

West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

17 February 2017

At the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 17 February 2017, at the County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mrs P A C Arculus (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Ms D M K Kennard
Mr D H Barling	Mrs L Kitchen
Mr L H Barnard	Mr R A Lanzer
Mr A J Barrett-Miles	Mr G V McAra
Mrs E A Bennett	Mrs M E Millson
Mr P J J Bradbury	Mrs J S Mockridge
Mr M J Brown	Mr J A P Montyn
Mr I R J Buckland	Mr R J Oakley
Mr R D Burrett	Mr S J Oakley
Mr P C Catchpole	Mr F R J Oppler
Mr P J Circus	Mr C G Oxlade
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	Mrs J E Phillips
Mrs E M Evans	Mr B J Quinn
Mr P C Evans	Mrs A M Rapnik
Mrs C M Field	Mr J L Rogers
Mr M J Glennon	Mr R Rogers
Ms M L Goldsmith	Mr D P Sheldon
Mr P A D Griffiths	Mr B A Smith
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	Mr S G Waight
Mr G L Jones	Dr J M M Walsh, KStJ, RD
Mr M G Jones	Mr B R A D Watson, OBE
Mrs A J Jupp	Mr D R Whittington

Lee Neale

156 The Chairman reported that, after 33 years with the Fire & Rescue Service and 7½ years with the County Council, Lee Neale, the current Acting Executive Director Communities & Public Protection and Acting Chief Fire Officer, would be retiring on 26 February 2017. Members joined the Chairman in expressing their thanks to Lee for his work for the Council and wished him a long and happy retirement.

Apologies and attendance

157 Apologies were received from Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Clark, Mrs Hall, Mr Lamb,

Minutes: Item 2

Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Mullins, Mr Parsons, Mrs Smith, Mrs Urquhart and Mr Wickremaratchi. Mr J L Rogers gave his apologies for the afternoon session. Mrs Bennett, Ms James and Mr Patel gave their apologies and left at 3.45 p.m. Mr Glennon, Mr G L Jones, Mrs Jupp, Mr Petch, Mr Sheldon and Mr Tyler left at 3.45 p.m. and Mr Griffiths left at 4.15 p.m.

Interests

158 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

Minutes

159 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 16 December 2016 (pages 407 to 434) be approved as a correct record.

Appointment of an Independent Member to the Independent Remuneration Panel and an Independent Person to the Standards Committee

160 The Council approved appointments to fill vacancies for an Independent Member to the Independent Remuneration Panel and an Independent Person to the Standards Committee in the light of a report by the Chairman of the Standards Committee (page 435).

161 Resolved -

That Mr Cooper be appointed as independent member of the Independent Remuneration Panel and as an independent person to the Standards Committee for an initial period of four years.

Appointment of Military Champion

162 The Council approved the appointment of Ms Kennard in place of Mr Peters as Military Champion on the recommendation of the Leader.

Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18 to 2020/21, Revenue Budget 2017/18, Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2021/22 and Treasury Management Strategy 2017/18

163 The Leader moved the report on the Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and Draft Budget 2017/18 to 2020/21 (pages 436 to 441). The Leader placed on record her particular thanks to all staff in the Adult Social Care field together with the Cabinet Members for Adult Social Care and Health and Community Wellbeing.

164 The Cabinet Member for Finance moved the report on the Draft Budget (pages 1 to 40 of Appendix 2). Members also had before them a statement from the Cabinet Member on a number of changes to the revenue budget which have arisen due to late notification from the borough and district councils. The statement also covered news of a late

award in the form of a capital grant from the Government to promote road safety. The required changes to the revenue budget were minor and the effects on the recommendations in the budget report and corresponding revisions to Table 1 in the budget pack had been circulated.

- 165** The Cabinet Member also moved the report on the Treasury Management Strategy (Appendix 3).
- 166** Two amendments were moved on behalf of the UKIP Group, as set out below, the cumulative effect of which on the 2017/18 budget if approved would have been as follows.

	Change £m	Balance £m
New budget for feasibility study on unitary status	+0.250	0.250
Extra sum for Sustainable Travel and Safer Routes to School (Safe and Sustainable Transport budget).	+0.650	1.050
Extra sum for School Crossing Patrols (Transport Budget)	+0.100	12.934#
Feasibility budget to support development and delivery of the capital programme	-0.850	0
Reduction to Contingency budget	-0.150	3.054
Net Change		0

would be the new total for the schools transport budget

- 167** The first UKIP amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Ms James and seconded by Mr Glennon:

'It is clear that the County Council, and District and Borough Councils face a continued climate of funding pressures for the foreseeable future. The figures in illustration 3 of the budget report show the budget is not balanced in 2018/19 nor in the following years, despite an assumed council tax rise. The County Council will need to make further savings and changes over the next four years beyond those already identified.

The benefits of unitary authority status can include: improved economies of scale and democratic costs, and significant reductions in fragmentation and duplication of services and functions, which in turn would provide efficiency savings and improved and sustainable service delivery for the residents of West Sussex.

It is estimated that this study would cost up to £250,000. This could be funded through two sources:

- The non-portfolio budget: reducing the contingency from £3.204m to £3.054m i.e. by £0.150m.
- Finance Portfolio – the balance of £100,000 to be provided from the feasibility budget to support the development and delivery of capital programme – Capital and Infrastructure (more detail in the other UKIP amendment).

Minutes: Item 2

	£m
Commission a feasibility study on unitary authority status.	+0.250
Funded by : Finance Portfolio Removal of feasibility budget to support the development and delivery of the capital programme – Capital and Infrastructure (the balance of this fund is allocated in the other amendment)	-0.100
Funded by: Non-Portfolio Reduction in Contingency budget	-0.150
Net change	0

168 The amendment was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the amendment – 11

Mr Glennon, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mr Oxlade, Mr Petch, Mr Quinn, Mrs Rapnik, Mr Sheldon, Mr Smith and Mr Sutcliffe.

(b) Against the amendment - 39

Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Bennett, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mr Buckland, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Dr Dennis, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Oppler, Mr Patel, Mr Peters, Mr Smytherman, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mr Watson and Mr Whittington.

(c) Abstentions – 6

Mr Griffiths, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr R Rogers, Mr Waight and Dr Walsh.

169 The amendment was lost.

170 The second UKIP amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Ms James and seconded by Mr Glennon:

'The County is making a significant investment in the number of school places for children. For 2017/18, the sum of £23.9m was agreed at the December 2016 County Council meeting to provide for 1,445 primary and 150 secondary places. A further 1,050 primary places and 540 secondary places are required for 2018/19 at a further cost of £35.2m. These additional numbers put pressure on local travel, with more children on the school run. Given the anticipated increase in local journeys, the proposal is to invest a further £0.650m in the Sustainable Travel and Safer Routes to School budgets in Highways and Transport and £0.100m for the School Crossing Patrol budget in Education and Skills. This would be aimed at

encouraging more parents to travel sustainably, particularly walking and cycling and not to drive relatively short distances to and from school.

The funding for this proposal would be found the Finance portfolio: the feasibility budget to support the development and delivery of the capital programme (£0.750m)

The amendment proposes to reduce the proposed growth of £0.850m, relating to a feasibility budget to support the development and delivery of the capital programme (per Illustration 16), by £0.750m. The capital programme in 2016/17 is forecast to spend £120.20m and the budget report is seeking to spend £145.3m next year, which has been facilitated WITHOUT this growth item.)

	£m
Highways portfolio	
Additional sum for Sustainable Travel and Safer Routes to School	+0.650
Education and Skills Portfolio:	
Additional sum for School Crossing Patrols	+0.100
Funded by :	
Finance Portfolio	-0.750
Removal of feasibility budget to support the development and delivery of the capital programme – Capital and Infrastructure	

171 The amendment was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the amendment – 18

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr Glennon, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mrs Millson, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

(b) Against the amendment - 37

Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Bennett, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Patel, Mr Peters, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mr Waight, Mr Watson and Mr Whittington.

(c) Abstentions – 2

Mr Griffiths and Mr Sheldon.

172 The amendment was lost.

Minutes: Item 2

- 173** The following amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Dr Walsh and seconded by Mrs Millson:

'This proposal affords £1m extra to Adults Social Care and Health, £0.5m to Waste Disposal and £0.4m to Highways and Transport.

The £1m extra for Adults Social Care and Health would be applied to increase the budgets around carer support, extra care housing, assistive technology and early prevention work. The early prevention work benefits everyone – both those needing care and the County's budget. The saving proposals (table 3, Page 45 of the budget pack) identifies £2m of savings in 2018/19 from a 'Focus on Prevention' work stream in Adults Social Care. We support the principles on which this is based – helping people to live independently will reduce demand and is our best option for making the budget more sustainable. However, such savings will not happen by chance. They will require up-front investment to promote the prevention agenda, especially as we know that there has been slippage in this area in the past.

On Waste, £0.5m is proposed to contribute to reversing some of the changes made during 2016 which introduced charges for DIY waste, reduced opening hours for amenity tips as well as resulting in closures on certain days of the week.

The £0.4m proposed for Highways and Transport would allow the decision on the cessation of the 3-in-1 card to be reversed to promote greater use of public transport.

The amendment would be financed by not proceeding with the budget growth for feasibility work in support of the development and delivery of the capital programme (£0.850m) residing in the Finance Portfolio. Also, reducing the contingency budget by £1.050m from £3.204m to £2.154m.

The Council also wishes to have an early decision from the Cabinet Member on how the extra £3.3m Adult Social Care government grant is to be utilised, and resolves to request that the Leader sends a formal letter of support to the West Sussex Head teachers for their "Worthless" campaign for a fair funding formula from government for all schools in West Sussex.'

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

(a) For the amendment – 14

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mrs Millson, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mr R Rogers, Mr Sheldon, Mr Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

(b) Against the amendment - 38

Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Bennett, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Cloake,

Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr Griffiths, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Patel, Mr Peters, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mr Waight, Mr Watson and Mr Whittington.

(c) Abstentions – 4

Mr Glennon, Ms James, Mr G L Jones and Mrs Rapnik.

175 The amendment was lost.

176 Three amendments were moved on behalf of the Labour Group, as set out below, the cumulative effect of which on the 2017/18 budget if approved would have been as follows.

Item	Change £m	Balance £m
Remove charges in waste for soil, hard-core & plasterboard disposal	+0.800	95.531#
Emergency Fund for schools	+1.000	14.141#
Extra sum for Child Sexual Exploitation	+0.100	95.073#
No budget for feasibility study (re: capital prog)	-0.850	0
Reduced Contingency reduction	-1.050	2.154

new net budget at portfolio level for Residents' Services, Education and Skills and Children - Start of Life.

177 The first Labour amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Mr M G Jones and seconded by Mr Oxlade:

'Mainstream schools in West Sussex are considerably underfunded in comparison with those in other Local Authorities. They are currently the 148th lowest funded authority out of 151. The County Council receives funding through the Schools block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) at a rate of £4,198 per pupil in 2016/17. If mainstream schools in West Sussex were funded at the 2016/17 national average per pupil rate of £4,636, they would have received an additional £438 per pupil, which would equate to an additional £44.6m in total this year.

Schools are therefore under enormous financial pressure. Many of them have now exhausted what reserves they might have had and further or unexpected costs will have serious implications which they may not be able to cope with.

In 2016/17 the budget available to support maintained schools in financial difficulty was £0.384m. By the end of January much of this had been allocated to 29 schools with further allocations expected to be made before the end of this term.

The proposal is therefore to add to the current sum available to support

Minutes: Item 2

local authority maintained schools that can demonstrate a clear need to access temporary additional funding. The indicative budget for this scheme, which has been funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) by charging all maintained schools £2.50 per pupil in 2017/18, is £0.292m before this proposal. The proposed emergency fund would provide a further £1m taking the total available for this purpose to £1.292m. This extra £1m would sit within the County Council's budget rather than be part of the sum administered by the Education and Skills (Schools) forum.

The proposal is funded by reducing the base budget for contingency in 2017/18 from £3.204m to £2.204m.

Emergency Fund to support schools

Item	£m
Education and Skills Portfolio: Emergency Fund to support maintain school opening hours	+1.000
Non Portfolio: Less: Contingency reduction	-1.000
Net change to budget	0

178 The amendment was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the amendment – 19

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr Glennon, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mrs Millson, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Sheldon, Mr Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

(b) Against the amendment - 37

Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Bennett, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr Griffiths, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Patel, Mr Peters, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mr Waight and Mr Watson.

(c) Abstentions – 0

179 The amendment was lost.

180 The second Labour amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Mr M G Jones and seconded by Mr Quinn:

'During the course of 2016/17, new charges were introduced for waste disposal. This covered charging customers to dispose of, soil, hard-core, DIY and plasterboard waste. The full year expected income from this new charge (excluding charges in respect of tyres) is around £0.800m for next year. This amendment proposes to cancel those charges but retain the charges for tyres.

At a time when Council tax was being raised, the decision to impose charges for the disposal of domestic DIY waste introduced w.e.f. 1 October 2016 was opposed by the Labour Group and many other opposition members. A significant majority of residents were opposed to the introduction of these charges.

There are extremely serious doubts over the legality of local authorities imposing charges for household DIY waste which have been steadily growing over recent months. The Government is opposed to councils charging for domestic DIY waste and has stated recently it would look to take Ministerial action where it believes councils have been over-zealous in their application of charges. The decision to charge for domestic DIY waste is likely to be challenged in the future, potentially by judicial review, or even enforced by further legislation from the Government.

The reduction to these charges is funded by a proposal to reduce the growth item worth £0.850m in the Finance portfolio covering the feasibility budget in support of the development and delivery of the capital programme.

Eliminating Waste New Charges

Item	£m
Residents' Services Portfolio: No charge for soil, hard-core, DIY and plasterboard waste disposal	+0.800
Finance Portfolio: Less: Budget growth for feasibility study work	-0.800
Net change to budget	0

181 The amendment was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the amendment – 18

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr Glennon, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Sheldon, Mr Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

Minutes: Item 2

(b) Against the amendment - 34

Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Bennett, Mr Bradbury, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr Griffiths, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Patel, Mr Peters, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mr Waight and Mr Watson and Mr Whittington.

(c) Abstentions – 5

Mrs Arculus, Mr Brown, Mr Circus, Mrs Millson and Mrs Mockridge.

182 The amendment was lost.

183 The third Labour amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Mr Oxlade and seconded by Mr Quinn:

'This proposal has been put forward following legitimate concerns that, despite earlier strong policy statements from the County Council, that measures to support the area of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) for those at risk were either extremely close to, or over, capacity for the places currently available within the county. This amendment looks to enhance the current arrangements.

The sums identified are in three parts:

- (a) £20,000 to enable all year 8/9 pupils in West Sussex schools to attend a performance of 'Chelsea's Choice', which raises awareness of the risks of sexual exploitation; and enable those who have been exposed or maybe particularly vulnerable to access support from professionals afterwards;
- (b) £50,000 to fund a vital strategic partnership lead for CSE and adolescents with complex needs (in the event that partner funding currently being sought is not forthcoming);
- (c) £30,000 to expand the service for children and young people at high risk of, or experience, CSE.

Although the total support is £100,000 above, only (a) would certainly be a cost for 2017/18 to progress the work. Item (b) may be funded in full by partners subject to further work and negotiation and therefore may not be called on. Item (c) would only be called on if predictions that this will be a growth area by senior council officers are proved correct, and there is a need to expand the service provision for children and young people at high risk of or experience of CSE, over and above the current capacity caseload of 60 young people receiving support at any one time. For members' reference, this has already happened in at least one of the quarters of the last year.

The work is proposed to be funded by reducing by £50,000 the growth item (worth £0.850m) in the Finance portfolio covering the feasibility budget in support of the development and delivery of the capital programme. Funding would also be found by lowering the contingency budget by £50,000.

Extra Resources supporting those at risk of CSE

Item	£m
Children – Start of Life Portfolio: Child Sexual Exploitation	+0.100
Finance Portfolio: Less: Budget growth for feasibility study work	-0.050
Non Portfolio: Contingency reduction	-0.050
Net change to budget	0

184 The amendment was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the amendment – 18

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr Glennon, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mrs Millson, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mr R Rogers, Mr Sheldon, Mr Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

(b) Against the amendment - 37

Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Bennett, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr Griffiths, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Patel, Mr Peters, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mr Waight and Mr Watson.

(c) Abstentions – 1

Mrs Rapnik.

185 The amendment was lost.

186 The replacement recommendations, as circulated, were put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

Minutes: Item 2

(a) For the replacement recommendations – 35

Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Bennett, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr Griffiths, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr McAra, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Patel, Mr Peters, Mr Sheldon, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mr Watson and Mr Whittington.

(b) Against the replacement recommendations - 9

Mr Glennon, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mr Oxlade, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn and Mr Smith.

(c) Abstentions – 13

Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Oppler, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe, Mr Waight and Dr Walsh.

187 The replacement recommendations were carried.

188 Resolved –

- (1) That the Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be approved; and
- (2) That the County Council Draft Budget for 2017/18, as set out in the Budget Pack at Appendix 2 to the report, subject to the revised recommendations as set out below, be approved.

That, taking account of Council priorities, finance strategy, the Local Government Finance Settlement and the results of internal and external consultation, the following items be approved:

- (1) An increase in council tax comprising:
 - **2.00%** for **Adults' Social Care**, plus
 - **1.95%** to support **other services**,
 - making a total increase of **3.95%**
- (2) Net revenue expenditure of **£530.3m** (as set out in paragraph 3.1 and Table 1 of Appendix 2);
- (3) Service commitments and net additional funding of **£6.5m** (paragraph 3.1 and columns 3 and 7 of Table 2 of Appendix 2);
- (4) Expenditure savings and income generation of **£16.8m** (paragraph 4.8 and Table 3 of Appendix 2);

- (5) Capital expenditure for the core programme of **£145.3m** in 2017/18 (of which £27.8m relates to new activities that have not been previously approved) and £146.6m in 2018/19. Capital expenditure for the income generating initiatives of **£49.4m** in 2017/18 (of which £34.0m relates to new activities that have not been previously approved) and £73.4m for 2018/19 (paragraph 7.1 and Table 6 of Appendix 2);
- (6) Proposed methods of financing the capital expenditure (paragraphs 7.30 to 7.32 of Appendix 2);
- (7) For 2017/18 a maximum operational borrowing limit of £583.910m for outstanding debt and an authorised borrowing limit of £814.693m, to encompass the highest estimate of the operational boundary up to 2019/20 plus an additional £40m for short term borrowing (paragraphs 7.35 to 7.38, and Table 7 of Appendix 2);
- (8) A limit of 100% on borrowing at fixed rates and 25% on borrowing at variable rates (paragraph 7.38 of Appendix 2);
- (9) The Director of Finance, Performance and Procurement's assessment of the robustness of estimates and the adequacy of reserves (paragraph 8.1 of Appendix 2);
- (10) The following amounts be approved for the financial year 2017/18 in accordance with Section 42A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
- (a) That the budget requirement to meet net expenditure of the County Council for the financial year 2017/18 is **£530.308m**, and the council tax requirement for 2017/18 is **£404.861m**.
- (b) That the following sums be payable for the year into the County Council's revenue fund:
- | | |
|--|-----------|
| Settlement Funding Assessment | £101.708m |
| Business Rates Local Growth | £1.953m |
| Business Rate Cap Grant | £2.324m |
| Education Services Grant (ESG) | £2.189m |
| Transitional Grant | £6.254m |
| New Homes Bonus Grant | £5.017m |
| Adult Social Care Grant | £3.318m |
| School Improvement Grant | £0.428m |
| Net surplus from District and Borough Collection Funds | £2.256m |
- (c) The council tax base for the year 2017/18 is the aggregate amount calculated by the billing authorities to which the County Council issues precepts totalling 322,446.70 Band D equivalents.

Minutes: Item 2

- (d) The amount of council tax being the budget requirement at 10(a) above, less the amounts receivable in 10(b) above, all divided by the council tax base at 10(c) above, shall be **£1,255.59** to the nearest penny for Band D.
- (e) The amount of council tax payable for dwellings listed in a particular valuation band, calculated in accordance with the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, shall be as follows:

Valuation Band	Amount	Valuation Band	Amount
A	£837.06	E	£1,534.61
B	£976.57	F	£1,813.63
C	£1,116.08	G	£2,092.65
D	£1,255.59	H	£2,511.18

- (f) That the district councils be requested to make payments of sums due under precepts calculated in proportion to their council tax Band D equivalents as follows:

Adur District Council	£25,999,878.81
Arun District Council	£74,652,359.04
Chichester District Council	£65,188,223.86
Crawley Borough Council	£42,556,339.67
Horsham District Council	£74,870,957.26
Mid Sussex District Council	£74,095,002.64
Worthing Borough Council	£47,498,090.79

- (g) That the district councils be required to make payments of precept by equal instalments of the above sums due on or before:

13 April 2017	18 May 2017	22 June 2017
27 July 2017	31 August 2017	5 October 2017
9 November 2017	7 December 2017	11 January 2018
15 February 2018		

- (h) Additionally, it is noted that payments be made by the district and borough councils in respect of the estimated surplus on their collection funds on 31 March 2017:

	Council Tax	Business Rates
Adur District Council	£145,945.07	£43,495.00
Arun District Council	£897,000.00	£82,926.00
Chichester District Council	£181,951.00	See below
Crawley Borough Council	£302,587.00	See below
Horsham District Council	£1,173,179.00	£70,000.00
Mid Sussex District Council	£621,960.00	See below
Worthing Borough Council	£50,596.38	£6,503.00

And payments be made to the district councils in respect of the estimated deficits on their collection funds on 31 March 2017:

Chichester District Council	£349,346.00
Crawley Borough Council	£590,690.00
Mid Sussex District Council	£380,229.00

- (11)** Any change in funding resulting from the late announcement of the final local government finance settlement (now not expected until after the County Council meeting) will be applied to the budget management reserve.

189 Resolved -

- (1) That the Treasury Management Strategy 2017/18, as set out at the Annex to Appendix 3, be approved; and
- (2) That the investment policies approved for 2017/18 be implemented with immediate effect for the remainder of 2016/17.

Governance Committee: Pay Policy Statement 2017/18

190 The County Council considered the Pay Policy Statement 2017/18, in the light of the report by the Governance Committee (pages 442 to 455).

191 Resolved -

- (1) That the proposed revisions to the Pay Policy Statement, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved; and
- (2) That authority to approve any subsequent changes to the wording of the Pay Policy Statement relating to changes to legislation be delegated to the Director of Transformation, Customer and Support Services and the Director of Law and Assurance and that the Scheme of Delegation be amended accordingly.

Minutes: Item 2

Question Time

- 192** Members asked questions of members of the Cabinet on matters relevant to their portfolios and questioned the Leader on matters currently relevant to the County Council, as set out at Appendix 3. This included questions on those matters contained within the Cabinet report (pages 456 to 464 and a supplementary report (page 464A to B)) and written questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 15(2) (set out at Appendix 2).

Notice of Motion by Dr Walsh

- 193** The following motion was moved by Dr Walsh and seconded by Mrs Millson:

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

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

- 194** The motion was referred to the Leader for consideration.

Notice of Motion by Mr Glennon

- 195** The following motion was moved by Mr Glennon and seconded by Mr Smith:

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

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

- 196** The motion was referred to the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services for consideration.

Recorded vote on question of whether to waive Standing Order 14(4)

- 197** A request to waive Standing Orders 14(4) to remove the time guillotine to allow the motion by Mr M G Jones to be taken was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).

(a) For the waiver – 17

Mr Buckland, Mr Catchpole, Dr Dennis, Mrs Field, Mr M G Jones, Mr McAra, Mrs Millson, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Peters, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mr Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe, Dr Walsh and Mr Whittington.

(b) Against the waiver - 22

Mrs Arculus, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mr Circus, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Ms Goldsmith, Mr Hunt, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mrs Mockridge, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Waight and Mr Watson.

(c) Abstentions – 5

Mr Burrett, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mrs Jones and Mr Turner.

198 The request for a waiver was lost.

Notice of Motion by Mr M G Jones

199 The following motion by Mr M G Jones was deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time:

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

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

- (1) Put greater pressure on lobbying the Government to ensure that West Sussex schools have the funding they need to provide an excellent education for every one of its pupils; and
- (2) Ask every member to express their support for the continuing efforts of the Worthless campaign in calling on the Government to bring forward transitional funding in lieu of the outcome of the current Government consultation on the proposed national finding formula, to ensure that every pupil across West Sussex knows they are 'Worth Much More'.'

Chairman

The Council rose at 4.20 p.m.

Minutes: Item 2 - Appendix 1

Agenda Item No. 1 – Interests

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

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 5 – Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18 to 2020/21, Revenue Budget 2017/18, Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2021/22 and Treasury Management Strategy 2017/18	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
	Mr Griffiths	Governor of Northbrook College and Downlands Community School, Hassocks
	Mr M G Jones	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council
	Mr Oppler	Member of Arun District Council
	Mr Quinn	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mrs Rapnik	Member of Arun District Council
	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council, Trustee of Coastal West Sussex MIND, Vice-Chairman of Governors – St Mary’s Primary School Worthing, Governor – Alternative Provision College
	Mr Turner	Member of Worthing Borough Council
	Mr Waight	Member of Worthing Borough Council
Item 7 – CMQT Paragraph 3 (Mid Sussex District Deal)	Mr Barrett-Miles	Member of Burgess Hill Town Council, Mid Sussex District Council and Burgess Hill Development Board
	Mrs Jones	Member of Burgess Hill Town Council, Mid Sussex District Council

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 1

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 7 – CMQT paragraph 6 (Implementation of the Care Act 2014 - Carers)	Mr Catchpole	Spouse employed by West Sussex Carers Support
	Mr Griffiths	Registered Carer
Item 7 – CMQT paragraph 7 (Adult Social Care User Survey)	Mr Catchpole	Spouse employed by West Sussex Carers Support
	Mr Griffiths	Registered Carer
Item 7 – Education items	Mr Bradbury	Trustee of Sussex Learning Trust
Item 8(c) – Notice of Motion on School Funding	Mr Bradbury	Trustee of Sussex Learning Trust
	Mr R Rogers	Governor of Durrington High School

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

17 February 2017

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

Question

At its meeting on 18 January 2017 the Health and Social Care Select Committee (HASC) discussed the proposal to procure the externally provided part of the community reablement service which had been called-in.

As a result of additional information being provided ahead of that meeting members were told that the current provider had provided domiciliary care services for this authority despite this not being part of their contracted services. We were also told this had had an impact on their workforce capacity such that the budget for reablement had been under-spent by up to £0.5m during the recent past.

I would be grateful if the Cabinet Member could:

- (a) Advise whether evidence from the Department of Health still suggests that the same provider should not deliver both home care and reablement in the same area;
- (b) Confirm what procedures (e.g. legal advice) has to be followed when the County Council wishes to request that a provider delivers additional services which do not form part of their current contracted service;
- (c) Confirm that the appropriate procedures referred to in (b) above were indeed followed and are documented;
- (d) Confirm whether the reablement services provider is still providing services that do not form part of their current contracted services; and

If the answer to (d) is no, confirm when this arrangement began and ceased.

Answer

- (a) Having researched Department of Health guidance it has not been possible to find any evidence of this nature. However, the County Council's commissioners feel that in the right circumstances it could be possible to manage a provider supplying both home care and reablement, although the preferred approach would be to keep them separate. This is because such a contract would be more complex to manage and would need to clearly set out the difference in services provided and the costs for each element supplied. The County Council would want to also retain control over how referrals were made to each service.
- (b) Whilst the delivery of care at home is not explicitly covered in the current reablement contract, it is usual in this type of arrangement to have clauses in the contract to enable the County Council to have some flexibility, in order to come to arrangements for the delivery of similar services. All

contracts that are let are formally reviewed by The County Council's legal services.

In this case the flexibility was used in order to support the pressures on care at home providers in supplying support to people to prevent a build-up of delayed discharges, so as to free up capacity in local hospitals. The alternative would be for the customer to be at home without services and/or to be retained in hospital or admitted to residential care.

- (c) As indicated in (b), the clause around providing flexibility is within the current reablement contract and has been used to enable the provider to provide care at home to particular named individuals and is monitored accordingly.
- (d) As indicated in (b), the clause, as set out in the contract, enables on-going discussions with the provider for the provision of similar services for the duration of the contract. The present provider is currently providing care at home services to particular customers to ease the pressures in local hospitals, as described above.

2. Written question from Ms James for reply by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations

Question

The issues with Direct Access have now been ongoing for some months, where certain users are unable to connect outside of a County Council office to the County Council's network. It appears that the County Council's IT contractor, Capita, has been unable to provide a long-term solution. The problem, which affects both staff and members, is frustrating, affects productivity and is detrimental in terms of time and cost in travelling to a County Council site to connect to the network to apply a 'fix' which does not have a permanent effect. Can the Cabinet Member:

- (a) Provide the reasons given by County Council's IT contractor, Capita, as to why the Direct Access IT issue has continued to be a problem for so long and why promises to fix the issue have been consistently unmet?
- (b) Reassure members and staff that there is not a more serious, underlying problem with the County Council's IT server; and
- (c) Advise if Capita are prepared to make up the costs where productivity has been lost through such problems as evidenced from the Direct Access issue and other County Council server problems?

Answer

- (a) Direct Access was deployed to all County Council laptops by January 2015. Since then there have been three technical issues that have impacted users:

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

- From April 2016 some Internet Service Providers changed the set up on their home routers. A number made their changes during April and May 2016, others made changes throughout the period April to December 2016. These changes required adjustments to be made to the way Direct Access was set up on each laptop. Different users experienced problems at different times depending on when and if their Internet Service Provider updated the home router.
 - During October and November 2016 the Direct Access software was updated from Direct Access 2008 to Direct Access 2012. Though testing with a pilot group identified no significant issues with the upgrade, as it was deployed to the wider user base some configuration problems arose for some users. Not all users were impacted by these changes as it was deployed at different times on the various servers that provide the Direct Access service.
 - In January 2017 a previously unreported error in the server configuration software implemented unintended changes to the Direct Access server software. This impacted all users for part of a day.
- (b) There are no known serious, underlying problems with the technology base used to provide Direct Access. The Direct Access solution has been tested and accredited by HM Government agencies. It includes the software on laptops and server equipment installed on both the public and secure sides of the County Council's firewalls. These servers are provided as clusters of virtual servers that are designed to manage peaks and troughs of activity and server availability runs at more than 99.5%.
- (c) The contract with Capita defines Service Level Agreements and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that define target response times when dealing with major incidents and problems. Failure to meet KPIs will result in the payment of service credits from Capita to the County Council. The Direct Access problems have contributed to a service credit payment for January 2017.
- 3. Written question from Mr Smytherman for reply by the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills**

Question

Regarding the impact of Dyscalculia on Maths education in West Sussex, does the Cabinet Member:

- (a) Know what Dyscalculia is and how this can impact on Maths tests results in our schools?
- (b) What is the percentage of students in West Sussex schools that suffer with Dyscalculia and what is the breakdown for Worthing?
- (c) What support is there in West Sussex schools for students who suffer from Dyscalculia?

- (d) What are officers are doing to help improve the lack of knowledge of Dyscalculia in schools in West Sussex?
- (e) What statistics are available for primary schools in the county to show the young people with poor grades in maths and a diagnosis of Dyscalculia?
- (f) What is the Cabinet Member doing to raise awareness about Dyscalculia to improve our Maths test results compared to Dyslexia?

Attached is a link to a website and tests for background information:
<https://www.understood.org/en/learning-attention-issues/child-learning-disabilities/dyscalculia/understanding-dyscalculia>

Answer

- (a) There is not an agreed definition for Dyscalculia. Therefore, West Sussex works with this definition from the National Numeracy Strategy:

'A condition that affects the ability to acquire mathematical skills. Dyscalculic learners may have difficulty understanding simple number concepts, lack an intuitive grasp of numbers, and have problems learning number facts and procedures. Even if they produce a correct answer or use a correct method, they may do so mechanically and without confidence.'

- (b) This data is not centrally collected.
- (c) Individual pupils with maths difficulties can be referred to the Learning and Behaviour Team or the Educational Psychology Service for advice on how to support the pupil. The Learning and Behaviour Team delivers free training regularly on Dyscalculia/ Maths difficulties throughout the county - centrally and in schools and localities.

Training and consultations highlight suitable assessments; research-based interventions, and develop the theoretical understanding of staff about why pupils struggle in maths and how they best learn maths. Schools are using a number of research based interventions to support pupils, which all involve training for staff.

- (d) The Learning and Behaviour Team are delivering regular training about Dyscalculia/ Maths difficulties centrally and in schools and localities where requested.
- (e) This data is not centrally collected.
- (f) In October 2016 the Cabinet Member approved the County Council's Special Educational Needs & Disability Strategy which aims to ensure that local early years, mainstream and special educational provision is effective, of a high quality and delivers the best educational outcomes for children and young people with SEND, which includes children with dyscalculia. In addition, the Learning and Behaviour Team take every opportunity to raise awareness of dyscalculia in their work with schools.

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

4. Written question from **Mrs Mullins** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance**

Question

I understand that as of 31 March 2016 there were 13 schools with deficits (up from seven the previous year) with a combined deficit of £261,000. In September the Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee was informed that eight of the 13 schools in deficit at March 2016 were expected to recover from them by March 2017, with five remaining in deficit. In addition, a further 11 additional schools (nine primary, two secondary) were expected to incur a deficit during 2016/17, which would leave 16 schools in deficit at 31 March 2017. I would be grateful if the Cabinet Member could provide an update on the position regarding schools currently in deficit and those likely to incur a deficit as of 31 March 2017.

At the time of writing, it is understood the Cabinet Member will publish a proposed decision on school funding for 2017/18 which will see the West Sussex Scheme for Financing Schools amended such that deficit budgets are converted to loans for repayment and that any outstanding loan, when a school converts to an academy, will in future be repaid in full or be transferred to sponsored academies. I would be grateful if the Cabinet Member could provide details of the total amount of deficit budgets that sponsored academies left as a charge to this authority since the academisation of schools in West Sussex began.

Answer

Licensed Deficits - As at 31 March 2016 there were 13 schools in deficit, with a combined deficit of £0.261m. Of these, eight schools were able to set a budget for 2016/17 which also enabled them to payback their deficit, and the remaining five requested a licensed deficit for the current financial year. A further nine schools were unable to set a balanced budget for 2016/17 and, therefore, also requested a licensed deficit.

In total the 14 schools were given approval for a licensed deficit of £0.985m, with an expectation that £0.582m of this would be saved, as part of their agreed recovery plans, in 2016/17:

Phase	Number 03/16	Licensed Deficit	Year 1 Saving	Number 03/17	Forecast Deficit 31/03/17
Primary	10	£0.695m	£0.484m	9	£0.211m
Secondary	3	£0.268m	£0.098m	3	£0.170m
Special	1	£0.022m	nil	1	£0.022m
Total	14	£0.985m	£0.582m	13*	£0.403m

* One primary school planned to clear its deficit in 2016/17

The latest forecast year end position is that six schools (five primary and one secondary) will have been able to clear their deficit, and the deficit balance at the end of the financial year for the remaining 8 schools is expected to be £0.330m.

Deficits on Conversion

Currently, any school converting to academy status takes its balance, be it positive or negative. However, any school becoming a sponsored academy by means of an Academy Order applied for by the governing body, under the Academies Act 2010, takes any surplus, but any deficit is left as a charge to the Local Authority.

Since 2009, when the academisation of schools in West Sussex began, there have been 8 schools that have become a sponsored academy with a closing deficit balance. The total value of these deficits is £1.534m, and these costs have been picked up by the County Council.

5. Written question from **Mrs Mullins** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance**

Question

The Cabinet Member will recall that at the County Council meeting in July 2016, I asked for information about the premises across the County previously used to provide youth services to help members understand whether they were still in use and what the County Council planned to do with them.

At the time I was told that a review of the County Council's property assets was being undertaken and a Strategic Asset Management Plan would be produced. I was given to understand that members would have sight of the plan by October 2016; however, nothing seems to have materialised. I would be grateful if the Cabinet Member could advise me:

- (a) What the following assets are currently being used for and what are the future plans for these sites:
 - (i) Old Court Lodge School site, Cuckfield;
 - (ii) County buildings, Exchange Road, Crawley.
- (b) When work on the property asset review and Strategic Asset Management Plan was commissioned and when it was due to be completed by;
- (c) When work on these actually commenced and when he anticipates these being finalised; and
- (d) When members will have an opportunity to see it.

Answer

- (a) (i) Old Court Lodge School site, Cuckfield
The premises known as Court Meadow, on the site in Cuckfield, are currently vacant.

A feasibility study is being commissioned to assess the options available to the Council for the future of the site. This work will

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

include an assessment of the current and future needs of the Council's Services for accommodation on the site.

(ii) County Buildings, Exchange Road, Crawley

Currently the County Council leases part of the County Buildings site to a dental practice; the remaining parts of the site are vacant.

Work is being undertaken to accommodate a temporary Coroners Court on the top floor of Centenary House. Consideration is also being given to accommodating the 'Find it Out' Service who currently lease a building in the town centre. Discussions are also taking place with one of the County Council commissioned service providers to take the remaining space on the ground floor of Centenary House. This is a temporary use for three to five years.

The future of the site is being reviewed and is part of the West Sussex One Public Estate programme (the County Council and Crawley Borough Council are working closely on a range of town centre initiatives identified in the Growth Deal including proposals for this area of the town).

(b) Combined response with (c) below.

(c) Work on the Asset Strategy commenced in November 2016 and will progress through 2017. The development work involves making site-visits to all assets owned by the County Council (in excess of 1,000) and working with services on their asset demand/requirement identified through service planning. This is a significant piece of work which is likely to conclude by the end of the 2017/18 financial year.

Previous work on developing an asset strategy was discontinued because it had become clear that the data gathering and survey work needing to be undertaken, to produce a robust and up to date strategy, was beyond the scope of the previous exercise.

(d) The Performance and Finance Select Committee will be updated on the strategy and progress being made as appropriate.

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

Question

Can the Cabinet Member advise:

(a) If the rate of the cost of disposal per tonne of waste is satisfactory declining; and

(b) Therefore, does this demonstrate that the County Council's strategy for waste disposal is fit for purpose relative to our peer council groups?

Answer

- (a) The ongoing work, undertaken by County Council waste management officers, in managing the waste treatment and disposal contracts, will ensure that the waste treatment and disposal costs for household waste continue to decrease compared to previous years. Successful delivery of the Refuse Derived Fuel offtake contract (procurement underway) will further reduce the County Council's waste disposal costs in future years.
- (b) This demonstrates that the County Council's waste treatment and disposal contracts are fit for purpose, are robustly managed and monitored and continue to provide value for money. This in turn helps to ensure that the strategic objectives and outputs required as part of the Joint Municipal Resource Management Strategy are being delivered efficiently and provide value for money. Any direct comparison to the County Council's peer county groups will be dependent on the scope, scale and contract details of their respective waste treatment and disposal contracts.

7. Written question from Ms James for reply by the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services

Question

Flytipping is a blight wherever it occurs and, in particular, when it affects the highly vaunted beauty of rural West Sussex, which is being adversely affected by changes in the Household Waste Recycling Sites (HWRSs), following the Cabinet Member's decision in October 2016 to close mobile sites in Chichester district, implement changes to hours and close many sites on some days of the week, as well charging residents at all sites for the disposal of certain non-household and DIY waste. The County Council cannot hide behind the fact that we have commissioned District and Borough authorities to clear up the flytipping, yet it is our responsibility to determine the overall HWRS strategy.

Can the Cabinet Member provide the annualised savings from the closure of the HWRSs relative to the increase in costs borne by district and borough authorities for dealing with flytipping and also the costs to the County Council in disposing of that flytipped waste (e.g. at Hambrook, the cost borne by Chichester District Council, and the cost incurred by County Council to dispose of flytipped waste).

Answer

The County Council has not commissioned the district and borough councils to clear fly tipped waste. This function and statutory duty is and always has been the responsibility of the districts and borough councils.

Where the risk of increased instances of fly tipping in the county was considered as part of the proposed changes, County Council officers have been liaising closely with district and borough council partners prior to and since the introduction of the changes to services and requesting fly tipping data and intelligence on a monthly basis. It is largely agreed by all district and borough councils that the increases in instances being reported cannot be directly attributed to the changes

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

made at our sites and all increases in fly tipping are in line with the annual increases being experienced in West Sussex (and across the UK).

In addition to this, the County Council is providing additional resources by recruiting two waste enforcement officers to assist the boroughs and districts in the identification of those responsible for fly tipping and to strengthen the individual and collective enforcement function in the county.

For the whole of 2016, with a few exceptions and anomalies, statistics show an increase for all months for all district and borough councils when compared to the corresponding month in 2015. With the exception of Chichester District Council the data shows a consistent increase in the instances of fly tipping in 2016 both before and after the introduction of the changes at the County Council's Household Waste Recycling Sites (HWRS) in October 2016. Chichester District Council is known to be experiencing increases in the instances of fly tips containing;

- Green Waste (which is not a chargeable waste stream at the HWRS);
- Asbestos, which may be as a result of Hampshire County Council introducing a charge for this waste stream as part of its own austerity measures in October 2016 (West Sussex County Council does not charge for the disposal of asbestos at its HWRS); and
- Builders' rubble, being illegally deposited by contractors.

County Council officers are working with Chichester District Council colleagues to identify why this increase has occurred and to determine where these fly tips have originated. Annual savings from County and departmental budgets that are expected, as a result of all the changes to the scope and scale of HWRS service provision, are stated within the Cabinet Member decision report but in summary are: £166,000 for the reduction in the Chichester mobile service and £600,000 for the change in opening hours/days at the HWRS.

Collectively, the borough and district councils spent an estimated:

- £199,000 in 2014 for the clearance of 4,170 fly tips.
- £205,000 in 2015 for the clearance of 4,310 fly tips.

As the recording of fly tips, actions and costs now forms part of Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs waste data flow recording process, the fly tip collection costs for October – December 2016 are not yet available but based on January – September 2016 data, it can be forecast that an estimated, collective cost in the region of £225,000 will be made for the clearance of a forecast 4,800 fly tips.

For the same period, the County Council spent the following on the disposal of this fly-tipped waste £374,000 in 2014, £265,000 in 2015 and an estimated £258,000 in 2016. The reduction in 2016 is as a result of lower fly tip tonnages i.e. each fly tip is on average smaller than the previous year.

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

Question

Answering a question last year on the Selsey Academy Fire, the Cabinet Member stated that "lots of other fire engines turned up within a few minutes of each other".

Is he aware that a Freedom of Information request shows that it took nearly three hours before the requisite numbers of appliances arrived? The true figures were: 1st appliance - 18 minutes; 4 appliances - 31 minutes; 8 appliances - 1 hour 5 minutes; 14 appliances - 2 hours 56 minutes.

Would he admit that such delays are unacceptable, and what measures will he take to improve the situation?

Answer

The question states that it took nearly three hours before the requisite number of appliances were in attendance. This is misleading as the incident commanders requested additional appliances as the incident progressed.

The first assistance message requesting six appliances ('make pumps 6') was sent at 08:12:16. A further assistance message was sent at 08:26 requesting 10 appliances ('make pumps 10'). At 08:44 there were seven fire engines and one Aerial Ladder Platform in attendance at the incident, 18 minutes after the make pumps 10 assistance message and 52 minutes after the initial call.

The incident commander sent his final assistance message to 'make pumps 14' at 10:13 which was two hours and 21 minutes after the time of call. The incident log shows that there were 14 fire engines in attendance at the incident at 10:36, 23 minutes after that request.

Recruiting of Retained Duty System (RDS) firefighters is a particular challenge experienced by the Fire and Rescue Service, which, for Selsey is made more challenging by its geographical location. The service is making efforts to improve the appliance availability at Selsey. A recruitment drop-in event was held at Selsey for prospective RDS recruits on the 28 January where five people registered their interest to become RDS.

A 'have-a-go day' was held on 29 January in Storrington which was attended by one person from Selsey. There are three prospective RDS recruits from Selsey attending the testing day on 22 February. If all candidates are successful it will result in improved appliance availability in Selsey.

Note: Answer revised since original publication due to an inaccuracy in the data.

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 2

9. Written question from Dr Walsh for reply by the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services

Question

The target response times in West Sussex for the Fire and Rescue Service to arrive at critical fires is set at 8-14 minutes, with a requirement to achieve that in at least 80% of cases. In similar rural counties the following targets are set, which apply to ALL locations in those fire service areas. Hampshire - 8 minutes; Kent, Norfolk, Surrey, Devon and Somerset - 10 minutes; in Suffolk and Oxfordshire - 11 minutes.

Is the Cabinet Member happy that we have lower target figures than other similar counties, and that the latest figures show that 25% of incidents wait more than 13 minutes in West Sussex?

Answer

The comparison of response standards with other Fire and Rescue Services is not as straightforward as it may first appear. This is due not only to the way that the response standard is measured but it is also influenced by the geography of the Services being compared, therefore comparisons cannot be considered like for like. West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service has a sophisticated risk model that is the basis for the response standard for the county.

The response standard for West Sussex is different from a significant number of other Services, in that the clock is started at the moment that the 999 call is received at the control centre. This means that the public can be clear that the time being measured includes the time that they have spent on the phone requesting assistance. This 'call handling' time is expected to be no more than two minutes. In many other Services the response standard is measured from the time that the first appliance required is alerted and does not include the call handling time.

The next factor in the comparison between the response standards set by other Fire and Rescue Services is the actual achievement against those standards. West Sussex set stretch targets that are met or are very close to being met. Some of the other Services mentioned are a number of percentage points away from achieving the standard that they have set.

The final point is to consider the complexities of measuring response standards across counties that vary considerably. Areas that have significant conurbations will often have a greater achievement of their response standard due to the higher activity within these more densely populated areas. This produces a high proportion of relatively short journeys, which has a disproportionate effect on the overall measurement.

10. Written question from Dr Walsh for reply by the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services

Question

In an answer to a previous question, the Cabinet Member stated "Hampshire Fire & Rescue don't actually come a great deal into West Sussex; approximately it's about 50 times every year".

Would he accept that the true figure is 3 times what he told the Council, at an average of 145 times per year. And that Hampshire also standby, at times, at West Sussex fire stations, and these figures are not included?

Answer

The response quoted above was made at the Council meeting in April 2016 in response to Ms James' question relating to Hampshire responses into West Sussex. Ms James' comments related specifically to the Bourne Division and I responded from my own general knowledge that Hampshire Fire and Rescue only enter West Sussex occasionally. In answering that, "approximately, it's about 50 times every year", I was referring to responses into Bourne from Emsworth, which for 2014/15 was 51 occasions. The next available appliance into that area from Hampshire is likely to be from Havant, which responded 47 times into the county in 2014/15. The total mobilisations of Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service into West Sussex are as follows:

2014/15:	151
2015/16:	142

Please note that a mobilised appliance may be cancelled prior to arrival at the location of the incident.

The figures given do not include stand-by moves as these are currently not recorded due to an anomaly of the current mobilising system used in Sussex Control Centre.

Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

Agenda Item No. 7 - Question Time

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

The Economy

Leader

The Leader answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 3, Mid Sussex District Deal, from Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Evans, Mrs Jones and Mr Watson.

Results of consultation on the A27, from Mrs Evans.

School funding, from Mr Evans and Dr Walsh.

In response to a question from Dr Walsh about whether the Leader had sought a cross-party meeting with Nick Gibb, the Schools Minister and West Sussex MP, the Leader said she would be happy to do so.

Later Life

Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health

The Cabinet Member answered questions on residential care beds in Crawley, from Mr Quinn.

In response to a question from Mr Quinn about when Crawley would see an increase in the number of residential care beds and how many there would be during 2017/18, the Cabinet Member said that as the investment in partnership work in the north of the county developed he would involve Mr Quinn in the work.

Stronger Communities

Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 8, Roads Funding 2017/18, from Dr Walsh.

Paragraph 11, Body-Worn Cameras, from Mrs Kitchen and Mr Smytherman.

In response to a request from Mr Smytherman for the issue of a camera to Durrington Infant School to be transferred to Thomas A Becket Junior School as the position of lollipop person at Durrington Infant School was currently vacant, the Cabinet Member said he was happy to do so but asked Mr Smytherman to submit a written request.

Essential public transport infrastructure, from Dr Dennis.

In response to a request from Dr Dennis that the County Council should continue to provide and maintain essential public transport infrastructure, such as bus stations and 'real time' information system, the Cabinet Member said he would look into what the County Council was responsible for and respond to Dr Dennis.

Adequate on-street parking, from Mr Buckland.

In response to a request from Mr Buckland for the Cabinet Member to lobby the Government about on-street car parking for a policy change to stop development happening without providing adequate parking spaces, the Cabinet Member said he would be happy to make a representation to the effect that planning legislation should ensure adequate parking standards and state minimum as well as maximum levels.

Cabinet Member for Residents' Services

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 18, Better Connected Project, from Mr Bradbury and Mr Griffiths.

Mr Griffiths asked the Cabinet Member to commend the BT team following visits by the local project manager to address two parish councils in his division which had been very well received. The Cabinet Member said he would pass on his thanks to the team.

Paragraph 19, Retained Firefighters Recruitment, from Mr Smith.

In response to a question from Mr Smith about how many retained firefighters there would be at the Selsey Fire Station from the end of February 2017, the Cabinet Member said he would find out and let Mr Smith know.

Effective Council

Cabinet Member for Finance

The Cabinet Member answered questions on school funding from the Education and Skills portfolio, from Mr Buckland.

In response to a question about what was happening about funding for SEN or SEBD schools, the Cabinet Member for Finance he would respond to Mr Buckland.