

## **West Sussex County Council – Agenda Item No. 7 – Written Questions**

---

**24 March 2017**

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

### **Question**

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

Therefore, can the Leader please comment on the following:

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

### **Answer**

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

The Leader was advised of the work that had been undertaken in relation to the Council's payments and accounting systems. The Compliance Team within Corporate Finance have, since February 2015, conducted a monthly review of financial transactions including a check for duplicate invoice payments on a monthly basis. A report is run by the One Way to Buy

(OWTB) team and then passed to the Compliance team who collate an Actual Duplicate Payment report. The report runs a comparison of data from the current month and looks back a year and a month for duplicates (and so, in January 2015 the report started with a six-month look back to July 2014). Internal Audit have commented that the control environment provides robust controls, with the Compliance Team monitoring the action taken by the teams to correct the duplicate payments when identified and the time it takes to recover the duplicate payment.

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

(c) and (d)

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

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

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

### **Question**

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

Please can the Leader advise:

- (a) So far, what has been the cost to the County Council of the preparation for devolution and the 3SC bid;
- (b) So far, what has been the 'overall' cost of the preparation for devolution and the 3SC bid;
- (c) What is the predicted future cost to the County Council to implement devolution in full;

- (d) What is the predicted 'overall' future cost to implement devolution in full; and
- (e) Taking aside the fact that the process is currently in abeyance, what were the predicted timescales for implementation of devolution.

## **Answer**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Question**

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

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

Therefore, could the Leader:

- (a) Advise what steps can be taken to improve the advice offered to local business in relation to the future opportunities from Brexit, working in conjunction with government bodies; and
- (b) Comment on whether there are any plans for a 'Brexit office' dedicated to that intent at West Sussex County Council.

**Answer**

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

advice to businesses. We will be able to take a clearer view on the role we may play in due course, as the terms of the Brexit deal and any associated issues for our businesses become clearer.

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

**Question**

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

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

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

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

Can the Leader comment on the following:

- (a) Does she accept that the figures she quoted for the implementation cost and implementation period were incorrect;
- (b) Can she state what benefits the people of West Sussex would get from the possibility of receiving significant savings of anywhere between £13m and £29m per year (depending on the options of one unitary authority or two unitary authorities, and after implementation); and

- (c) Now that she properly understands the research, will she agree to invest £250,000 in a feasibility study for unitary authority status in West Sussex.

### **Answer**

- (a) The figures quoted during the debate were taken from the County Councils Network (CCN) website and are not my figures. I quoted accurately the figure for the cost of implementing unitary councils across all 27 shire counties although I should have made explicit what that number referred to. In terms of the implementation period the CCN's report quotes a range of periods and during the debate I referred to my own experience of implementing major organisational change.
- (b) There are far too many 'ifs' in the question and what is also missing is a realistic cost of implementation. It is suggested that a 'mid-point' cost is 'only £12m' or 'only £16m'. West Sussex is one of the larger shire counties and so is likely to incur greater costs in addition to the long period of disruption to secure speculative longer term savings. I cannot indulge such speculation. The significant losses to the residents of West Sussex, however, would be the distraction caused to our elected councillors in dealing with local government reorganisation when we need to focus on services and the priorities our residents have identified. When local people are asked what their priorities are for the use of the Council taxes they pay, local government reorganisation over several years is not on the list.
- (c) The research does not persuade me that such an exercise would be a sensible use of precious council tax and officer resources at a time when we should be focusing on what matters to our residents. I do not think it right to spend a quarter of a million pounds to devise a proposal to spend another £16m on something our residents do not want or need.

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

### **Question**

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

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

- (a) Does she regret her decision not to support a Public Forum in early 2016 and would she agree that through that one poor decision an opportunity

was lost to help the community to become more unified during the consultation process; and

- (b) Would she also agree that the lack of a Forum has contributed to a lack of transparency during the Chichester consultation process and has facilitated disunity amongst the community. This disunity has been seized upon by, Chris Grayling, Secretary of State for Transport, as a reason for him to cancel any A27 Chichester improvements; and
- (c) For the record, can she outline the dates, from the beginning of 2016 and throughout the consultation process, when she and/or the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport met with:
  - (i) Highways England; and
  - (ii) Chichester District Council, including opposition group members from West Sussex County Council.
- (d) For the record, can she outline what engagement she had, to promote collaboration, with the following:
  - (i) Parish and Town Councils across the Chichester area; and
  - (ii) Various lobby groups; and
  - (iii) Landowners

### **Answer**

- (a) The question is nothing more than a political confection based on the questioner's distorted account of events. The questioner identifies a decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport and then asks me whether I regret that decision by reference to more recent events unknowable at the time. I cannot be asked whether I regret something I did not do based on something I could not have known. The question is preposterous.
- (b) The second element of the question is inviting me to indulge in entirely fanciful speculation. How is it possible for me or any other person to speculate about what difference could have been made to the thoughts and minds of the residents of Chichester by something that did not happen during a process that has now passed using the false premise of the Secretary of State's decision. The question is misguided.
- (c) I am not able to speak for the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport but, as far as my own meetings with the named organisations are concerned they were as follows:
  - (i) With Highways England's officers – mostly with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport in attendance on 19 January, 29 February, 19 April, 9 and 14 June and 24 November 2016.

- (ii) I was invited to and attended a meeting organised by Chichester District Council on 25/1/16 which included senior members at the District Council and a number of officers from both councils.
- (d) (i) I have regular contact with parish and town councils across my division and across Chichester.
  - (ii) It is not clear what lobby groups are being referred to.
  - (iii) There are many landowners across Chichester. I had no reason to have direct contact with any of them as part of my work in connection with the A27 consultation process undertaken by Highways England.

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

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

**Question**

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

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

Please can the Cabinet Member comment on the following:

- (a) What has been the estimated cost to the County Council in terms of criminal damage to County Council property and the full costs for managing flytipping within our county; since the beginning of 2016 to the present; and
- (b) What representation has been made to the Police and Crime Commissioner regarding these changes to local policing, and what representations, if any, have been made regarding a return to locally

available policing, so that proper local relationships can be built with officers who know their local area and can stop crime escalating.

## Answer

- (a) There is a very low and intermittent level of criminal damage to the County Council's buildings with no reportable costs. Unfortunately, the greatest impact of this low level damage comes from some of our vulnerable clients as opposed to any criminal activity by members of the public. The other area of cost incurred by the County Council is the intrusion and damage to our vacant property sites. Costs include security patrols/cameras and Heras fencing on our vacant sites and remedial repairs following damage or trespass. The County Council has spent £69,705 on security for vacant sites during the 2016/17 financial year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question**

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

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

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

- (f) What are the identified pressures on performance in 2017, given the predicted increase in school numbers, as projected in the Planning School Places 2017 publication.

## Answer

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

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

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

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

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

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

## GCSE

### West Sussex

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

### South East

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

### National

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

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

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

### A level

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

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

Data source: DfE SFR05/2017

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

		Biologica l Sciences	Chemistry	Physics	Other Science	Mathema tics	English	French	German	Spanish	Other modern languages
<b>A* to E grades</b>											
England (inc FE colleges)		98.50%	98.46%	97.85%	98.40%	98.79%	99.68%	99.47%	99.65%	99.48%	98.98%
State-funded sector		98.48%	98.32%	97.64%	98.32%	98.70%	99.67%	99.38%	99.57%	99.45%	98.47%
South East		98.43%	98.32%	97.66%	98.19%	98.83%	99.65%	99.48%	99.58%	99.64%	98.80%
West Sussex		97.76%	99.13%	97.92%	98.21%	98.67%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.82%	100.00%
West Sussex rank (South East)	out of 19	14	5	10	10	12	1	1	1	17	1
West Sussex rank (National)	out of 152	116	45	79	55	92	1	1	1	117	1

For A\* to E, West Sussex shares a rank of 1 with several other LAs achieving 100%

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

### **GCSE**

Ranking out of 151 nationally

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

Ranking out of 19 South East counties

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

Shire+ Ranking out of 34

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

### **A level**

Area	West Sussex ranking
South East	8
National	54

- (c) **The Performance Dashboard**

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

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

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

- It has been recognised nationally that the Writing interim frameworks were published late and then revised and republished to schools in the spring of 2016, just ahead of the assessment process. This was due to some confusion between guidance issued by the DfE and the Standards and Testing Agency (STA).

- West Sussex moderation assessors adhered closely to the rules in the framework, which was acknowledged by the STA. The STA has recognised that the outcomes across all local authorities were varied and the results from this first year of the frameworks are seen as 'anomalous'. This has been agreed by the teaching unions.
- A lot of schools, but not all, accessed a range of national training for teaching the National Curriculum and its assessment, but there appears to be a weakness in the provision of specialist subject guidance. This is being addressed through the West Sussex School Improvement Strategy 2016.

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

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

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

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

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

**Question**

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

Legislation is drastically reducing the amount of fossil fuels used and given that 80% need to stay in the ground there is a strong risk of fossil fuel firms having

reserves that cannot be used, which will result in stranded assets.

## **Answer**

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

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

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

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

### **Question**

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

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

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

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

- (a) Advise what investment is being made to the cycling lanes across the county, and specifically the 'Chemroute' which is the main thoroughfare from Chichester to Emsworth and which suffers from incomplete cycling lanes along its route; and
- (b) Further outline the investment being made to:

- (i) All main arterial roads including those serving Chichester (including the 'Chemroute'), with regard to improvements to the cycling lanes;
- (ii) When this investment will actually occur; and
- (iii) What specific scope it will take.

## **Answer**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question**

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

**Answer**

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

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

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

The 5 fires in airport buildings were as follows:

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

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

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

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

The two fires in airport buildings were:

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