

West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

12 December 2014

At an Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 12 December 2014, at County Hall North, Horsham, the members present being:

Mrs A J Jupp (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Mr R A Lanzer
Mrs P A C Arculus	Mr G V McAra
Mr D H Barling	Mr P G Metcalfe
Mr L H Barnard	Mrs M E Millson
Mr A J Barrett-Miles	Mrs J S Mockridge
Mrs E A Bennett	Mr J A P Montyn
Mr P J J Bradbury	Mrs S R Mullins
Mr M J Brown	Mr R J Oakley
Mrs H A Brunsdon	Mr S J Oakley
Mr R D Burrett	Mr J J O'Brien
Mr P C Catchpole	Mr F R J Oppler
Mr P J Circus	Mr C G Oxlade
Mr M R Clark	Mr L W Parsons
Mr M A Cloake	Mr A Patel
Mr D G Crow	Mr A P Petch
Dr N P S Dennis	Mr N F Peters
Mrs J E Duncton	Mr B J Quinn
Mrs E M Evans	Mr J G Rae
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	Mrs B A Smith
Mr P D High	Mr R J Smytherman
Mr S R Hillier	Mr A C Sutcliffe
Mr J C Hunt	Mr B W Turner
Ms S James	Mr G M Tyler
Mrs A F Jones, MBE	Mrs D L Urquhart
Mr G L Jones	Mr S G Waight
Mr M G Jones	Dr J M M Walsh, KStJ, RD
Ms D M K Kennard	Mr B R A D Watson, OBE
Mrs L Kitchen	Mr D R Whittington
Mr P K Lamb	

Apologies and attendance

- 128** Apologies were received from Mr Buckland, Mrs Phillips and Mr Wickremaratchi. Mr Petch arrived at 11.20 a.m. Mr Smytherman and Mr Turner gave their apologies for the afternoon session. Mr Cloake and Mr High arrived for the afternoon session at 2.15 p.m. Mr Sheldon left at 3.55 p.m. due to a pecuniary interest in item 10(e).

Minutes

Interests

129 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

Minutes

130 Subject to the addition of Mr Watson's OBE to the attendance list, it was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 17 October 2014 (pages 257 to 282) be approved as a correct record.

Written Questions

131 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

132 Members asked questions on the Cabinet Members' reports (pages 283 to 288) and a supplementary report (page 288A), as set out at Appendix 3.

Leader's Question Time

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

Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and Four-Year Financial Strategy 2015/19

134 The Council debated an initial draft of the Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and the Four-Year Financial Strategy (pages 289 and 290 to 306). Members also had before them the draft of the Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19.

135 Resolved –

- (1) That the Cabinet take into consideration comments made by members on the draft content of the Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19; and
- (2) That the report on the Four-Year Financial Strategy be noted.

Governance Committee: Pension Advisory Board, Start of Life Partnership Board and terms of reference of the Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee

136 The Council considered the establishment of a Pension Advisory Board and
342

a Start of Life Partnership Board and a minor change to the terms of reference of the Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee (pages 307 to 320).

137 Resolved -

- (1) That the establishment of a Pension Advisory Board, with effect from 1 April 2015, with terms of reference, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be approved;
- (2) That the consequential changes to the terms of reference of the Governance Committee and the delegations to the Executive Director Corporate Resources and Services and the Director of Law, Assurance and Strategy, as set out at Appendix 2 to the report, be approved;
- (3) That the Think Family Partnership Board and Executive transform into a Start of Life Partnership Board with effect from 1 January 2015;
- (4) That the terms of reference for the Start of Life Partnership Board, as set out at Appendix 3 to the report, be approved; and
- (5) That the change to the terms of reference of the Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee, as set in paragraph 12 of the report, be approved.

Additional Ordinary Meeting of the County Council

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

139 Resolved -

- (1) That an additional ordinary meeting of the County Council be held on Monday, 19 January 2015 for the purpose of considering the County Council's response to the Airports Commission's consultation on proposals for expansion at Gatwick Airport; and
- (2) That, with regard to the additional meeting of the County Council to be held on 19 January 2015, Standing Orders 15(2), 15(11), 15(12) and 16(1) be waived to allow the meeting to deal only with consideration of the Council's response to the Airports Commission and any other business which, in the view of the Chairman, should be dealt with at that meeting.

Minutes

Adult Safeguarding Panel

140 Mrs Arculus, on behalf of the Adult Safeguarding Panel, moved the report of the Panel (page 322) and accompanying newsletter on its recent work. Members noted that the signatories at the bottom of the report should refer to Mr Wickremaratchi not Mr Patel.

141 Resolved -

- (1) That the report and enclosed newsletter be noted; and
- (2) That the Adult Safeguarding Charter, as set out in the newsletter, be endorsed.

Corporate Parenting Panel

142 The Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Panel moved the report of the recent work of the Panel (pages 323 to 338).

143 Resolved -

That the report be noted.

Notices of Motion

Notice of Motion by Mr Acraman

144 The following motion was moved by Mr Acraman and seconded by Mr Griffiths.

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

In the last year the following have become clear:

- GAL has issued a second set of figures on the numerical consequences of a second runway. GAL state that 122,000 new jobs would be created, meaning immigration into the SE of 100,000 + people.
- 100,000 immigrants, 3 times the size of the proposed Mayfield new town, would put intolerable pressure on roads housing schools and hospitals with GAL's contribution to those costs would appear to be between zero and minima, with council tax payers left to fund the sizeable residue. GAL's estimate of 40,000 new homes is clearly a gross underestimate.
- 250,000 extra road journeys per day would result. Again GAL will only fund road IMPROVEMENTS CLOSE TO THE TERMINAL. Improvements to

M23/A23, M25, A264, A272 and A27 would need to be county-funded as the only provider, since there will be no government financial support.

- The brief of Davies Airport Commission leaves a lot to be desired. His emphasis, like that of GAL, has been on the problems within the airport perimeter, taking no cognisance of problems such as hospital provision beyond the perimeter.
- Davis regards it as a given that runway capacity in the SE is a necessity and it is, to him, just a question of where. His short list of 3 does not include Stansted, which is excluded on flimsy grounds and thus the consideration is not being done on a level playing field.
- GAL has nonsensically stated that they can engineer a great increase in the train capacity on the London Brighton line. How can they do that with an immovable line capacity pinch point at East Croydon and limited train lengths on a network run by somebody else?
- At least 6 other MPs in the Surrey/Sussex area, including the Rt Hon Sir Nicholas Soames, Rt Hon Francis Maude and Rt Hon Nick Herbert, are opposed to a second runway.
- Any new runway anywhere cannot be reconciled with the UK's obligations under the Climate Change Act.
- A new runway will increase the county's Gross Economic Value. However there will be more people wanting that benefit and it will be a bigger cake but with more people wanting a slice so each person's slice (Gross Economic Value per person) will be much the same. The same arithmetic applies to the county's tax revenue. It will be greater but there will be much more required expenditure on dealing with an ageing demographic and potential increase in problems like dementia.
- It is no longer realistic to imagine that Gatwick is just a north of the county problem which will have no effect in the coastal area. The pressure on housing roads and infrastructure will be county wide – from Shoreham to the Manhood peninsula as well as from East Grinstead to Horsham.

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

- 145** The motion was referred to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport for consideration.

Notice of Motion by Mr Glennon

- 146** The following motion was moved by Mr Glennon and seconded by Mr Sutcliffe.

'This Council recognises the significant financial burden faced by the

residents of many of the 15,000 properties fronting the more than 3,000 unadopted and private roads in West Sussex.

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

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

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

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

- (1) Establish a cross-party working group to complete an up-to-date analysis of the location, historical context, usage levels and ownership of unadopted roads within the county;
- (2) Lobby the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to amend current legislation to enable rebates for residents living on unadopted roads, to be dependent on the context of the current road status.'

147 The motion was lost.

Notice of Motion by Mr G L Jones

148 The following motion was moved by Mr G L Jones and seconded by Mr Glennon.

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

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

We recognise that veterans can find making the transition to civilian life

extremely challenging, particularly in finding and securing lasting employment and believe that the County Council has a leading role to play in helping ex-servicemen and women to fulfil their potential outside of the Services.

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

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

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

- 149** The motion was referred to the Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations for consideration.

Notice of Motion by Mrs Mullins

- 150** The following motion was moved by Mrs Mullins and seconded by Mrs Smith.

'This Council notes that none of the towns, villages, or housing estates in the county were ever designed to accommodate the presently required parking provision and no one could have predicted how parking problems would blight our communities today.

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

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

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

- 151** The motion was referred to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport for consideration.

Notice of Motion by Mr M G Jones

- 152** The following motion was moved by Mr M G Jones and seconded by Mr Lamb.

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

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

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

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

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

- 153** The motion was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

- (a) for the proposition – 17

Mr Clark, Dr Dennis, Mr Glennon, Mrs Hall, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oxlade, Mr Parsons,

Mr Quinn, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Smith and Dr Walsh.

(b) against the proposition – 36

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mrs Bennett, Mr Brown, Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mrs Circus, Mrs Dunton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr High, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr O'Brien, Mr Patel, Mr Peters, Mr J L Rogers, Mr Sutcliffe, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Mr Watson and Mr Whittington.

(c) abstentions – 1

Mrs Jupp.

154 The motion was lost.

Chairman

The Council rose at 4.45 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 pecuniary or prejudicial unless indicated.

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 4(b) CMQT paragraph 1 (A27 Action campaign)	Ms James	Member of Hambrook and Chidham Parish Council
	Mrs Jones	Member of Mid Sussex DC and Burgess Hill Town Council
Item 4(a) Written Question 4 (Aspire Sussex)	Mr Hunt	Trustee of Aspire Sussex Ltd
Item 4(b) CMQT paragraph 12 (development of the education function)	Mr Griffiths	Governor of Albourne C of E Primary School, Chailey Heritage School and Northbrook College
	Mrs Jones	Governor of Oakmeeds Community College
Item 4(b) CMQT paragraph 15 (Business Rates)	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council
Item 4(b) CMQT paragraph 16 (Network Rail's draft Sussex Area Route Study)	Dr Dennis	Annual season ticket holder between Horsham and London
Item 4(b) CMQT paragraph 17 (Airports Commission)	Ms James	Member of Hambrook and Chidham Parish Council
	Mrs Jones	Member of Mid Sussex DC and Burgess Hill Town Council
Item 6 – Governance Committee: Pension Advisory Board	Mr Burrett	Individual member of the Local Government Pension Scheme and member of the Local Government Pensions Committee, appointed by the LGA Conservative Group
	Mr Lanzer	Member of the Local Government Pension Scheme

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 6 – Governance Committee: Pension Advisory Board (cont)	Mr J L Rogers	Member of the Local Government Pension Fund
Item 10(b) Notice of Motion (unadopted roads)	Mr Sutcliffe	Lives on an unadopted road
Item 10(c) – Notice of Motion (Community Covenant)	Mr Barling	Member of Steyning Royal British Legion
	Mr Metcalfe	Member of Royal British Legion
Item 10(e) Notice of Motion (food banks)	Mr Burrett	Trustee of Crawley Open House, which distributes Local Assistance Network funds on behalf of the County Council
	Mr Lamb	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Sheldon	Pecuniary interest as Chief Executive of Horsham Matters (which runs Horsham District Food Bank)

Minutes - Appendix 2

12 December 2014

Question

1. Written question from **Mrs Mullins** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health**

Question

The Cabinet Member will, I'm sure, share my concern about the lack of residential care provision in Crawley, as a result of recent 'bed losses', following the closure of a number of care homes in the area, including the recent loss of 120 beds at Oakhurst Grange. Given that it is predicted that in Crawley and Horsham the number of people over 75 years, will increase by 11,000 by 2019, can the Cabinet Member please confirm:

- (a) How many residential care beds are currently available in the north of the county;
- (b) Whether he is concerned there will be a shortfall this winter;

And advise what action he is taking to:

- (c) Encourage providers to come to Crawley and elsewhere in the north of the county or to stimulate the market economy;
- (d) Attract and retain appropriately skilled workers to the area;
- (e) Liaise with partners to identify care home sites through neighbourhood plans in the north of the county.

Answer

- (a) There are 352 registered residential care beds in Crawley, of which 150 are residential, 164 are dual-purpose registration and 38 are nursing beds. The equivalent figures for Horsham are 535 residential care beds, of which 128 are residential, 127 are dual-purpose registration and 280 are nursing beds. Occupancy levels are broadly in line with the whole of the county and are between 85% and 95%.

The County Council recognises that an ageing population means there will be increased demand for these beds and will also raise demand for many other formal support services. The Council continues to ensure its focus remains on keeping people healthy and independent and it provides, with Clinical Commissioning Groups and other partners, a range of preventative local services. The County Council also continues to ensure suitable supply and choice within the residential market by, for example, looking at

increasing and introducing flexibility into its big block contract for beds with Shaw Healthcare.

- (b) The County Council is aware of on-going seasonal pressures placed on residential services, particularly in the winter months. It is working with care providers and with health colleagues to ensure there are enough beds by, for example, buying extra beds now to increase capacity in the coming months.
- (c) Work has started to stimulate the care market. The Council is having conversations with both existing care providers and other organisations who have expressed an interest in entering the residential care market in the county. The County Councils intend to undertake more formal market testing in the New Year with the view to securing investment in this sector in West Sussex.
- (d) Recruitment and retention of staff is a national issue and in the South East there are clear shortages of a number of key workers; nursing, residential and home care workers in particular.

The County Council supports providers with a range of services designed to help them with issues of retention and training and development. The Council also offers targeted support to care providers in order to enhance their business skills and staff competencies

Areas of support have included courses and peer mentoring in areas such as manual handling, infection control, dementia awareness, medicine management and so on. Using its provider forums the County Council is developing additional training programmes to be introduced in the New Year.

To attract staff in to the sector, the County Council is working with a number of national skills agencies including Skills for Health, Skills for Care, the National Skills Academy and local Further Education and Higher Education provision to explore how the Council can reduce some of the barriers to entry into this sector and develop bespoke accredited training.

- (e) With the borough and district councils and Clinical Commissioning Groups, the County Council is identifying existing and potential sites that would be suitable for residential and nursing care.

Supplementary Question

A former purpose-built care facility in Crawley has recently been sold despite a lack of care beds in the area - does the Cabinet Member think leaving care home to the private sector is still the best option?

Supplementary Answer

A mixed economy is required as it is not possible to rely on capital in the public sector and it is therefore important to have a market-based approach. The strategy developed by the County Council is to look at all of the options in such a County Council Report

Minutes - Appendix 2

way as to encourage people to invest. I will supply you with a report containing detail of how the care market might be encouraged, particularly in the north of the county.

Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Mr Quinn and Mrs Smith.

In response to a question by Mrs Smith about the need for additional care home facilities in Crawley and whether the Council would invest in care homes via the PropCo Panel, the Cabinet Member agreed that it could be a potential scheme for the Panel to look at and that he would encourage his colleagues to do so. The Cabinet Member also said he would send Mrs Smith a copy of the report referred to above which would answer her questions about the process.

In response to a question from Mr Quinn about what plans there were for further investment in extra-care schemes in Crawley, the Cabinet Member said he would respond to Mr Quinn in due course.

2. Written question from **Mrs Mullins for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health** and the **Cabinet Member for Children - Start of Life****

Question

The Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) exists to help employers make safer recruitment decisions and prevent unsuitable people from working with vulnerable groups, including children. It replaces the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) and Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA).

The DBS dictates the criteria for who is eligible for a DBS check and, like all employers, the County Council's role is to ensure compliance with the legislation and DBS protocols. As members are currently excluded from the eligibility criteria, they cannot undergo a DBS check.

- (a) Do the Cabinet Members agree with me that our children looked after and vulnerable adults should be able to feel assured that the members who are responsible for their safety and wellbeing, and who visit them from time to time, have themselves been subjected to a DBS check?

- (b) Will the Cabinet Members agree to lobby central government to seek a change in the DBS eligibility criteria to ensure those members with corporate parenting responsibilities and who come into contact with vulnerable adults undergo a DBS check?

Answer

- (a) This is a very important issue as it is vital that adults, children and young

people are safe and feel safe when visited by members. It is also important to understand how the situation has changed since 2012.

Prior to the introduction of the Disclosure & Barring Service (DBS) in 2012 one of the ways in which safety was promoted was through completion of a Criminal Records Bureau check. This practice ended in 2012 when the new definition of 'regulated activity' for working with adults or children resulted in the number of people requiring checks reducing by almost half.

Under the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012, the routine activity of elected members is legally excluded from a DBS check. It is an offence to complete a DBS check when there is not a legal basis to carry out one. The completion of a DBS check could add a further level of reassurance, although its validity is only guaranteed on the day it is done, but this option is not legally open to the County Council.

The desired level of safety for adults and children when they meet with elected members can be achieved through the appropriate behaviour of members. This is through ensuring that the adult or child has an adult with them (whether this is a friend, family member or a professional) who enables them to feel safe. This offers protection to both parties and promotes safety.

- (b) Any lobby for change would impact far beyond the role of elected members, which could not be seen in isolation. The current definition of regulated activity excluded a large number of people from having DBS checks, including volunteers supervised at a reasonable level, school governors and those with access to sensitive data. Therefore any consideration of changes to the completion of DBS checks must be considered alongside all other activities to ensure an appropriate and proportionate approach. We should not lose sight that the reason for the changes in 2012 was that many good people were deterred from volunteering, acting as sports coaches and officials, and even giving lifts to neighbours' children, for fear of the bureaucracy and implied accusation of the previous system. This would therefore become a fundamental review of the Disclosure & Barring Service. It is the County Council's view that this is not required and that it can promote safety through safe practices such as I have outlined above, as advised by the County Council's Head of Safeguarding.

Supplementary Question

Will the Cabinet Members explore the possibility of additional awareness training for all members who visit vulnerable adults and children to protect both the members and those they are visiting in addition to producing some best practice guidelines for members?

Supplementary Answer

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health said it was a good idea and that he would talk to the Adult Safeguarding Champions about developing such arrangements and possibly a training session for members. The Cabinet Member

Minutes - Appendix 2

also agreed to look into the issue of male councillors sometimes feeling uncomfortable when visiting young people.

3. Written question from **Mr Oxlade** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life**

Question

Can the Cabinet Member please provide a breakdown of how many youth sessions have been delivered each month by West Sussex staff to young people at each of the youth centres in Crawley between December 2013 and December 2014?

Answer

The following breakdown of youth sessions is provided below:

County Council Centres	Dec 13	Jan 14	Feb 14	Mar 14	Apr 14	May 14	Jun 14	Jul 14	Aug 14	Sep 14	Oct 14	Nov 14	Total
Langley Green	12	14	12	13	4	11	8	7	1	7	13	7	109
Thomas Bennett	29	28	25	24	4	9	5	0	0	4	3	4	135
Bewbush	7	9	10	5	2	4	2	0	1	5	6	3	54
West Green	0	2	3	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	14
Other Non-County Council venues													
Doorman's Y Centre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Crawley Open Arts Centre	5	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Crawley Fire Station	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	10
Oriel Youth Wing	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	6

Supplementary Question

Why have the number of youth sessions at the majority of venues in Crawley drastically declined and what assurances can the Cabinet Member give to young people and parents in Crawley about the provision of youth support in the future?

Supplementary Answer

There have been some changes to the number of sessions but they are not the only work undertaken with young people at the venues as there are also 121 sessions and other activities.

Additional Question

An additional question was asked by Mrs Smith.

4. Written question from **Mr Oxlade** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Education and Skills**

Question

I am sure the Cabinet Member will agree with me that it is important to support parents and carers understand how they can support their children to learn, both at school and at home. Can he please:

- (a) Provide details of how many parent and carers in West Sussex participated in family learning courses run by Aspire Sussex Ltd each month between September 2011 and September 2014;
- (b) Confirm how the current level of staff resources (both tutors and administrative support) dedicated to delivering family learning courses compares to that in September 2011.

Answer

The Cabinet Member fully agrees that parents and carers play a vital role in preparing for and supporting schools in order to give children the best start in life.

However, since 2012, Aspire Sussex has been a staff-run charitable social enterprise, independent of the County Council and responsible to its Board of Trustees for all areas of work including Family Learning.

Aspire Sussex have provided the following information in response to the County Council's request:

- (a) Number of learners (Parents and carers)

Year	No. of Learners
2012/13	1086
2013/14	574 + 715 children

- (b) Staff allocated to Family Learning

Year	Tutors	Admin Support
2012/13	20 active approximately	1.0 FTE Term time only
2013/14	20 active approximately	Change from above to 11 hours per week

Minutes - Appendix 2

Year	Tutors	Admin Support
2014/15	12 to date	0.6 FTE administrator (18 hours per week approximately) 0.5 FTE Subject Specialist Co-ordinator (16 hours) 0.2 Senior Manager to oversee provision development from January 2015

In addition, the Chief Executive Officer commented "As a provider of this type of learning we are aware of the social impact and local priorities for skills development and health and wellbeing influenced by education, and currently are looking at securing grants ... to match fund what we currently allocate in order to grow our offer over the next two years."

Supplementary Question

I am concerned about the reduction in family learning courses – will the Cabinet Member, as a Board member of Aspire Sussex, raise his concerns?

Supplementary Answer

Yes, I share Mr Oxlade's concerns and there are several issues I will be discussing with the Board at its next meeting in January.

5. Written question from **Mr Parsons for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance****

Question

The recent findings from the County Council's 'What Matters to You?' survey suggest that four times more residents favour higher council tax to maintain acceptable service levels than those who favour reductions.

Given the very high response rate to this year's survey, in what ways will the cabinet member ensure that this clear message is incorporated into his 2015/16 budget proposals?

Answer

There was indeed a higher response rate to the 'What Matters to You' survey with 2,907 people completing and returning the survey online. Of those 2,907 people who responded 10% indicated that they would like the Council to consider a reduction in council tax, 41% of respondents would like the Council to consider a freeze of its share of their council tax and the same number indicated they would like the Council to consider increasing council tax. Eight per cent of respondents either did not care or did not know the level at which council tax should be set.

One can therefore intimate from the results that more people want the Council to

consider a reduction or freeze (51%) than an increase (41%). This reinforces this Administration's guiding principle of minimising the burden of local taxation whenever possible.

Given that, it is extremely unlikely that the Cabinet Member will propose an increase in council tax at next February's Budget debate.

Supplementary Question

The question was not intended to seek a proposal to increase council tax but rather to give the Cabinet Member for Finance an opportunity to ensure that all residents' views are considered seriously.

Supplementary Answer

Just under 3,000 people responded to the survey and, by a majority of 51 to 41 percent, favoured continuing to bear down on council tax. I will try as far as possible to take everyone's views into account.

Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Mr Bradbury and Dr Walsh.

6. Written question from **Mr Glennon for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport****

Question

Can the Cabinet Member explain to us the level of consultation between the County Council and Gatwick Airport Limited in arriving at the figure of 9,300 new homes and the £5,000 per home allocation for infrastructure improvements and how far these figures have been based on consultation with utilities companies?

Answer

When considering its three options for providing an additional runway, Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) commissioned an Employment and Housing Technical Report to focus on the relevant issues and implications in terms of employment, workforce and housing.

In conducting that work, GAL's specialist consulted with a group including officers representing the local authorities affected by the Airport; the Housing and Employment Topic Group. The Group's primary role was to seek to understand, discuss and challenge the work undertaken for GAL as part of a commitment to continuous engagement.

Following local consultation on GAL's three options, the specialist updated the work to reflect the implications of the forecast higher capacity of the expanded Airport – up to 95 million passengers per year, higher than the figure of 87 million passengers per year in the work considered by the Group.

Minutes - Appendix 2

The conclusions drawn from that work are GAL's. There is no explicit or implicit agreement on behalf of West Sussex County Council or any of the other local authorities to the detailed methodology, assumptions or findings.

GAL's pledge of £5,000 per new home towards infrastructure improvements is GAL's response to local people and seeking to maximise the benefits of the Airport's expansion locally whilst minimising and mitigating the impacts of the expansion. The idea of a pledge was GAL's, as part of its series of Community Pledges. The sum pledged was determined by GAL. The extent to which this figure was based on consultation with utilities companies, or other parties, is a matter for GAL and those parties.

Supplementary Question

How does Cabinet Member expect the residents of West Sussex to have any confidence in the Council's continuing support for Gatwick's expansion when it has had no meaningful input in determining how a second runway would impact on the county or in setting the level of financial contribution required to meet the huge burden that would be placed on communities and infrastructure?

Supplementary Answer

I would refer members to the forthcoming select committee and Council sessions in January. In addition, an extremely detailed study has been produced by the Airports Commission. The Council now has to consider its response to the Commission to ensure it gets the very best outcome, whether or not the runway comes to Gatwick. The work is being supported by a Task and Finish Group and members will have further details in the New Year when all members will be able to contribute via the select committee and the Council meeting. Members of the public are also able to address the Commission direct.

Additional Question

An additional question was asked by Mr Acraman.

7. Written question from **Ms James for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport****

Question

The Cabinet Member will no doubt be aware that the Road Safety Foundation has recently declared that the A285 between Chichester and Petworth is 'persistently the highest-risk stretch of road' in the UK and has seen a 16% increase in the number of fatal and serious crashes over time.

The data held on the County Council's accident log shows that, between 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2013, there were 56 slight collisions, 30 serious collisions and five fatal incidents on this road. This horrific toll has only worsened in 2014.

In spite of the County Council's efforts to reduce speeds and enhance safety on the A285, according to the Foundation 'the safety measures taken so far are not enough to tackle the route' and that more far reaching intervention, to make junctions and roadsides safer is required.

- (a) Can the Cabinet Member tell us what interventions are planned to address this unacceptable safety record, such as through the forthcoming revision of the County Council's Road Safety Strategy and the work of the Safer Roads Partnership, including any timescales and likely costs?
- (b) What consideration will be given to innovative measures to reduce 'design speed' such as those outlined in the Rogate Options Appraisal Study, at key incident black-spots on the route?

Answer

The Cabinet Member welcomes the member's concerns and can assure her that they are not just shared by himself, but also by his highway officers. The Road Safety Team monitor all the Council's major routes and were aware in 2012/13 of the figures the Road Safety Foundation have just published. A number of additional road safety measures have been introduced at locations along the route.

The Road Safety Foundation's 2014 EuroRap report compares Killed and Serious Injury (KSI) accident statistics between 2007 and 2009 to those between 2010 and 2012. Consequently there is a time lag between the report and the current situation. Accident data is now available to October 2014 and this does show an improvement in the number of serious accidents on the A285, an early indication that the most recent interventions carried out over the last 18 months are having a positive effect.

Black spots, if they manifest themselves, are most successfully treated by traditional local safety measures such as those recently installed on the bends south of Seaford College in Duncton village. Since installation in the summer of 2013 there has been only one recorded accident at this location compared to 11 in the three years before the improvements were made.

- (a) Forthcoming interventions include altering the no over-taking zone on the Duncton straight, which is perhaps not readily understood by some motorists, to a double white line system, extra hazard bend signing on the north side of Duncton hill and a programme of lines and signs renewal along the whole of the route to be undertaken in 2015/16. A budget of £150,000 has been allocated to these works.

The County Council continues to work with all partners to improve road safety and influence drivers. Over a third of the KSI accidents involve motorcycles and Sussex Police via the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership regularly undertake Operation Ride, the covert police motorcycle initiative, on the A285 during the motorcycling season.

- (b) The speed management schemes already introduced use the concept of influencing design speed and include measures to give drivers the right

Minutes - Appendix 2

information at the most appropriate point on approaches to hazards. The types of measures outlined in the Rogate study are more appropriate to village centres and not readily applicable to route treatments.

Supplementary Question

Will the Cabinet Member undertake to keep all Chichester members informed about the plans for safety measures on the A285 to ensure there is no slippage as has been the case with the A27?

Supplementary Answer

As and when safety measures are introduced I will inform all members.

Additional Question

An additional question was asked by Mr McAra.

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

Question

A recent spike in traffic crashes on the A24 from Horsham to Capel has led to significant levels of concern amongst Horsham residents, especially amongst those who use the road regularly. I understand that there have been investigations into possible causes and that some amelioration work is planned.

- (a) Can the Cabinet Member please give details of the planned work?

Some people have suggested that excessive speed for conditions is the main cause of many of the crashes.

- (b) In how many of the crashes was excessive speed the main, or a major, factor?
- (c) What partnership work is being done with the police to ensure adherence to the speed limits along this section of the road?

Answer

Thank you for this question, the County Council is currently planning the following works at this location:

- (a) Subject to dry road and favourable weather conditions the County Council has whole-width road surface retexturing works booked for overnight on 13 December 2014 (with 14 December also available if required) to cover a distance of approximately 275 metres through the Shiremark Farm and

Lodge bends on the A24. Where practicable the opportunity will be taken to reaffix any dislodged chevron signs to existing posts.

Additionally, along the same stretch of road the County Council is reviewing the positions and condition of the existing chevron signs, bend warning signs, and hazard marker posts. Where appropriate these will be replaced, upgraded, or frequency increased, to give clearer information to road users. The West Sussex county boundary nameplate and several 50 mph speed limit repeater signs are also due for refurbishment. The intention is to undertake these works overnight between 16 and 20 February 2015 when road space is also provisionally booked to complete hedge trimming and other signing improvements nearer Warnham, again weather and road conditions permitting.

- (b) With regard to the recent crashes; none of the recent collisions, reported in October, have 'exceeding the speed limit' or 'travelling too fast for conditions' as recorded factors.

In the 10-year period from 1 November 2004 to 31 October 2014 there were 16 reported injury collisions between Marches Road, Kingsfold and the Surrey border. Of these, only one collision recorded 'exceeding the speed limit' as a possible factor and it also had a record of careless/reckless driving as a possible factor. A second collision recorded 'travelling too fast for conditions' as a likely factor and three other collisions had 'careless/reckless' driving recorded against them.

- (c) As a matter of course the County Council is routinely in contact with the Police who provided notification of the recent accidents along this route and identified potential contributory factors. Speed Limit enforcement is of course an operational matter for the Police who can give extra consideration to locations where they think it appropriate. In addition the County Council works closely with Surrey County Council to ensure there is a consistency of appropriate safety measures across the county border.

Supplementary Question

Since speed has not been an important factor in the recent accidents, can the Cabinet Member tell the Council the main contributory factors identified?

Supplementary Answer

I do not have any more detail than in the written answer but I will try to find out more information in due course.

Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Mrs Kitchen and Dr Walsh.

Minutes - Appendix 2

- 9. Written question from Mr Clark for reply by the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services**

Question

The lengthening of the inspection cycle for Rights of Way from nine months to 15 months will contribute a worthwhile saving of £81,500 annually. Accordingly, however, maintenance must surely suffer to some extent.

What prior consultation was undertaken with parish councils and other stakeholders to ensure that maintenance would not suffer as a result of the changed schedule and what initiatives are being explored with them to enlist additional voluntary support in monitoring Rights of Way and assisting with the clearance of vegetation when appropriate?

Answer

The revenue budget will be reduced by £50,000 which is 10% of the current maintenance budget. It is anticipated that this can be offset by the re-procurement of the routine maintenance contract and the additional works volunteers will be delivering in the future.

Consultation was carried out with the West Sussex Local Access Forum and South Downs Local Access Forum. These bodies represent users, land managers and other interests within the county. The Environmental and Community Services Select Committee and the Walking and Cycling Champion were also consulted. The views of parish councils were not formally sought on the proposed decision. This is because the change in the inspection cycle will not prevent them, or other users, from reporting problems at any time in their area as is currently the case. Where these issues prevent the use of the Right of Way, the County Council's maintenance contractor or a volunteer gang will be sent into the area.

The County Council has two types of volunteers who work on the network; Parish Path Inspectors, who carry out inspections; and Volunteer Rangers, who deliver works out on the network. All the Parish Path Inspectors have been contacted to explore how they may be able to assist us with issues which are reported outside of the inspection cycle.

The County Council's Volunteer Development Team has also been working with other local community groups and Parishes to provide training so they can carry out tasks such as vegetation clearance. The County Council currently has sufficient levels of volunteers to cover the whole county.

Supplementary Question

Given the inevitable increase in operational uncertainty owing to reliance on a volunteer labour force, how confident is the Cabinet Member that sufficient coverage can be maintained across the county and that works can be undertaken in a timely manner?

Supplementary Answer

I am very confident of the volunteer force which is being built up on all sides including stronger communities' volunteers.

Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Mr Acraman and Mrs Millson.

10. Written question from **Mr Oxlade** for the Cabinet Member for **Residents' Services**

Question

The Cabinet Member may be aware that back in October 2012 I raised the prominence of the 'Tell Us Once' (TUO) service operated by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) which enables those recently bereaved to provide details of their loss to one organisation which is then passed on to others, thereby minimising the burden at a very difficult time. At the time I was advised that the County Council was constantly reviewing whether to offer TUO in West Sussex, which would involve not only the County Council, but the borough and district councils. At that time 80% of local authorities were already making this service available including Hampshire, Kent and Surrey County Councils.

In December last year through a Cabinet Member decision (RS7(13/14)), he recommended that a Tell West Sussex once at death registration scheme be introduced, with a pilot to run for 12 months, following which the benefits would be evaluated; and that a tell West Sussex once at birth registration be explored further once the service had been piloted and the benefits assessed to be sound.

I am given to believe that the pilot scheme has gone well and that Districts and Boroughs have all now agreed to be part of the DWP TUO service which will enable information to be shared not only with local authorities but also the DVLA, HMRC and HM Passport Office.

Can the Cabinet Member please:

- (a) Agree to share the findings of the report evaluating the Tell West Sussex pilot scheme with members once available;
- (b) Confirm that issues relating to the reliability of the IT system supporting the TUO service have now been overcome;
- (c) Provide an indication of the level of financial savings per annum once the authority is in a position to offer the full TUO service to residents and the extent to which these will outweigh any associated resource implications to deliver the service;
- (d) Confirm that residents of West Sussex will not only be able to register a death through the TUO service but also register a birth; and

Minutes - Appendix 2

- (e) Advise when he anticipates being in a position to make a decision relating to extending the pilot to the full TUO service and when residents in West Sussex are likely to be able to benefit from the full scheme.

Answer

- (a) The Cabinet Member is happy to share the findings of the Tell West Sussex pilot report with members.
- (b) The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) has given reassurance that the IT portal and systems used for the Tell Us Once process are robust and little down time is experienced.
- (c) The customer benefit to be derived from the use of Tell Us Once is considerable by reducing the need for individual contacts with local and national government departments. The borough and district councils are the primary recipients of the information about death registrations and there may be savings made in that regard which are a matter for those councils. For the County Council, it is anticipated that if the scheme is put into effect in place of Tell West Sussex, the Registrars will be able to encourage take-up and transmit the required information within the current appointment time. The recipients of the information will need to devote some resource to accessing the information but it is hoped that this will replace the resource currently needed to receive and process information that is given individually by informants direct to the service. The savings for the County Council will be, for example, by way of recovered equipment, prevention of overpayment of allowances and prevention of fraudulent use of blue badges.
- (d) If Tell Us Once is implemented in West Sussex it will initially be on death registration. The birth service is heavily reliant on manual processes and DWP has recently completed a review and are mid-way through implementing a number of tactical short-term improvements. The County Council has been strongly advised by DWP not to proceed with Tell Us Once for birth registration at this time.
- (e) The Cabinet Member is in receipt of a report in which the recommendation is to introduce Tell Us Once in West Sussex as soon as possible and this will replace Tell West Sussex. This decision will be made in January 2015.

Supplementary Question

Is the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services frustrated at the amount of time it has taken to implement the 'Tell us Once' service?

Supplementary Answer

Yes, I have been frustrated but the Council has moved as fast as it possibly could. I will arrange for Mr Oxlade to have a personal interview with Mrs Butler who arranges the service so that he can be brought up-to-speed on progress.

Agenda Item No. 4(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 1, A27 Action Campaign, from Mrs Urquhart and Dr Walsh.

Paragraph 3, 'After Orchid View – Ensuring an effective system-wide response' conference, from Mrs Evans and Dr Walsh.

Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs.

Paragraph 4, Care Act, from Mrs Mullins and Mr Watson.

In response to a question from Mrs Mullins about the number of additional staff required to deliver the assessments from 2015 and on what basis they would be recruited, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health agreed to let Mrs Mullins have information about the work which was currently underway for both internal and external services.

Paragraph 5, 'place of safety', from Mr Bradbury and Dr Walsh.

In response to a request from Mr Bradbury for the numbers involved to be sent to all members, the Cabinet Members for Adult Social Care and Health and Children – Start of Life agreed to do so once the impact of the improvement programme was seen.

Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 6, Signs of Safety, from Mrs Jones.

Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 8, Better Care Fund, from Mrs Dunton.

Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 9, Customer Experience Programme, from Mr Patel.

Paragraph 10, County Council website, from Mr G L Jones.

In response to a question from Mr Jones about the profile of the residents' panel, County Council Report
19 January 2015

Minutes - Appendix 3

the Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations said he would let him know.

Cabinet Member for Education and Skills

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs.

Paragraph 12, development of the education function, from Mr Griffiths, Mrs Mullins and Mr Quinn.

Paragraph 13, Pupil Premium, from Mr Cloake and Mrs Smith.

Cabinet Member for Finance

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 15, Business Rates Pool, from Mr Glennon and Mr Parsons.

Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 16, Network Rail's draft Sussex Area Route Study, from Mr Burrett and Dr Dennis.

Paragraph 18, Better Roads Programme, from Mr Cloake, Mrs Jones and Mrs Millson.

In response to congratulations from Mrs Millson on the major success of the scheme, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport said he would pass her comments to the officers and contractors involved.

Paragraph 21, flood defence scheme, from Mr Barling and Mr S J Oakley.

The Cabinet Member agreed to respond to Mr Oakley as to whether, as part of the work on the schemes, there would be any reassessment of the Environment Agency ground fluvial and pluvial flooding models.

Cabinet Member for Residents' Services

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 19, Manor Royal Business Park, from Mr Acraman and Mr Crow.

Paragraph 20, Collaborate 2014, from Dr Walsh.

Agenda Item No. 4(c) - Leader's Question Time

The Leader answered questions from members on the following topics:

Storrington and A27 improvements, from Mr Circus.

English local authorities and devolution of powers, especially West Sussex, from Mr Rae.

Restriction of use of judicial review, from Mrs Millson.

Keeping local members informed of safeguarding concerns at hospitals in their local areas, from Mrs Smith.

The Leader agreed that local members would be kept informed of safeguarding concerns at hospitals in their local areas.

Introduction of sustainable drainage systems (SuDs) into planning law in relation to flooding, from Mrs Duncton.

Network Rail Study and improvements to the Gatwick Airport station, from Mr Glennon.

In response to a question about the timing of the Council's response to the proposals for expansion at Gatwick Airport and the earlier deadline for a response to the Network Rail Study, the Leader said passenger numbers would be circulated as a background to the decision in due course.

Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner's proposals in relation to funding of local policing, from Mr M G Jones.