 and 2 to the report.

### Report of Urgent Action

- 227** The report of urgent action taken under regulation 11 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 (pages 532 and 533) was noted.

### Notice of Motion by Dr Walsh

- 228** The following motion was moved by Dr Walsh and seconded by Mr Smytherman:

'This County Council is utterly shocked and disappointed at the cancellation by the Secretary of State for Transport of any A27 improvement scheme for Chichester. In particular it is troubling that no timetable for alternative proposals has been presented.

The improvement of this major south coast route is vital to the increasing prosperity of the local economy, as well as for the environmental and health benefits that would accrue to local residents and the wider community, particularly with the huge proposed increases in local house building along the south coast.

It resolves to request that the Leader of the County Council seeks an urgent meeting with the Secretary of State, with local MPs and the business community to ensure that the project can be re-started at the earliest opportunity. It also seeks re-assurance from the Transport Secretary that proposals for A27 improvements at Arundel and Worthing/Lancing are not affected by this cancellation.'

- 229** An amendment was moved by Mr Evans and seconded by Mr R J Oakley.

'**Whilst** this County Council is ~~utterly shocked and disappointed~~ at the cancellation by the Secretary of State for Transport of any A27 improvement scheme for Chichester, **the consultation result showed 47% against any of the proposed options**. ~~In particular it is troubling that no timetable for alternative proposals has been presented.~~

The improvement of this major south coast route is vital to the increasing prosperity of the local economy, as well as for the environmental and health benefits that would accrue to local residents and the wider community, particularly with the huge proposed increases in local house building along the south coast. **The cancellation provides an opportunity for a holistic community response.**

It resolves to request that the Leader of the County Council seeks an urgent meeting with the Secretary of State **following the successful workshop held on 22 March, to explain the work underway and asks,**

## Minutes: Item 5

---

~~with local MPs and the business community to ensure that the project can be re-started at the earliest opportunity. It also **asks the Leader of the County Council to** seeks re-assurance from the Transport Secretary that proposals for A27 improvements at Arundel and Worthing/Lancing are not affected by this cancellation **and that there is no repetition of the flawed consultation that happened in 2016.**~~

**230** The amendment was carried.

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

'Whilst this County Council is shocked at the cancellation by the Secretary of State for Transport of any A27 improvement scheme for Chichester, the consultation result showed 47% against any of the proposed options.

The improvement of this major south coast route is vital to the increasing prosperity of the local economy, as well as for the environmental and health benefits that would accrue to local residents and the wider community, particularly with the huge proposed increases in local house building along the south coast. The cancellation provides an opportunity for a holistic community response.

It resolves to request that the Leader of the County Council seeks an urgent meeting with the Secretary of State following the successful workshop held on 22 March, to explain the work underway and asks that the project be re-started at the earliest opportunity. It also asks the Leader of the County Council to seek re-assurance from the Transport Secretary that proposals for A27 improvements at Arundel and Worthing/Lancing are not affected by this cancellation and that there is no repetition of the flawed consultation that happened in 2016.'

### Notice of Motion by Ms James

**232** The following motion was moved by Ms James and seconded by Mrs Rapnik:

'The announcement on 1 March 2017 that funding for the A27 Chichester improvements has been withdrawn will mean continued misery for the road users in Chichester and its surrounding towns and villages, as well as regionally. It sends the wrong message in support of the West Sussex economic growth plan.

This Council expresses its extreme disappointment with the announcement by Secretary of State for Transport, Chris Grayling, that improvements to the A27 at Chichester have been cancelled, and calls on the Leader to:

- (1) Lobby the Secretary of State for Transport to reinstate funding for the A27 Chichester scheme; and
- (2) Initiate an Independent Review to assess the correct options for the A27 Chichester. This review should:

- (a) be independent from Highways England;
- (b) include community groups and parishes and have 'cross party' elected member representation;
- (c) be capable of accessing all the work already undertaken on the A27 Chichester (given this work has already received public funding);
- (d) this independent review to be time specific with its response to this Council.

Additionally, this Council calls upon the Leader to explain what will happen to the £10m set aside by the County Council as its contribution towards the A27 Chichester improvements, and specifically if government funding is not re-instated in the immediacy.'

**233** An amendment was moved by Ms James and seconded by Mrs Rapnik.

'The announcement on 1 March 2017 that funding for the A27 Chichester improvements has been withdrawn will mean continued misery for the road users in Chichester and its surrounding towns and villages, as well as regionally. It sends the wrong message in support of the West Sussex economic growth plan.

This Council expresses its extreme disappointment with the announcement by Secretary of State for Transport, Chris Grayling, that improvements to the A27 at Chichester have been cancelled, and calls on the Leader to:

- (1) Lobby the Secretary of State for Transport to reinstate funding for the A27 Chichester scheme **and provide regular updates on progress**; and
- (2) Initiate an Independent Review to assess the correct options for the A27 Chichester. This review should:
  - (a) be independent from Highways England;
  - (b) be chaired by an independent panel and devoid of political bias;**
  - ~~(c)~~ include community groups and parishes and **including** have 'cross party' elected member representation;
  - (d) invite participation from businesses within Chichester including, by way of example, the Goodwood Estate and Rolls Royce;**
  - ~~(e)~~ be capable of accessing all the work already undertaken on the A27 Chichester **including all previous options** (given this work has already received public funding);
  - ~~(f)~~ this independent review to **have a time boundary in**

## Minutes: Item 5

---

***reporting back to this Council on its response to a correct solution for the A27 Chichester. Whilst not prescriptive this timeframe is suggested to be within 12 months*** ~~be time specific with its response to this Council.~~

Additionally, this Council calls upon the Leader to retain the £10m set aside by the County Council as its contribution towards the A27 Chichester improvements.'

**234** The amendment was lost.

**235** An amendment was moved by Mrs Evans and seconded by Mr S J Oakley.

'The announcement on 1 March 2017 that funding for the A27 Chichester improvements has been withdrawn will mean continued misery for the road users in Chichester and its surrounding towns and villages, as well as regionally. It sends the wrong message in support of the West Sussex economic growth plan.

This Council expresses its extreme disappointment with the announcement by Secretary of State for Transport, Chris Grayling, that improvements to the A27 at Chichester have been cancelled, and ~~calls on~~ ***is pleased that*** the Leader ***has*** ~~to~~:

- (1) ***Written to*** lobby the Secretary of State for Transport to reinstate funding for the A27 Chichester scheme; and
- (2) ***Initiated a 'Build a Better A27' workshop of community leads which are uniting communities*** ~~an Independent Review~~ to assess the correct options for the A27 Chichester. This review should:
  - (a) be independent from Highways England;
  - (b) include community groups and parishes and have 'cross party' elected member representation;
  - (c) be capable of accessing all the work already undertaken on the A27 Chichester (given this work has already received public funding);
  - (d) this independent review to be time specific with its response to this Council.

Additionally, this Council calls upon the Leader to ***retain*** ~~explain what will happen to~~ the £10m set aside by the County Council as its contribution towards the A27 Chichester improvements, ~~and specifically if government funding is not re-instated in the immediacy.'~~

**236** The amendment was agreed.

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

'The announcement on 1 March 2017 that funding for the A27 Chichester improvements has been withdrawn will mean continued misery for the road users in Chichester and its surrounding towns and villages, as well as regionally. It sends the wrong message in support of the West Sussex economic growth plan.

This Council expresses its extreme disappointment with the announcement by Secretary of State for Transport, Chris Grayling, that improvements to the A27 at Chichester have been cancelled, and is pleased that the Leader has:

- (1) Written to lobby the Secretary of State for Transport to reinstate funding for the A27 Chichester scheme; and
- (2) Initiated a 'Build a Better A27' workshop of community leads which are uniting communities to assess the correct options for the A27 Chichester. This review should:
  - (a) be independent from Highways England;
  - (b) include community groups and parishes and have 'cross party' elected member representation;
  - (c) be capable of accessing all the work already undertaken on the A27 Chichester (given this work has already received public funding);
  - (d) this independent review to be time specific with its response to this Council.

Additionally, this Council calls upon the Leader to retain the £10m set aside by the County Council as its contribution towards the A27 Chichester improvements.'

### **Notice of Motion by Mr Glennon**

**238** At the County Council meeting on 17 February 2017 the following motion had been moved by Mr Glennon and seconded by Mr Smith, and referred to the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services for consideration. A report by the Cabinet Member was included with the agenda (pages 534 to 537).

'This Council supports an early independent review to report on Fire and Rescue Service response times in West Sussex. The review to examine response times for each risk category in each fire station area, to identify the reasons behind any increased response times, and to make recommendations to reduce those response times.

The Council asks the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services to commission a review as soon as possible.'

**239** An amendment was moved by Mr M G Jones and seconded by Mr Lamb.

## Minutes: Item 5

---

'This Council supports an early independent review to ~~report on Fire and Rescue Service~~ **understand the local factors that have contributed to increasing response times for some incidents** in West Sussex **over the past ten years, such as the first appliance taking 18 minutes to attend the Selsey Academy fire**. The review ~~to examine response times for~~ **should look at** each risk category in each fire station area **where there has been an increase in** ~~to identify the reasons behind any increased response times, and to make recommendations to reduce those response times.~~

The Council asks the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services to commission a review as soon as possible.'

**240** The amendment amendment was accepted by the proposer of the motion and was not put to the vote.

**241** The motion as amended was lost.

### Notice of Motion by Dr Walsh

**242** At the County Council meeting on 17 February 2017 the following motion had been moved by Dr Walsh and seconded by Mrs Millson, and referred to the Leader for consideration. A report by the Leader was included with the agenda (pages 538 and 539).

'This Council notes the failure of the proposed devolution bid in neighbouring Hampshire. It recognises that better delivery and management of some regional infrastructure such as highways and rail could be achieved through regional co-operation, but does not consider that an elected Mayor covering East and West Sussex and Surrey is appropriate nor will it lead to greater accountability, and could generate further expensive bureaucracy.

It therefore resolves to ask the Leader to inform the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government of its view.'

**243** The motion was lost.

### Notice of Motion by Mr Oppler

**244** The following motion was moved by Mr Oppler and seconded by Mr Smytherman:

'Every week in the UK thousands of animals are killed as a result of snares. Foxes and rabbits are often the main target; however other wildlife that is supposedly protected by law such as badgers are often victims of snares. There have been many reported incidents of domestic pets such as cats and dogs being caught in snares as well.

West Sussex County Council is one of the largest land owners in the county with over 1,400 acres of land leased to a variety of tenants. The

size of the leased land ranges from less than two acres to well over 100. The authority's land is the home to an abundance of animals, all of which makes up the great diversity of wildlife in this county. As an owner of this wonderful resource comes great responsibility. It is, however, a responsibility that West Sussex County Council has not recognised. Officers have confirmed that this authority has no policy in place to prevent the use of snares and probably never has had.

Snares are still being used as a means of predator control across the county. These traps are known for their barbaric and indiscriminate nature. It is common for animals to suffer days of extreme pain before dying. As a major landowner this council has a moral responsibility to address this issue.

Therefore, this Council resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Finance to:

- (1) Put a policy in place that imposes a ban on the use of snares on all Council-owned land; and
- (2) Oppose the use of any inhumane method of wildlife control that causes undue suffering.'

**245** The motion was referred to the Cabinet Member for Finance for consideration.

### **Chairman**

The Council rose at 4.40 p.m.

## Minutes: Item 5 - Appendix 1

### Agenda Item No. 1 – Interests

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

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 5 – Petition: Woodlands Meed Special School	Mr High	Family member has an Education, Health and Care Plan
	Mrs Jones	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and Burgess Hill Town Council
Item 6 – Motion on School Funding	Mr Bradbury	Trustee of Sussex Learning Trust
	Mr Oppler	Foster carer
	Mr Smytherman	Vice-Chairman of Governors – St Mary’s Primary School Worthing Governor – Alternative Provision College
Item 7 – CMQT paragraph 3 (apprenticeships)	Mr Griffiths	Governor of Northbrook College
Item 7 – CMQT paragraph 5 (A27 Community Action)	Mrs Evans	Member of Chichester City Council
	Mr Evans	Member of Chichester City Council and Ferring Parish Council
	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council
Item 7 – CMQT paragraph 7 (work of the care and business support team)	Mrs Millson	Carer
Item 7 – CMQT paragraph 8 (support for Older People from Age UK)	Mrs Millson	Carer
Item 7 – CMQT paragraph 10 (Operation Watershed)	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Tangmere Parish Council

## Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 1

<b>Item</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Item 7 – CMQT paragraph 21 (Fairtrade fortnight)	Mrs Millson	Member of the Fairtrade West Sussex Steering Group
Item 7 – CMQT paragraph 22 (West Sussex Pension Fund)	Mr Burrett	Deferred member of the West Sussex Local Government Pension Scheme
	Mr Lanzer	Deferred member of the West Sussex Local Government Pension Scheme
Item 7 – CMQT (parking problems and road space audit)	Mr Lanzer	Member of Crawley Borough Council
Item 7 – CMQT Education items	Mr Bradbury	Trustee of Sussex Learning Trust
	Mr Oppler	Foster carer
Item 7 all items	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council Trustee of Coastal West Sussex MIND
Item 8 – Pension Fund Pooling – Governance arrangements	Mr Burrett	Personal Interest as a deferred member of the West Sussex Local Government Pension Scheme
	Mr Lanzer	Personal Interest as a deferred member of the West Sussex Local Government Pension Scheme
Items 12(a) and 12(b) – Motions on A27 Chichester	Mrs Evans	Member of Chichester City Council
	Mr Evans	Member of Chichester City Council and Ferring Parish Council
	Mr Oppler	Member of Arun District Council

## Minutes: Item 5 - Appendix 1

---

<b>Item</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Items 12(a) and 12(b) – Motions on A27 Chichester (cont)	Mrs Rapnik	Member of Arun District Council
Item 12(c) – Notice of Motion on Fire and Rescue Service	Mr Parsons	Son-in-law works for West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service
Item 12(e) Notice of Motion on snaring	Mr Glennon	Member of the League Against Cruel Sports and the Sussex Wildlife Trust
	Mr Oppler	Member of the League Against Cruel Sports
	Mr Petch	Member of the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) Foundation
	Mr Tyler	Member of Rustington Parish Council

**24 March 2017**

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

### **Question**

UKIP members have previously raised the matter of aged duplicate payments made by this Council at Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee (RAAC) and also at County Council in December 2016. Whilst it is accepted that the details of these aged duplicate payments are protected under Part II matters and that the issue will continue to be scrutinised by RAAC, it is still important for the public to be reassured that everything possible is being done to address the problem, and that there is open accountability for the actions of the County Council in relation to the length of time taken to address this.

Therefore, can the Leader please comment on the following:

- (a) When did she first become aware about the issue of duplicate payments; and
- (b) What action did she take and when was that action taken; and also
- (c) When did the Chairman of RAAC first become aware about the issue of duplicate payments; and
- (d) What action did the Chairman of RAAC take and when was that action taken.

### **Answer**

- (a) In August 2015 the Leader received a letter from a company that had undertaken some work to identify and assist the County Council to deal with potential duplicate payments. The contract had ended at the end of 2013.
- (b) The letter referred to a dispute which the company had raised with the County Council in relation to the contract it had and how that dispute had been responded to more than a year earlier. As the dispute had involved legal advisers the letter was referred to the Council's legal services so that an account of the matter could be provided and the letter responded to. The letter also provided some information about the output from the contract. This was referred to the finance and procurement teams by the Leader.

The Leader was advised of the work that had been undertaken in relation to the Council's payments and accounting systems. The Compliance Team within Corporate Finance have, since February 2015, conducted a monthly review of financial transactions including a check for duplicate invoice payments on a monthly basis. A report is run by the One Way to Buy (OWTB) team and then passed to the Compliance team who collate an Actual Duplicate Payment report. The report runs a comparison of data from the current month and looks back a year and a month for duplicates

## Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 2

---

(and so, in January 2015 the report started with a six-month look back to July 2014). Internal Audit have commented that the control environment provides robust controls, with the Compliance Team monitoring the action taken by the teams to correct the duplicate payments when identified and the time it takes to recover the duplicate payment.

Similar checks are built into the County Council's OWTB system operated by Capita whose system process also autoflags any potential duplicates. Any flagged are then manually checked by the Capita One Way To Buy team in Chichester. In addition, OWTB also reject all consolidated invoices, again to minimise the potential for duplicate payments.

(c) and (d)

The Leader is not in a position to provide information about the correspondence or actions of the Chairman of the Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee. The Leader is however aware of the effective scrutiny of this issue by that Committee which has considered and debated it at its last two meetings and will do so at its next meeting.

At its March meeting the Committee was advised that £18,000 worth of historic duplicate payments had so far been identified by the company commissioned to carry out checks against the hundreds of payments the County Council made during the period examined – dating back to April 2011.

**2.** Written question from **Mr Glennon** for reply by the **Leader**

### Question

3SC claims that its bid for devolution "will provide a financial return for the UK, as well as huge benefits for local residents and businesses – helping drive the economy forward, while also making the area a better place to live, work and visit". Work on the 3SC project has now been ongoing for well over 18 months, and yet it is understood that the process is now in abeyance until after the elections.

Please can the Leader advise:

- (a) So far, what has been the cost to the County Council of the preparation for devolution and the 3SC bid;
- (b) So far, what has been the 'overall' cost of the preparation for devolution and the 3SC bid;
- (c) What is the predicted future cost to the County Council to implement devolution in full;
- (d) What is the predicted 'overall' future cost to implement devolution in full; and
- (e) Taking aside the fact that the process is currently in abeyance, what were

the predicted timescales for implementation of devolution.

### Answer

- (a) The County Council, as administrator of the Business Rate Pool involving the County Council, Adur/Worthing, Chichester and Arun, provided a £50,000 contribution to Surrey County Council to assist with costs and expenses. This funding was facilitated by the Pooling agreement in place between the respective authorities, which generates an additional return from business rates by lowering the Levy paid by West Sussex authorities to the Government from their growth in business rates. It was, therefore, not part of the County Council's base budget.

There are direct costs the County Council has also incurred, amounting to around £41,000 in 2016/17. Officer time has also been spent on this work, but this is not an extra cost, given staff budgets already exists.

- (b) Surrey County Council has led on accounting for the resource and, as such, they inform us that partners contributed £130,000 to help with expertise needed. This includes the £50,000 mentioned as coming from the West Sussex business rate pool. Other participant authorities have contributed resource in-kind through officer time (as mentioned above).

- (c) and (d)

This would be entirely dependent on the outcomes of any future negotiations with the Government and, therefore, it is not possible to provide an answer.

- (e) This would be dependent on when the Government can enter negotiations.

### 3. Written question from **Ms James** for reply by the **Leader**

#### Question

On Thursday 23 June 2016 the people of the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union.

The latest Future West Sussex Plan aims to champion the West Sussex economy. For West Sussex, with its location in the south of England, important maritime services, international and local businesses, it is important to ensure that the needs of our residents and businesses are at the forefront as the Country moves forward with Brexit. In the climate of continued budget pressures, this County Council needs to be proactive in preparing for and responding to Brexit.

Therefore, could the Leader:

- (a) Advise what steps can be taken to improve the advice offered to local business in relation to the future opportunities from Brexit, working in conjunction with government bodies; and

## Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 2

---

- (b) Comment on whether there are any plans for a 'Brexit office' dedicated to that intent at West Sussex County Council.

### Answer

- (a) The County Council is committed to 'championing the economy', and to working to create the conditions for businesses to start, grow and develop.
- Advice to businesses on BREXIT is primarily led by representative organisations such as the Federation of Small Businesses, the British Chambers of Commerce, and the Confederation of British Industry, who are also advising government. The County Council is aware of the advice, and will share where appropriate.
  - We will work with our partners including the representative bodies and the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to ensure businesses can access the information and advice they will require. It is anticipated that the Government will put in place support services for businesses, including through the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, and the Department for International Trade.
  - On behalf of our businesses, we will be seeking to engage in and benefit from opportunities that emerge. We will be responding to the Government's Industrial Strategy Green Paper with our District and Borough partners as part of a West Sussex response, as well as with our 3 Southern Counties (3SC) partners in Surrey and East Sussex, to ensure West Sussex's views and priorities are clearly expressed. We will also seek to take advantage of any new funding opportunities to support businesses.
  - Through our strategic positioning for international trade, with ports and international airports (including London Gatwick) nearby, we will be working with the Coast to Capital LEP and the Department for International Trade to promote and support our businesses to explore markets beyond the EU. New work is progressing, for example, around opportunities in South East Asian markets.
  - We will engage with the work the Local Government Association is doing with the Government on our exit plan. This will provide us with a route to alert the Government to any opportunities or concerns about the impact of Brexit on growth.
  - We recognise there will be a period of uncertainty for our businesses, and that some are likely to have particular concerns – for example, the horticulture sector has expressed concerns on workforce matters. We will want to listen to, and understand these challenges, and support where we can.
- (b) There are currently no plans for a 'Brexit office' dedicated to offering advice to businesses. We will be able to take a clearer view on the role we may play in due course, as the terms of the Brexit deal and any associated issues for our businesses become clearer.

### 4. Written question from **Ms James** for reply by the **Leader**

#### Question

At County Council on 17 February 2017 I proposed an amendment to the Revenue Budget 2017/18, to re-allocate £250,000 to commission an independent feasibility study into unitary authority status. The Leader responded by stating that it would cost £519m to implement a system of two unitary authorities in West Sussex, with a saving of £19m, and that it would take 5 to 7 years to implement. The Leader quoted research available on the County Councils Network website.

The statistics the Leader used were taken from a scenario which applies to all 27 County Councils in England adopting unitary authority status. The County Councils Network 'Response to Independent Studies on Structural Reform' does not quote implementation costs for individual Counties; however, it does quote potential savings after the implementation period plus expected payback times for an average sized County of 0.8m people. It also clearly shows that 'payback' periods are much shorter than the 'implementation' period quoted by the Leader. The Ernst and Young research 'Independent Analysis of Governance Scenarios and Public Reform in County Areas', which is one of the two research articles quoted in the County Councils Network document, does show 'mid-point' annual savings and implementation costs per average sized County.

To set up a single unitary authority, the quoted annual savings are between £23 and £29m post implementation (with a figure of £88m to £106m total savings over the first 5 year period). The payback period is an average of 2 years, 2 months. The 'mid-point' implementation costs are actually **only £12m**.

To set up two unitary authorities within the County, the quoted annual savings are between £13 and £19m post implementation (with a figure of £43m to £63m total savings over the first 5 year period). The payback period is an average of 3 years, 2 months. The 'mid-point' implementation costs are actually **only £16m**.

Can the Leader comment on the following:

- (a) Does she accept that the figures she quoted for the implementation cost and implementation period were incorrect;
- (b) Can she state what benefits the people of West Sussex would get from the possibility of receiving significant savings of anywhere between £13m and £29m per year (depending on the options of one unitary authority or two unitary authorities, and after implementation); and
- (c) Now that she properly understands the research, will she agree to invest £250,000 in a feasibility study for unitary authority status in West Sussex.

#### Answer

- (a) The figures quoted during the debate were taken from the County Councils Network (CCN) website and are not my figures. I quoted accurately the figure for the cost of implementing unitary councils across all 27 shire

## Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 2

---

counties although I should have made explicit what that number referred to. In terms of the implementation period the CCN's report quotes a range of periods and during the debate I referred to my own experience of implementing major organisational change.

- (b) There are far too many 'ifs' in the question and what is also missing is a realistic cost of implementation. It is suggested that a 'mid-point' cost is 'only £12m' or 'only £16m'. West Sussex is one of the larger shire counties and so is likely to incur greater costs in addition to the long period of disruption to secure speculative longer term savings. I cannot indulge such speculation. The significant losses to the residents of West Sussex, however, would be the distraction caused to our elected councillors in dealing with local government reorganisation when we need to focus on services and the priorities our residents have identified. When local people are asked what their priorities are for the use of the Council taxes they pay, local government reorganisation over several years is not on the list.
- (c) The research does not persuade me that such an exercise would be a sensible use of precious council tax and officer resources at a time when we should be focusing on what matters to our residents. I do not think it right to spend a quarter of a million pounds to devise a proposal to spend another £16m on something our residents do not want or need.

### 5. Written question from **Mrs Rapnik** for reply by the **Leader**

#### Question

In April 2016, the County Council heard a petition on the issues relating to the A27 Chichester road improvement, brought by Chichester Deserves Better. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport declined a proposition by UKIP to set up a Public Forum to assist the community in the A27 improvement process. At the time, the Leader made no representation to support the setting up of such a Forum nor, indeed, did she guide her party to support the proposition, which was voted upon formally within the chamber, leading to the proposition, and the opportunity, being lost.

Can the Leader reflect on her on her lack of support of the proposition and can she please comment on the following:

- (a) Does she regret her decision not to support a Public Forum in early 2016 and would she agree that through that one poor decision an opportunity was lost to help the community to become more unified during the consultation process; and
- (b) Would she also agree that the lack of a Forum has contributed to a lack of transparency during the Chichester consultation process and has facilitated disunity amongst the community. This disunity has been seized upon by, Chris Grayling, Secretary of State for Transport, as a reason for him to cancel any A27 Chichester improvements; and
- (c) For the record, can she outline the dates, from the beginning of 2016 and

throughout the consultation process, when she and/or the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport met with:

- (i) Highways England; and
  - (ii) Chichester District Council, including opposition group members from West Sussex County Council.
- (d) For the record, can she outline what engagement she had, to promote collaboration, with the following:
- (i) Parish and Town Councils across the Chichester area; and
  - (ii) Various lobby groups; and
  - (iii) Landowners

### Answer

- (a) The question is nothing more than a political confection based on the questioner's distorted account of events. The questioner identifies a decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport and then asks me whether I regret that decision by reference to more recent events unknowable at the time. I cannot be asked whether I regret something I did not do based on something I could not have known. The question is preposterous.
- (b) The second element of the question is inviting me to indulge in entirely fanciful speculation. How is it possible for me or any other person to speculate about what difference could have been made to the thoughts and minds of the residents of Chichester by something that did not happen during a process that has now passed using the false premise of the Secretary of State's decision. The question is misguided.
- (c) I am not able to speak for the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport but, as far as my own meetings with the named organisations are concerned they were as follows:
- (i) With Highways England's officers – mostly with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport in attendance on 19 January, 29 February, 19 April, 9 and 14 June and 24 November 2016.
  - (ii) I was invited to and attended a meeting organised by Chichester District Council on 25/1/16 which included senior members at the District Council and a number of officers from both councils.
- (d) (i) I have regular contact with parish and town councils across my division and across Chichester.
- (ii) It is not clear what lobby groups are being referred to.
- (iii) There are many landowners across Chichester. I had no reason to

## Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 2

---

have direct contact with any of them as part of my work in connection with the A27 consultation process undertaken by Highways England.

Written questions are intended to provide members with information useful to enable them to discharge their role as members. Officer resources are used to obtain the information. I find it regrettable that this question is so obviously politically motivated and, thereby, would have been a misuse of officer time.

### 6. Written question from **Mrs Phillips** for reply by **Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing**

#### Question

West Sussex, as part of Sussex Policing area, has seen its local police force moved to a mode of operation where the "Sussex Local Policing Model gives a named person, rather than someone with a physical presence in every locality in Sussex". Whilst the Police and Crime Commissioner announced plans for a further increase in policing there appears to be no intention to return to local policing in any meaningful way. And, as you may know, the additional police personnel only serve to address the cuts that have already been made over the last 4 to 6 years by the Commissioner.

There is evidence that local policing allows local crimes to be 'nipped in the bud' before they escalate to more serious criminality. Parish Councils are reporting concerns about the escalation of low level crimes, including theft; damage to property, and particularly flytipping on private land or on the highways. It then often falls upon local residents or the local councils, including the County Council, to manage the implications and the associated costs.

Please can the Cabinet Member comment on the following:

- (a) What has been the estimated cost to the County Council in terms of criminal damage to County Council property and the full costs for managing flytipping within our county; since the beginning of 2016 to the present; and
- (b) What representation has been made to the Police and Crime Commissioner regarding these changes to local policing, and what representations, if any, have been made regarding a return to locally available policing, so that proper local relationships can be built with officers who know their local area and can stop crime escalating.

#### Answer

- (a) There is a very low and intermittent level of criminal damage to the County Council's buildings with no reportable costs. Unfortunately, the greatest impact of this low level damage comes from some of our vulnerable clients as opposed to any criminal activity by members of the public. The other area of cost incurred by the County Council is the intrusion and damage to our vacant property sites. Costs include security patrols/cameras and

Heras fencing on our vacant sites and remedial repairs following damage or trespass. The County Council has spent £69,705 on security for vacant sites during the 2016/17 financial year.

District and borough councils are responsible to collect fly-tips that occur on public land including highways.

There is an agreed formula for all local authorities that estimates the clearance costs. These are reported on regular basis to the Department for the Environment, Farming and Rural Affairs. The costs reported by West Sussex borough and districts councils for the last three years are as follows.

	Financial Year 2014/15	Financial Year 2015/16	Financial Year 2016/17
Total Flytips reported	4,174	4,311	4,900
Clearance costs	£199,142	£205,162	£217,600

The County Council incurs the cost to dispose of the flytip waste and for a similar period these costs are shown below:

	Financial Year 2014/15	Financial Year 2015/16	Financial Year 2016/17
Disposal costs	£374,100	£264,900	£258,000

NB: Since the reporting period is 1 April to 31 March, the final Financial Year 2016/17 costs have been estimated because data is only available up to the end of February 2017. The actual reduction in disposal costs seen over the last three years can be attributable to the fact that the actual size (by weight) of each flytip on average has been reducing.

- (b) The operating model for policing in West Sussex is a matter for the Chief Constable and is overseen by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Sussex.

The PCC is formally scrutinised by the Sussex Police and Crime Panel whose role is to examine the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner on behalf of the citizens of the area.

The County Council has two seats on the Police and Crime Panel. Mr Watson and Ms James are the current representatives West Sussex County Council members on the Panel. The Panel meets quarterly in public and all of the agendas and minutes are available via the County Council's website. The Panel has received reports on 'Local Policing' from the PCC and discussion on this topic is a regular feature of the agenda.

The County Council is also an active partner in the Safer Communities Partnership with Sussex Police and other partners, and works to collectively manage the reality of resources available to focus on the key community safety priorities. The partnership allows a space to raise concerns and to work together on ways to share local intelligence and where appropriate join up officer resource to target hot spots.

## Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 2

---

In addition, each district and borough authority has a Community Safety Partnership which brings together tactical resources locally including the police and others to share intelligence and support joint working to address key community safety issues.

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

#### Question

Nationally, the United Kingdom has fallen from position 7 to number 27 in the world league tables for maths (the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) published results of the Programme for International Student Assessment). Countries in the Far East hugely outstrip our performance and many European nations also do much better. 22 per cent of 15 year olds in the United Kingdom do not reach Level 2, which is the baseline level of achievement and this means they cannot solve problems routinely faced by adults in their daily lives.

Please can the Cabinet Member for Education respond regarding the following:

- (a) What is the full breakdown of children's performance at GCSE and A level within West Sussex schools/colleges for 2016 by subject; and
- (b) How do we compare with other United Kingdom regions for 2016 by subject area; and
- (c) Why does the County Council's Performance Dashboard not refer to the specific performance in West Sussex schools/colleges as a compendium of performance data by subject area accessible to parents/guardians; and
- (d) What comments does the Cabinet Member have regarding the appalling primary school performance at Key Stage 2, which then feeds into later performance at Key Stage 4; and
- (e) What is being done to improve performance at all Key Stages, and specifically in mathematics; and
- (f) What are the identified pressures on performance in 2017, given the predicted increase in school numbers, as projected in the Planning School Places 2017 publication.

#### Answer

##### (a) **Performance at GCSE and A Level**

The following are explanations of the KS4 measures in the tables below:

**Attainment 8:** the straightforward measure of student achievement across 8 subjects in a broad curriculum – the % of pupils in a school who achieve a result across eight subjects.

**Progress 8:** the measure of the value added to pupils' learning by a school, based on prior attainment at KS2, with average progress as 0 (zero) and schools being up or down from that measured as tenths of a grade (e.g. - 0.4). Over 0.5 in either direction (+ or -) is seen as significant.

**EBAAC:** English Baccalaureate – measure of 5 key subjects, including the core subjects of Maths and English.

**Basics:** the % of pupils achieving A\*-C in English & Maths – the old measure, soon to be dropped, or replaced by the new number grade system in operation from 2017.

### GCSE

#### West Sussex

All Pupils	Progress 8	Attainment 8	BASICS	EBACC
2016	0.10	50.8	64.9%	26.1%
2015		50.0	62.3%	26.7%
2014			59.9%	24.6%

#### South East

All Pupils	Progress 8	Attainment 8	BASICS	EBACC
2016	0.02	51	65.8%	27.3%
2015		49.6	62.1%	26.5%
2014			61.3%	26.2%

#### National

All Pupils	Progress 8	Attainment 8	BASICS	EBACC
2016	-0.03	50.1	63.3%	24.8%
2015		48.6	59.2%	24.3%
2014			58.9%	24.2%

(Where data is missing, it is because the particular measure did not exist in that year)

English Baccalaureate Subjects	Percentage Achieved					West Sussex Ranked				
	English	Maths	Science	History or Geography	languages	English	Maths	Science	History or Geography	languages
West Sussex	77.8	69.7	63.9	69.0	71.3					
South East	77.1	70.9	66.7	66.6	70.9	7	10	12	6	7
National	75.1	68.8	63.9	63.9	69.9	42	63	73	35	55

### A level

(2016 data only. The measurement of APS changed in 2016 so comparison with previous years is not possible).

## Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 2

Area	A-Level APS per entry
West Sussex	30.50
South East	31.31
National	30.44

Data source: DfE SFR05/2017

		Biological Sciences	Chemistry	Physics	Other Science	Maths	English	French	German	Spanish	Other modern languages
<b>A* to A grades</b>											
England (inc FE colleges)		28.23%	32.81%	30.70%	26.08%	42.84%	19.56%	38.89%	39.79%	35.48%	51.49%
State-funded sector		24.82%	28.70%	26.66%	23.79%	38.57%	17.10%	32.16%	33.27%	29.59%	44.00%
South East		28.46%	32.17%	29.14%	21.30%	40.43%	19.88%	35.60%	36.84%	29.25%	50.34%
West Sussex		25.65%	27.98%	26.23%	27.68%	39.58%	14.80%	25.81%	21.21%	34.12%	50.91%
West Sussex rank (South East)	out of 19	9	12	11	2	9	16	12	11	7	7
West Sussex rank (National)	out of 152	47	64	61	24	49	91	82	69	40	36

		Biological Sciences	Chemistry	Physics	Other Science	Mathematics	English	French	German	Spanish	Other modern languages
<b>A* to E grades</b>											
England (inc FE colleges)		98.50%	98.46%	97.85%	98.40%	98.79%	99.68%	99.47%	99.65%	99.48%	98.98%
State-funded sector		98.46%	98.32%	97.64%	98.32%	98.70%	99.67%	99.38%	99.57%	99.45%	98.47%
South East		98.43%	98.32%	97.66%	98.19%	98.83%	99.65%	99.48%	99.58%	99.64%	98.80%
West Sussex		97.76%	99.13%	97.92%	98.21%	98.67%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.82%	100.00%
West Sussex rank (South East)	out of 19	14	5	10	10	12	1	1	1	17	1
West Sussex rank (National)	out of 152	116	45	79	55	92	1	1	1	117	1
For A* to E, West Sussex shares a rank of 1 with several other LAs achieving 100%											

- (b) **Data at GCSE ranked against National, South East and Shire plus and for KS5 against National and South East**

### GCSE

Ranking out of 151 nationally

All Pupils	Progress 8	Attainment 8	BASICS	EBACC
2016	30	51	54	56
2015		40	39	53
2014			68	65

### Ranking out of 19 South East counties

All Pupils	Progress 8	Attainment 8	BASICS	EBACC
2016	5	10	10	10
2015		8	8	8
2014			12	11

### Shire+ Ranking out of 34

All Pupils	Progress 8	Attainment 8	BASICS	EBACC
2016	3	11	15	10
2015		7	7	10
2014			6	15

### A level

Area	West Sussex ranking
South East	8
National	54

#### (c) **The Performance Dashboard**

The Performance Dashboard refers to Progress 8, as agreed with the Cabinet. All West Sussex school data are available on the Department for Education (DfE) Performance Tables, and, as public information, are accessible to parents.

#### (d) **Primary school performance at Key Stage 2**

Several issues may have contributed to the results experienced by schools in the 2016 KS2 outcomes:

- It has been recognised nationally that the Writing interim frameworks were published late and then revised and republished to schools in the spring of 2016, just ahead of the assessment process. This was due to some confusion between guidance issued by the DfE and the Standards and Testing Agency (STA).
- West Sussex moderation assessors adhered closely to the rules in the framework, which was acknowledged by the STA. The STA has recognised that the outcomes across all local authorities were varied and the results from this first year of the frameworks are seen as 'anomalous'. This has been agreed by the teaching unions.
- A lot of schools, but not all, accessed a range of national training for teaching the National Curriculum and its assessment, but there appears to be a weakness in the provision of specialist subject guidance. This is being addressed through the West Sussex School Improvement Strategy 2016.

## Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 2

---

(e) **Action to improve performance at all Key Stages**

To address the issues of Key Stage 1 & 2 underperformance and build sustainable improvements, West Sussex LA has been implementing an improvement plan since October 2016. This plan sits within the existing West Sussex School Improvement Strategy, 'Every Learner in a Good or Outstanding School' and has been presented to Cabinet Members. The Action Plan has addressed the shortfall in maths performance with targeted support and training and there has been a large conference for maths teachers in Years 3/4. Additionally, throughout 2016 and into 2017, the School Improvement Service has engaged the services of Education London (a specialist subject expertise company) to provide specific maths support, audits of primary maths curricula and leadership support. West Sussex also commissioned Education London to provide a conference on Maths for Year 5/6 teachers to improve subject knowledge.

(f) **Pressures on performance in 2017**

Whilst the pressure on schools and school improvement for 2017 is focused on areas of learning that need to improve, other pressures on performance, such as that mentioned in the question, are long-term and part of our planning for the provision of high quality education to the children of West Sussex. Other pressures include school funding, teacher recruitment and subject expertise. However, these do not have a recognised impact on the work being done in 2017.

**8. Written question from Mr Smytherman for reply by the Cabinet Member for Finance**

**Question**

Further to the helpful and lengthy response from officers to my written question on the subject of investment in fossil fuel companies, which was published in Members' Information Service on 1 March 2017, please could you advise why climate change is not included as a material risk in the Investment Strategy Statement?

Legislation is drastically reducing the amount of fossil fuels used and given that 80% need to stay in the ground there is a strong risk of fossil fuel firms having reserves that cannot be used, which will result in stranded assets.

**Answer**

The Pension Fund employs investment managers to make decisions about the equities it invests in. The Investment Strategy adopted by the fund highlights good practice. Within the strategy the Pensions Panel has directed fund managers to act in the best financial interests of the fund. They are expected to consider, amongst other factors, the effects of social, environmental and governance issues on the performance of a company when considering the acquisition, retention or realisation of investments for the fund.

As highlighted in the reply to your previous written question in February, the Fund's investment managers have signed up to the United Nations Principles of Responsible Investment. This has been set up by the United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative, to encourage asset owners and asset managers to incorporate environmental, social and governance issues into investment analysis and decision making.

Issues and risks associated with climate change would be identified by Fund Investment Managers via the fund's adoption of the above policy.

**9. Written question from Mr Sutcliffe for reply by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

**Question**

I think everyone would agree that cycling is a form of exercise that is to be promoted; serving both the individual well and helping to reduce the reliance on modes of transport that produce harmful CO<sub>2</sub> and other emissions.

This county should be proactive in its support for cycling on our road systems where cyclists have designated lanes for travelling. These lanes should be properly maintained, with clear linage being essential to delineate cyclists from other road users.

The safety issue for cyclists is particularly important due to removal of the 3in1 card that previously provided young people with help with travel costs. Through the County Council's Safer Routes to School scheme more school children are being encouraged to find alternative means of transport including safe cycling passages to Chichester based schools.

Can the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport comment on the following:

- (a) Advise what investment is being made to the cycling lanes across the county, and specifically the 'Chemroute' which is the main thoroughfare from Chichester to Emsworth and which suffers from incomplete cycling lanes along its route; and
- (b) Further outline the investment being made to:
  - (i) All main arterial roads including those serving Chichester (including the 'Chemroute'), with regard to improvements to the cycling lanes;
  - (ii) When this investment will actually occur; and
  - (iii) What specific scope it will take.

**Answer**

- (a) The County Council's Cycling and Walking Strategy sets the framework in which such schemes will be developed and delivered over the coming years. The strategy sets out 10 years of continuous development that will deliver

## Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 2

---

improved infrastructure and increasing numbers of people walking and cycling in West Sussex.

There are currently 43 separate cycling and walking schemes under development in West Sussex, promoted by both the County Council and its partners including the district and borough councils, the South Downs National Park Authority, community groups or via negotiations with developers. Of these the County Council has prioritised the following schemes which are programmed for feasibility design work (£38,000) to be produced during 2017/18 and 2018/19 as part of the Strategic Transport Investment Programme. These are:

- A259 Shoreham - Lancing
- A259 Worthing – Littlehampton
- A259 Chichester – Emsworth (Chemroute)

The County Council's budget for capital spend on cycling activity is £1.29m for the current financial year. In addition the 2017/18 Highways and Transport Integrated Forward Works and Annual Delivery Programmes (subject to approval) contains the following schemes:

- Ifield Avenue Crawley – feasibility design £30,000
- Horsham Town Contraflows plus cycle route Lynd Cross & Carfax – feasibility design £30,000
- A24 Findon Valley to Findon – feasibility design £30,000
- Cycle Infrastructure delivery Medmerry/Pagham Harbour delivery subject to agreements - £300,000 including s106
- Fontwell Cycling Scheme; Arundel Road (Walberton) final section delivery £200,000
- Westhampnett to Chichester – design £70,000
- Downslink – Christs Hospital – feasibility design £60,000.
- A259 Bognor – ~~Chichester~~ **Littlehampton** tender for construction (funded via Local Enterprise Partnership and capital programme tbc)

A full list of schemes programmed for feasibility development or delivery can be found in the Integrated Forward Works Programme and Annual Delivery Programme 2017/18. This list also includes specific Safer Routes to School and road safety engineering funding, a proportion of which will be aimed at improving cycling and walking safety.

(b) (i), (ii) and (iii)

Investment currently identified is described above. In addition, the Cycling and Walking Strategy identifies a list of approximately 300 potential schemes which includes those following more major routes. During the coming months future priorities for development will be identified for potential future funding and feasibility design work. This work, including the method of prioritisation, will be considered by the Cycling and Walking Champion, the Environmental and Community Services Select Committee and the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport when it is available during the summer and autumn 2017.

The majority of these schemes, particularly those following main roads will take time and require large investment from sources other than the County Council to achieve. Therefore, the approach is to carry out feasibility studies followed by bids for funding. For all schemes, including those identified above as under design, it is not possible to say exactly what form the works will take, where funding might come from or when these schemes will be implemented. That said, the basic principle for those routes that connect communities is to achieve, where possible, high quality separated cycle routes. Bids for funding will be made to The County Council's Integrated Transport Block capital funds, the Local Economic Partnership, Department for Transport challenge funds, other bodies funding and bids and developers.

**10. Written question from Mr Jones for reply by the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services**

**Question**

- (a) Would the Cabinet Member provide details of the number and type of Fire and Rescue Service incidents (not including medical only calls) at Gatwick Airport in 2014/15 and 2015/16. The details to indicate if only the private Gatwick Airport Fire & Rescue Service attended, if only West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service attended, or if both services attended.
- (b) Details of any incidents attended by Gatwick Airport Fire & Rescue Service outside the airport boundary are also requested.

**Answer**

- (a) In 2014/15 West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service (WSFRS) attended incidents to Gatwick Airport as follows:

<b>Type of Incidents</b>	<b>Aircraft</b>	<b>Airport Buildings</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
False Alarms	4	9	13
Special Services*	43	0	43
Fires	0	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>61</b>

**\*Types of Special Services included** – Aircraft Full Emergency, Aircraft Standby Emergencies and Not Required on arrival.

The five fires in airport buildings were as follows:

- Small fire in the roller door motor in one of the Hangar Buildings
- Fire in light fitting of coffee shop
- Fire in overhead cable in a service area
- Small fire in an extractor in one of the restaurants
- Dishwasher fire in offices

In 2015/16 WSFRS attended incidents to Gatwick Airport as follows:

## Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 2

---

<b>Type of Incidents</b>	<b>Aircraft</b>	<b>Airport Buildings</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
False Alarms	2	10	12
Special Services*	34	2	36
Fires	1	2	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>51</b>

**\*Types of Special Services included** – Aircraft Full Emergency, Aircraft Standby Emergencies and Not Required on arrival

The two fires in airport buildings were:

- Deliberate fire in a bin in the terminal building.
  - Fire in the kitchen of one of the restaurants, resulting in minor damage.
- (b) WSFRS do not record the private Gatwick Airport Fire & Rescue Service attendances and, therefore, there is no data regarding the operational attendances of the Gatwick Airport Fire & Rescue Service on or off Gatwick Airport.

### **Agenda Item No. 7 - Question Time**

Members asked questions of members of members of the Cabinet as set out below. In instances where a Cabinet Member or Leader undertook to take follow-up action, this is also noted below.

#### **Start of Life**

##### **Children – Start of Life**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 2, IPEH Implementation Update, from Mrs Millson and Mr Parsons.

In response to a request for North Horsham Parish Council to provide youth services at Roffey Children and Family Centre from Mrs Millson, the Cabinet Member agreed to provide a written response.

Paragraph 3, Apprenticeships, from Mr Griffiths.

#### **The Economy**

##### **Leader**

The Leader answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 4, Solar PV for Schools project, from Mr M G Jones, Mrs Millson and Mrs Mockridge.

In response to a request from Mrs Millson about whether the new business rates for schools would have an impact on panels already installed, the Leader agreed to provide a written response.

Paragraph 25, Local Enterprise Partnership Local Growth fund allocation, from Mr Watson.

Written Question 1, duplicate payments, from Mr Bradbury, Mr Glennon and Ms James.

Written Question 4, independent feasibility study into unitary authority status, from Mr Glennon.

##### **Later Life**

##### **Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 7, Work of the Care and Business Support Team, from Mrs Jupp, Mrs Millson and Mrs Rapnik.

In response to a suggestion from Mrs Jupp, the Cabinet Member agreed that a progress report could be provided to the Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee if the Committee was willing to receive it.

## **Minutes: Item 5 – Appendix 3**

---

### **Stronger Communities**

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

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Closure of bus stops on the A24, from Mr Circus, Mr S J Oakley, Mr R J Oakley and Mr Parsons.

On the subject of suspended bus stops on the A24, in response to a request for further information from Mr Circus, the Cabinet Member said that he would provide the outcome of the study and a timeline for the bus stops' reinstatement to local members.

Parking problems and road space audit, from Mr Lanzer and Mrs Mullins.

#### **Cabinet Member for Residents' Services**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the latest recycling rates, from Mr Evans and Dr Walsh.

### **Effective Council**

#### **Cabinet Member for Finance**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 27, Adult Social Care Grant, from Dr Walsh.

Special Educational Needs (SEN) funding, from Mr Buckland.

On the subject of future SEN funding, the Cabinet Member agreed to resend his previous response to Mr Buckland.