

West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

27 May 2016

At the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 27 May 2016, at the County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mrs P A C Arculus (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Mr P G Metcalfe
Mr D H Barling	Mrs M E Millson
Mr L H Barnard	Mrs J S Mockridge
Mrs E A Bennett	Mr J A P Montyn
Mrs H A Brunsdon	Mrs S R Mullins
Mr I R J Buckland	Mr R J Oakley
Mr P C Catchpole	Mr S J Oakley
Mr P J Circus	Mr J J O'Brien
Mr M A Cloake	Mr F R J Oppler
Mr D G Crow	Mr L W Parsons
Dr N P S Dennis	Mr A Patel
Mrs J E Duncton	Mr A P Petch
Mrs E M Evans	Mr N F Peters
Mr P C Evans	Mrs J E Phillips
Mrs C M Field	Mr B J Quinn
Mr M J Glennon	Mr J G Rae
Ms M L Goldsmith	Mrs A M Rapnik
Mr P A D Griffiths	Mr R Rogers
Mr P D High	Mr D P Sheldon
Mr S R Hillier	Mr B A Smith
Mr J C Hunt	Mrs B A Smith
Ms S James	Mr R J Smytherman
Mr M G Jones	Mr A C Sutcliffe
Mrs A J Jupp	Mr B W Turner
Ms D M K Kennard	Mr G M Tyler
Mrs L Kitchen	Mrs D L Urquhart
Mr P K Lamb	Mr S G Waight
Mr R A Lanzer	Dr J M M Walsh, KStJ, RD
Mr G V McAra	Mr L S Wickremaratchi

Message from HM the Queen on her 90th Birthday

38 The Chairman reported a letter of thanks from HM the Queen in response to the best wishes of the Council on the occasion of her 90th birthday.

Apologies and attendance

39 Apologies were received from Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mr Burrett, Mrs Hall, Mrs Jones, Mr G L Jones, Mr Oxlade, Mr J L Rogers, Mr Watson and Mr Whittington. Mrs Bennett, Mr Quinn, Mr Smith, Mr Turner and Mr Tyler gave their apologies for the afternoon session. Mr Clark was absent and Mrs Brunsdon and Mr Oppler were absent for the

Minutes: Item 2

afternoon session. Mr Lamb arrived at 10.43 a.m. and Mr Sheldon at 10.46 a.m.

Interests

40 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

Minutes

41 It was agreed that the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the County Council held on 15 April 2016 (pages 59 to 93) be approved as a correct record.

Appointment

42 The Council approved an appointment as set out below.

Panel	Change
PropCo	Mrs Mockridge in place of Mr Barling

Address by a Cabinet Member

43 Members received an address by the Leader on proposals for Police and Crime Commissioners to take over Fire and Rescue Services. The Leader said there would be a fuller debate at the next meeting of the County Council in July 2016.

Notice of Motion by Ms James

44 The following motion was moved by Ms James and seconded by Mrs Rapnik.

'This Council recognises that providing an adequate supply of affordable housing for our local residents and their families is one of the greatest challenges facing the South East and will increasingly act as a barrier to economic growth. However, this needs to be balanced with the need to protect our countryside and the green belt from further development.

The current interest in local government devolution, such as the '3SC' proposal, has placed new emphasis upon greater innovation in dealing with these challenges. However, in order to take full advantage of this opportunity, the County Council must first establish core principles regarding sustainable provision of affordable housing.

This Council therefore asks the Leader to agree to establish a cross-party working group to:

- (a) Explore issues to enable local people to access genuinely affordable housing in West Sussex and assess sustainable solutions, which will

protect our countryside and green space.

- (b) Explore the potential scope and funding options for the remediation of brownfield land to be earmarked for affordable housing, wherever practicable.
- (c) Liaise with the on-going 3SC devolution proposals to ensure that these are aligned with the County Council's priorities and keep all county councillors regularly updated as to progress.
- (d) Provide a succession strategy for progressing with affordable housing solutions should devolution not progress within a reasonable timescale.'

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

- (a) For the motion – 16

Dr Dennis, Mr Glennon, Ms James, Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oppler, Mr Parsons, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mrs Rapnik, Mr B A Smith, Mrs B A Smith and Mr Sutcliffe.

- (b) Against the motion - 43

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mrs Bennett, Mrs Brunson, Mr Buckland, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Dunton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr Griffiths, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr O'Brien, Mr Patel, Mr Peters, Mr Rae, Mr R Rogers, Mr Sheldon, Mr Smytherman, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Dr Walsh and Mr Wickremaratchi.

- (c) Abstentions – 0

46 The motion was lost.

Written Questions

47 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

48 Members asked questions of Cabinet Members on matters relevant to their portfolios, including those in the Cabinet Members' reports (pages 94 to 103), and a supplementary report on pages 103A to B, as set out at Appendix 3.

Minutes: Item 2

Leader's Question Time

- 49** Members questioned the Leader on matters currently relevant to the County Council, including on the Leader's report (page 104), and a supplementary report on page 104A, as set out at Appendix 3.

Electoral Review Panel: Further Boundary Commission Consultation on Crawley

- 50** Following receipt from the Boundary Committee for England on 10 May 2016 of a revised scheme for electoral division boundaries in Crawley, as part of the current County Boundary Review, the Council considered the County Council's proposed response (pages 105 to 111).

- 51** Resolved -

That the Local Government Boundary Commission's new scheme for Crawley, published on 10 May 2016, be supported.

Governance Committee: Changes to the Constitution: Call-in Protocol and terms of reference of the Start of Life Partnership Board

- 52** The County Council considered changes to the call-in protocol and a minor change to the terms of reference to the Start of Life Partnership Board (pages 112 to 115).

- 53** Resolved -

- (1) That the revisions to the Call-in Protocol, as set out at the Appendix to the report, be approved; and
- (2) That the terms of reference of the Start of Life Partnership Board in the Scheme of Delegation in the Constitution be amended to remove the reference to the number of meetings per year.

Chairman

The Council rose at 3.07 p.m.

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
Agenda Item 3 Address by Leader on proposals for Police and Crime Commissioners to take over Fire and Rescue Services	Mr Parsons	Son-in-law is a firefighter
Agenda Item 4 - Notice of Motion on Affordable Housing and Devolution	Mr Circus	Cabinet Member for Housing at Horsham District Council
	Mr Lamb	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Turner	Executive Member for Regeneration and Planning Policy at Worthing Borough Council; and Chairman of Coastal West Sussex Strategic Planning Board
Agenda Item 5(b) CMQT	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council and member of Charity Guild Care
	Mr Oppler	Member of Arun District Council
Agenda Item 5(b) CMQT paragraph 9 (Development of Dementia Friendly Communities)	Mr Griffiths	Registered Carer
Agenda Item 5(b) CMQT paragraph 11 (Potential to develop Extra Care Housing Scheme: Westergate)	Dr Walsh	Member of Arun District Council
Agenda Item 5(b) CMQT paragraph 23 (Pension Fund Pool)	Ms James	Member of West Sussex Pension Fund as part of Chichester College employment
	Mr Lanzer	Member of Local Government Pension Scheme

Minutes: Item 2 - Appendix 1

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Agenda Item 5(c) Leader's Question Time (Royal British Legion 'Count Them In' campaign)	Ms Goldsmith	Son is in the services
Agenda Item 6 - Electoral Review Panel: Further Boundary Consultation on Crawley	Mrs Smith	Member of Crawley Borough Council, Langley Green Ward

27 May 2016

1. Written question from Ms James for reply by the Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing

Question

Hundreds of local people, including vulnerable elderly people and cancer patients have missed important appointments for treatment, whilst others have been left out of pocket after having to arrange for expensive taxis - all because of the disastrously managed transfer of non-emergency transport to the private firm Coperforma.

- (a) What is the Cabinet Member's view of this fiasco and what lessons does he think should be drawn for any future outsourcing arrangements?
- (b) How can the County Council provide support to affected West Sussex patients, including those pursuing claims for reimbursement for taxi fares?
- (c) How confident is the Cabinet Member that the Council will retain sufficient capacity to hold our health partners to account if there is a reduction in resource for scrutiny at the County Council?

Answer

- (a) The commissioning of a Patient Transport Service (PTS) for patients in West Sussex is the responsibility of the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). In this instance High Weald Lewes and Havens CCG led the procurement process for the seven CCGs across Sussex.

The County Council was not involved in the procurement process and it would not be appropriate for me, or any of my Cabinet colleagues, to express a view.

- (b) The County Council is sorry for those people who have been affected and sympathises with the inconvenience and trouble that seems to have been caused. The responsibility for patient transport, however, lies with the CCGs. The County Council does of course support the work of the CCGs, and also of Healthwatch West Sussex which is currently engaging with the provider Coperforma, to ensure that West Sussex residents are supported if they have been adversely affected.
- (c) A cross-party member Task and Finish Group (TFG) is currently underway to consider proposals for savings from the Democratic Services' budget. This includes options concerning the scrutiny function of the County Council. It would not be appropriate for me to comment on the work of a TFG which is still in progress.

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

Supplementary Question

Is the Cabinet Member comfortable with the answer to the question?

Supplementary Answer

It is important to be clear about the powers of the authority as it is not a service that is commissioned by, provided by nor over which the Council has direct influence. However, the Council will always stand up for the people of West Sussex and it has let the people responsible for the services know that it is concerned.

2. Written question from **Mr R Rogers** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations**

Question

- (a) Can you please give me a breakdown in recruitment costs for each Head of Paid Service (Chief Operating Officer and Chief Executive), Executive Director and Director recruited from February 2014 to the present time?
- (b) I understand that the County Council does not implement a 'Probationary Period' in its staff contracts, although most major employers in the UK do.

Can you please explain:

- (i) Why the County Council does not have a Probationary Period in its staff contracts?
- (ii) What are the benefits in not having one?
- (iii) Whether the County Council will consider introducing a Probationary Period in all employees' contracts in future?

Answer

- (a) A total of 20 recruitment campaigns have been made since February 2014 to the following temporary, or permanent roles:
 - 1. Chief Executive
 - 2. Chief Operating Officer
 - 3. Executive Director Corporate Resources and Services
 - 4. Executive Director Residents' Services
 - 5. Executive Director Care, Wellbeing and Education
 - 6. Transformation Director
 - 7. Director of Public Health and Wellbeing x2
 - 8. Director of Finance and Resources
 - 9. Director of Adult Operations
 - 10. Director of Customer Services
 - 11. Director of Highways and Transport x2

12. Director of Family Operations
13. Director of Education and Skills
14. Commercial Director
15. Director of Economy, Planning and Place x2 (1 as Strategic, Planning and Place)
16. Director of Workforce, Organisational Development and Delivery Support
17. Director of Law, Assurance and Strategy

The above list excludes internal acting up, but does include temporary appointments and permanent promotions. The total recruitment cost of the above 20 recruitment campaigns is £243,000.

In every case officers would have considered the most appropriate recruitment methodology to achieve the desired outcome. The methodology would have included internal/external approaches, as well as consideration for targeted press advertisement, headhunting and selection tools.

It is not possible to provide a more detailed breakdown of the costs, as in many of the above circumstances, where search and selection agencies were used, rates were negotiated and therefore this would be considered commercially sensitive information.

- (b) (i) The County Council uses an approach of managing performance in the first 12 months with reviews at three, six and nine months for all new staff (including staff with local government experience). Employees' progress and any significant issues of concern would be managed through this performance management framework.

In addition there also certain groups outside this local practice due to existing national terms and conditions (e.g. Youth Workers who have a national provision for formal probation for 12 months) and in schools, where Green Book staff have retained the six months provision. The County Council's policy and practice for probation is determined by the employees' contractual terms and conditions of service.

- (ii) This enables performance to be managed across the first 12 months, as opposed to six months under a formal probation review period. For the remaining staff covered by national terms and conditions, the practice remains unchanged.
- (iii) The three, six and nine month process is currently being reviewed. This review is intended to see how the current policy and practice is working, whether these reviews can be improved and how the County Council can use any revised practice to support individual performance, contributing to better service delivery and motivated staff.

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

Supplementary Question

Is the £243,000 spent a good use of public funds and why have there been two appointments to some of the posts in two years?

Supplementary Answer

The spend should be seen in the context of a saving on the base budget of around £5.5m since 2014. The use of a recruitment company has been instrumental in recruiting a strong team to the new management restructure. The need to appoint a second time to some of the posts was due to a variety of reasons including retirement. There could be a case for introducing formal probation periods and I will look at that possibility.

Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Mr M G Jones and Dr Walsh.

3. Written question from **Ms James** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Education and Skills** (answered by the Cabinet Member for Finance)

Question

High levels of house building is underway within the Bourne Division with further significant increases planned over the local plan period. As local member I am concerned about the capacity of the existing primary schools to cope with the resultant rise in primary student numbers.

Class sizes at primary level appear to be stretched already. Can the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills please advise what plans are in place to expand the primary schools in Bourne, what specific timescales there are for these improvements and what level of expenditure has been agreed?

Is he is aware of any other concerns about capacity in this area?

Could the Cabinet Member confirm within his response:

- (a) The projected primary school children numbers for 2016 relative to the existing net capacity of primary schools in the Southbourne locality; and
- (b) The resultant expected primary school classroom size for 2016.

Answer

The County Council's Planning School Places 2016 document, a copy of which has been provided to every member of the County Council, reports that the County Council continues to carefully monitor pupil numbers in the Bourne locality. Should the County Council determine that expansion of any of the schools is required, this will not be undertaken without first having discussions with the schools.

Earlier this year, it was indicated that additional pupil places might be needed as a result of the number of first preferences received, but after discussion with the locality schools it was agreed that further expansion was not immediately needed. The situation would, however, be reviewed again later this year.

- (a) The projected primary school population is not expected to exceed the number of available places across the locality in the next four years but could reach 97% capacity in 2018/19. The number of available primary places in the locality is 1,353 and the projected number on roll in 2018/19 is estimated at 1,309.
- (b) The decision over classroom size for 2016 is a matter for the Headteacher and governing body of each school to determine, taking into account various factors, especially the need to not exceed 30 pupils in a Key Stage 1 classroom for pupils in Year R, Year 1 or Year 2, so that they comply with Infant Class size legislation.

Capital expenditure for permanently expanding any of the schools in the Bourne locality has not yet been identified. Should, however, the pupil numbers increase significantly to require any school to expand, the County Council will seek to allocate sufficient funds from its capital programme to meet the need.

Supplementary Question

Can the Cabinet Member advise on the typical cost of expanding a class size per school, what that would entail in terms of delivery time and the additional costs for resourcing, particularly if found to be necessary by the end of this year?

Supplementary Answer

I will ask officers to provide a detailed answer to the question. However, the classroom size of 30 for Years R 1 and 2 is set in legislation so the Council is not at liberty to exceed that except as a result of independent appeal panel decisions.

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

Question

I recognise that the County Council employs external consultants for a variety of purposes. Can the Cabinet Member please provide:

- (a) A table that sets out the broad categories of spend on external consultants, from the 2014/15 and 2015/16 financial years, plus a projection for 2016/17; and
- (b) An explanation of the broad categories of external consultants use and whether he considers that this spend represents good value for money.

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

Answer

- (a) The first table below sets out the actual spend for 2014/15 and 2015/16, along with the projected budget for 2016/17 for the capital programme.

The second table details revenue spend by portfolio. In both years, the majority of this spend related to either service transformation projects or one-off projects where the specialist resources were not available in-house.

There is £1.1m included in the budget for 2016/17. In addition to this figure, there will be further drawdowns from the Transformation Reserve to continue to fund the County Council's transformation programme.

- (b) The relevant explanations are included in the two tables. All spend that is incurred by the County Council does represent good value for money. Any spend on consultants goes through a rigorous test of whether it is value for money and would be supported by a robust business case, prior to the procurement of the consultancy services. The amount which is spent on external consultants represents a very small amount of our total pay bill – 1.4% for 2014/15, 1.8% for 2015/16 and 0.6% for 2016/17.

Capital Spend

	Total Spend 2014/15	Total Spend 2015/16	Total Estimate 2016/17
Architect	235,262	270,640	312,378
Asbestos	73,469	114,571	116,108
Construction Design and Management	2,591,841	1,418,055	2,475,982
Feasibility Studies (for approved schemes)	132,764	360,915	304,831
IT	14,027	244,473	159,615
Land and Building Surveys	419,386	764,232	730,846
Mechanical and Electrical	160,161	147,959	190,254
Other Consultancy	190,819	211,407	248,361
Project Management	112,388	21,070	82,406
Total Consultancy Spend	3,930,117	3,553,322	4,620,781
Total Capital Programme	138,563,178	117,869,602	158,339,000

Revenue - Analysis by Portfolio

	Actuals 2014/15	Actuals 2015/16	Budget 2016/17	Comment
	£	£	£	
Adult Social Care and Health	169,768	106,959	72,300	The majority of the costs relate to project management for service transformation projects.

Minutes: Item 2 - Appendix 2

	Actuals 2014/15	Actuals 2015/16	Budget 2016/17	Comment
	£	£	£	
Children - Start of Life	662,215	1,325,038	360,600	The majority of the costs relate to consultants who have delivered specific projects across the services including service redesign and procurement initiatives. Approximately £500k specifically relates to preparation for the Ofsted inspection.
Corporate Relations	22,459	293,000	0	Service transformational and £100k on national living wage.
Education and Skills	26,350	143,341	88,500	Most spend relates to specialist school advisors progressing a number of initiatives.
Finance	928,767	663,382	81,000	The majority of the spend is for technical experts required to progress the SAP Optimisation and Customer Experience projects.
Highways and Transport	747,819	404,428	71,500	The majority of costs are on technical consultants required to deliver Highway projects. These costs include both strategic projects and programme management activity.
Leader	44,381	246,196	0	The majority of costs are on architects, engineers and economic development activity required to progress initiatives.
Residents' Services	269,080	547,927	435,000	The majority of costs are on specialist advice for waste contracts.
Total	2,870,839	3,730,271	1,108,900	

Supplementary Question

How confident is the Cabinet Member that he will keep to his 2016/17 projected budget figures for consultancy analysis by portfolio, as the projection represents a significant reduction from the actuals incurred in 2014/15 and 2015/16?

Supplementary Answer

I have absolute confidence in all my Cabinet Member colleagues who run the portfolios to keep to the budget.

Additional Questions

An additional question was asked by Mr Glennon.

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

5. Written question from **Mrs Mullins** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

- (a) Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether the trees to be removed, as part of the highway improvements being undertaken at Cheals roundabout, on the A23, in Crawley, are to be replaced?

Can he also confirm:

- (b) The Council's policy on replacing trees removed for highway improvements (i.e. two trees planted for every tree removed); and
- (c) What budget he has for tree replacement in 2016/17?

Answer

- (a) The developer has been asked to provide replacement planting; the extents of which are yet to be agreed. It may not be possible to achieve two for one replacement within the scheme constraints.
- (b) The County Council does not have a current policy regarding the planting of highway trees. However, the Council does seek to plant new highway trees in appropriate sites with priority given to sites where highway trees are currently or have in the past been located. Depending on circumstances the Council does try to replant two trees for every one removed, however, some sites are constrained and this is not always possible.
- (c) The County Council spends about £50,000 a year on the planting and replacement of highway trees as part of its general highway stewardship duties.

Where the need for planting or replanting arises as a result of a highway scheme we do not tend to record this expenditure separately; as a result these costs are not included in the figure above.

Supplementary Question

I understand that organisations such as the Tree Council and the Woodland Trust run schemes for eligible schools and communities to apply for tree planting packs. Does the Cabinet Member agree that trees are a huge asset to the county and will he work with his fellow Cabinet Members to promote schemes for free trees within schools and communities across West Sussex?

Supplementary Answer

I would be happy to have a meeting with Mrs Mullins to discuss the idea of free trees for schools and what it would entail.

6. Written question from Mr McAra for reply by the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services

Question

I am pleased to hear that a training schedule has been booked for the Midhurst fire crew next month for the new 6x6 vehicle and that the weight/balance issues have been resolved. Can you give me a definitive in-service date for the vehicle?

Answer

Training on the 6x6 vehicle at Midhurst will be undertaken throughout June and it will be operational on 1 July 2016.

Supplementary Question

According to the new Fire Service dashboard, the Midhurst Fire Station has reached 96% of appliance availability which is an outstanding achievement against a target of 75%. When the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services visits the fire station to congratulate them, will he bring the County Chairman with him?

Supplementary Answer

I would be delighted to visit with the County Chairman and I echo Mr McAra's congratulations to the Midhurst Fire Station.

7. Written question from Mr McAra for reply by the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services

Question

Given that under the current and recently re-elected Crime and Police Commissioner, the police presence in Midhurst and north of the downs is no longer permanent, can you ensure that every step is being taken to ensure that the fire service remains a core function of West Sussex County Council, potentially avoiding a similar fate and that this bizarre government proposal is implacably rejected.

Answer

The Cabinet Member can assure Mr McAra that every possible step will be taken to ensure that the Fire and Rescue Service remains a core function of West Sussex County Council.

Supplementary Question

The Fire Service is one of the glories of local government. Will the Cabinet Member join me in wishing national politicians would keep quiet?

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

Supplementary Answer

There will be a full debate at the next meeting and I will make my views clear at that time.

8. Written question from **Mr Smith** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Residents' Services**

Question

Given the concern within this region to reach Household waste recycling targets, can the Cabinet Member provide specific information on the usage of each of the Household Waste recycling sites across the Chichester district and the associated levels of Household Waste recycling.

Could the Cabinet please include:

- (a) Confirmation of the recycling targets for household waste for this year and for future years;
- (b) The performance against these recycling targets over the last three years including the contribution made from the Household Waste Recycling sites (HWRS);
- (c) The usage data for each recycling waste site including the tonnage levels collected per site per day of the week; and
- (d) The cost of clearing up fly-tipping for the area over the last three years.

Answer

- (a) At present there are no local or national statutory targets for the recycling of household waste on a year by year basis. The UK (and therefore each of its constituent local authorities are obliged (by the 2008 waste framework directive) to achieve a 50% recycling performance rate for household waste. In addition, a 65% recycling performance rate in 2030 for household waste forms part of the EU's Circular Economy Package 2015 but this has yet to be adopted by the UK or transposed into national law.
- (b) At present, the County Council is reported by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) as recycling 41.58%. This is based on the 2014/15 statistics. (2015/16 recycling performance will be issued by DEFRA in December 2016). This performance represents annual increase in recycling performance from the 2013/14 figure of 41.14% but is a decrease on the 2012/13 figure of 42.61%. The recycling of household waste delivered to the Household Waste Recycling Sites contributes between 5 to 6% to these targets each year.
- (c) The usage for Westhampnett HWRS is known to be on average 15,000 separate visits each month compared to the usage for the Midhurst HWRS of an average of 3,000 separate visits each month. Tonnage data for each

site is not known or recorded on a daily basis as all separate wastes are 'weighed out' as required and when containers are full. Tonnage data for each waste stream at each site is reported to DEFRA on a quarterly basis and is available if required. However it is known that in 2015/16, 20,400 tonnes of waste was delivered to Westhampnett HWRS of which 74.83% was recycled and 1,500 tonnes of waste was delivered to Midhurst HWRS of which 69.93% was recycled.

- (d) The responsibility for the removal of fly-tipped wastes from the public highway and private land in the county rests with the district and borough councils. Each instance of fly-tipping is recorded by each of the borough and district councils and reported to DEFRA via the 'Flycapture' regime. This information is publicly available and it is known that in 2014/15, Chichester District Council dealt with 536 separate instances of fly-tipping within its boundaries at a reported clearance cost of £30,568. Please note that West Sussex County Council (as the disposal authority) meets the costs associated with the disposal of this waste at a cost of c. £164.00 per tonne (additional information is awaited and will be provided direct to Mr Smith).

Supplementary Question

Is the Cabinet Member concerned that fly-tipping will increase as a result of changes to the HWRS and, specifically, with the removal of the Selsey HWRS, placing a further strain on the Council to clean up fly-tipping?

Supplementary Answer

There is currently a substantial consultation with a large number of responses, many of which mentioned fly-tipping. I am aware of the issue, as are officers, and I will consider it further once the responses have been evaluated.

Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Mr Glennon, Mr R Rogers and Dr Walsh.

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

Agenda Item No. 5(b) - Cabinet Member Question Time

Members asked questions of the Cabinet Members and Leader (in respect of the Economy portfolio) 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

Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 2, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services, from Mrs Evans and Dr Walsh.

In response to a comment from Dr Walsh about issues with CAMHS with getting children into the system in the first place and then, in some cases, transitioning from level 1 to level 2, mostly due to staff shortages, the Cabinet Member said he was aware of widespread concern from parents. He said the issue was being looked at and he would provide Dr Walsh with a fuller answer.

Cabinet Member for Education and Skills

Questions to the Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 4, Adult Education contract, from Mr M G Jones (answered by the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health).

Paragraph 5, Storrington and Rydon Schools (STARS), from Mr Circus, Mrs Jupp and Mr Parsons (answered by the Leader).

Central Sussex College closure of Haywards Health campus, from Mr Wickremaratchi (answered by Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing).

In relation to a question about the impact on SEN children in particular, the Cabinet Member said that she would ask the Cabinet Member for Children - Start of Life, who had already provided a detailed response to a resident, to share that response with Mr Wickremaratchi.

The Economy

Leader

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 8, Beautiful Outdoors – Wave 2, from Mr Sutcliffe.

County Council's policy on using local contractors and suppliers, from Ms James and Mrs Mockridge.

Later Life

Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 7, Local Growth Fund – Care Business Development Fund, from Mr Griffiths, Mrs Smith and Mr Smytherman.

In response to a request from Mr Smytherman for the key locations for provision of care home beds, the Cabinet Member said he would see what could be done.

Stronger Communities

Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 13, Road Space Audit Task and Finish Group, from Mrs Mullins.

In relation to a question from Mrs Mullins about the Chichester road audit and how many parking audits could be paid for from within the county-wide parking account and how the findings of the Chichester road space audit would be taken forward and paid for, the Cabinet Member said he would let her know the cost of rolling out the audit across the county.

Temporary suspension of bus stops on the A24, from Mr S J Oakley, Mr Parsons, Mr Quinn and Mrs Urquhart.

A27 improvements, from Ms James, Mrs Urquhart and Dr Walsh.

Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 15, Healthy Child Programme, from Mr Evans.

Cabinet Member for Residents' Services

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 17, Broadband, from Mr Circus, Mr Glennon and Ms James.

West Sussex Fire and Rescue response times, from Ms James and Dr Walsh.

In response to a request from Ms James for data with regard to the level of attendance from Hampshire Fire Brigade in the Bourne division, the Cabinet Member agreed to continue to provide her with any information she required.

Household waste recycling sites consultation, from Mr Buckland, Mr Oppler and Mr Parsons.

In relation to a question from Mr Oppler about the household waste recycling sites consultation and whether it was true that the flyers being given out about the

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

consultation were being limited to a few per day, the Cabinet Member said he would make enquiries.

Libraries as community resources, from Mr Griffiths.

Effective Council

Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations

The Cabinet Member answered questions on Capita outsourcing jobs to India, from Ms James.

Cabinet Member for Finance

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 23, Pension Fund Pool, from Mr Waight.

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

The Leader answered questions from members on the following matters.

Paragraph 1, Education White Paper, from Mr Glennon.

Lord Laming's report 'In Care, out of Trouble', from Mrs Millson.

In response to a question from Mrs Millson about Lord Laming's report and Surrey County Council and Surrey Police being an exemplar for reducing the number of children looked after in the criminal justice system, the Leader said she would speak the Executive Director Care, Wellbeing and Education and the Leader of Surrey County Council to see if there was anything the County Council could adopt in terms of best practice.

Royal British Legion campaign, 'Count them in', from Mr Peters.

Keeping jobs in the UK via contacts, from Mr Lamb.

Marking the Battle of the Somme, from Mr M G Jones.

Representation on Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee, from Mr Acraman.

Review of retained firefighter duty system, from Dr Walsh.