

West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

13 February 2015

At an Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 13 February 2015, at Chichester College, Chichester, the members present being:

Mrs A J Jupp (Chairman)

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

Executive Director Residents' Services, Director of Customer Service and Director of Highways and Transport

168 On behalf of members, the Chairman welcomed Cathryn James, Amanda Anderson and Nicola Debnam, three new members of the senior management team, to the Council meeting.

Minutes

Apologies and attendance

169 Apologies were received from Mrs Bennett and Mr Rae. Mrs Brunsdon left at 3.24 p.m., Mr Sheldon left at 3.25 p.m., Mr Patel left at 3.30 p.m. and Mr Buckland, Mrs Jones, Mr Oppler and Mr Petch left at 4.20 p.m.

Interests

170 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

Minutes

171 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 19 January 2015 (pages 409 to 416) be approved as a correct record.

Review of Proportionality

172 The County Council was reminded of its statutory duty to review the proportionality on its committees following Mr Petch's recent change in group affiliation. A paper on the application of the proportionality rules and how they were applied was set out at pages 417 and 418 together with a table showing the number of seats on committees.

173 Resolved –

That the review of proportionality on committees be agreed.

Appointments to Committees

174 The following changes to appointments were made which took effect from the end of the meeting:

Committee	Change
Appeals Panel	Mr Barnard to fill vacancy Mr Circus to fill vacancy Mr Tyler to fill vacancy
Corporate Parenting Panel	Mr Griffiths in place of Mr Barling
Children and Young People's Services Select Committee	Mr R J Oakley to fill vacancy
Environmental and Community Services Select Committee	Mr Barnard in place of Mr R J Oakley
Performance and Finance Select Committee	Remove Mr Acraman Add Mr McAra
Rights of Way Committee	Mr Bradbury in place of Mr Barling
Standards Committee	Mr Barnard in place of Mr Barling

Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and Draft Budget 2015/16 to 2018/19 and Treasury Management Strategy 2015/16

- 175** The Council agreed to waive Standing Order 14(1) to allow a change to the order of business so that the item could be debated in the morning session.
- 176** The Leader moved the report on the Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and Draft Budget 2015/16 to 2018/19 (pages 419 to 422).
- 177** The Cabinet Member for Finance moved the report on the Draft Budget (pages 1 to 34 of Appendix 2) subject to a correction sheet which had been circulated and set out minor changes to the budget as a result of the final local government finance settlement and late notification from borough and district councils of funding information and contained a set of revised recommendations, together with the draft budget pack. The Cabinet Member also moved the report on the Treasury Management Strategy (pages 95 to 124 of Appendix 2).
- 178** The following amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Mr Glennon and seconded by Ms James:

	£m	£m
Total net expenditure in original recommendations		528.886
Additional one-off spending for 2015/16:		
Adult Social Care		
Professional Development Programme	2.000	
Children's Social Care		
Professional Development Programme	0.850	
Missing Children and CSE Research Study	0.150	
TOTAL ADDITIONAL SPENDING		3.000
One-off funding:		
Reduction in monies transferred to Infrastructure Reserve	-3000	
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FUNDING		-3.000
Revised total net expenditure		528.886

This budget amendment sets out to provide an additional £3m of resources for an absolutely vital social care investment, funded by transferring a smaller amount than is planned in the budget papers to the Infrastructure Reserve. Currently, it is proposed to create that reserve with an initial £12m, whereas the UKIP amendment proposes that this is reduced to £9m. There is no impact upon our council tax freeze or on our levels of borrowing.

Our amendment hinges upon the concept of *investing to save* in key areas of adult and children's social care, where our service faces growing demands and where a relatively modest amount of money spent now, will enable us to cope much more cost-efficiently in the austere years ahead.

The details of this proposed additional investment are as follows:

Adult Health & Social Care – Professional Development

Given that West Sussex County Council is deeply committed to improving the quality of both its residential and home care, UKIP believes that making an initial investment now on a major incentive for the independent sector would enable us to work more proactively with providers to meet the ever more complex needs of our communities. We hear that improved quality is to be achieved through new models of care and that we must work with the Clinical Commissioning Groups to release funds for transforming community health and social care services.

Towards this end, we should invest now in creating further and higher education opportunities in the field of social care, thus offering a greater range of training options for struggling employers. Our investment should focus on providing high-quality apprenticeships and professional training for nurses, social workers, occupational therapists and other workers, who have already gained some care-giving experience and who are seeking to expand their professional skills. Only by nurturing and developing our workforce will we be able to address our county's existing shortfall of over 1,400 staff and the forecast shortfall of nearly 9,000 by 2024.

Surely the key to solving this manpower problem in the longer term is to create a greater sense of professional pride in this vital work. We want staff to feel the self-esteem of having a real career, rather than seeing their job as a temporary, transitional phase on their way to "something better". Higher professionalism at all levels of staffing will also be a key factor in preventing care failures of the Orchid View type.

It is vitally important that staff perceive their job as a rewarding, versatile career with definite progression paths. It needs to be made attractive not only to students as they leave education, but also to those returning to work after a break to raise their own families or as they seek a career change later on in life.

This council's progression towards ever more out-sourcing has placed the logistical challenge firmly on the shoulders of the private sector. It is our clear duty, therefore, to stimulate the provision of skilled and motivated staff for the social care industry at large.

Our amendment, therefore, begs that in the coming year we make a one-off £2m investment to kick-start an education and training programme and preferably this would be delivered through the county's existing education providers.

This would enable us to bring a new stimulus to what is currently an industry in decline and one which ironically faces a sharply expanding market. It is appreciated that the on-going funding for such training provision will have to be found in subsequent years, but the crucial matter at this stage is for the County Council to get the concept up and running.

Once this has been achieved and the benefits start to become felt, the participating stakeholders will have to take responsibility thereafter.

UKIP believes that this is very consistent with the County Council's statutory duties, reinforced by the 2014 Care Act, to ensure that there is diversity and choice of quality care provision available for all of our residents and the cabinet budget proposal to earmark an additional £3m reserve in that direction is welcomed. However, the desired outcomes cannot be achieved without an appropriate workforce – both in quantitative and qualitative terms - and right now we are heading for huge supply problems, which are likely to prevent this council from fulfilling its obligations.

Children's Social Care – Professional Development

The redesign of the service for Children's Social Care is now well in hand, but our longer term ability to retain really experienced social workers is a potential threat to its delivery. Whilst there is an over-supply of trained staff in the market, these are largely staff who are newly qualified social workers. The stressful nature of the work generates a distinct attrition rate in the profession, typically after about seven years' service. This leads inevitably to a gap in expertise, which manifests itself particularly in the more complex case work we handle.

There is evidence that better training, mentoring and supervision is the key to retention, as workers are better able to cope with on-going pressure if they have more opportunity to consolidate their own professional development. This will empower them to build the more robust confidence, crucial to sustaining commitment to this type of career in the longer term.

UKIP's budget amendment proposes a one-off investment of £850,000 to instigate a one-year professional development programme for 50 social workers, carefully selected from our existing staff, who would over time form that highly experienced, sustainable cadre so necessary to the service, which at present we are lacking. The programme would be tailored to our own West Sussex specifications and could be delivered as a combination of formal lectures and on-job mentoring. An external consultant would be tasked with its creation and delivery.

The benefits of developing a highly experienced elite workforce include, not only better quality delivery, but also lower staff turnover throughout the department as a whole and a reduced need to access expensive agency staff. In short it will be a case of *invest to save*.

Children's Social Care - Research Study

The County's role in identifying those children, who are at risk of going missing and at risk of sexual exploitation is increasingly demanding. At present there is room for improvement in our conceptual grasp of the key

indicators, scoping the scale of the issues and identifying what a 'good' multi-agency response in West Sussex would look like.

A specific investment of £150,000 should be made to fund an experienced staff member plus background support to embark upon a one-year research study in conjunction with Sussex Police. The objective would be to gain a much clearer insight into the scale of the issue in West Sussex and the social indicators as they manifest themselves within specific territorial patterns.

This study would enable us to enhance our working methods, providing valuable, on-going material for staff operational guidelines. Overall, it has the scope to greatly improve our performance, safe-guard the reputation of the Council and allow us to "work smarter" in the face of reduced funding in subsequent years.

In Summary

These proposed investments are affordable, given the additional amounts of money earmarked to be added to the Infrastructure Reserve for "long-term investment on capital projects".

The concept of hoarding more resources to prepare for a *rainy day* on the infrastructure front is sound and the UKIP group are supportive of prudence. However, the *rainy day* for social care is about to dawn much sooner than some might realise. Allowing core services, such as social care for the elderly, to wither on the vine, defending ourselves behind a notion that the private sector simply has *to get on with it*, is facile.

An industry facing such chronic labour supply pressures, will not simply *get on with it* in the longer term. Over time, private investors will step back from this industry and we shall face not only labour shortage, but a dearth of private capital investment as well.

Given that "long term investment on capital projects" is nigh impossible to quantify or qualify this coming year – and with so many imponderables at hand, taking just one quarter of that reserve to ameliorate a proven, existing crisis would be a wiser use of resources.

With another major challenge confronting us elsewhere in the arena of Children's Social Care, we in this council must not underestimate the gravity of the legal and moral responsibilities facing us.'

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

(a) For the amendment – 22

Mr Buckland, Mr Clark, Dr Dennis, Mr Glennon, Mrs Hall, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Parsons, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Smith, Mrs Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

(b) Against the amendment - 42

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, 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, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr O'Brien, Mr Petch, Mr Peters, Mr J Rogers, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(c) Abstentions - 0

180 The amendment was lost.

181 The following amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Mr M G Jones and seconded by Mr Oxlade:

	£m
Reverse budget reduction re: future Fire and Rescue arrangements (item 35 in Table 3 re: Balancing the Budget)	+1.6
Funded by: reduced base contingency sum	-1.6
Net change	0

This proposal means reducing the contingency from the proposed £4.723m in 2015/16 by £1.600m, taking the contingency in 2015/16 to £3.123m. At this level, contingency is still above the level which was set out for 2014/15 of £2.974m.

The implications of the proposed future fire and rescue arrangements (as summarised overleaf) are of significant concern to residents of West Sussex as can be demonstrated by a petition available on the West Sussex County Council website which has so far attracted many signatures. We are extremely concerned about the impact these cuts will have on the elderly, those on low income and those of ethnic minority who are statistically more likely to be at risk.

This budget amendment seeks to retain the current staffing levels and appliances in order to maintain response times to current levels. It would also enable more young people to benefit from both the 'firebreak' and the 'safe drive to stay alive' initiatives and enable the fire service to invest in new technologically and training.

Minutes

District/ Borough	Fire Station	Crewing model	Pre FFR Phase 2		After FFR Phase 2	
			Appl.	Staff	Appl.	Staff
Adur	Shoreham	Whole-time	1	10	1	9
		Retained	1	17	1	17
Arun	Bognor Regis	Whole-time	1	28	1	25
		Retained	1	16	1	16
	Littlehampton	Whole-time	1	9	1	25
		Retained	1	23	1	18
	East Preston	Retained	1	12	1	12
	Arundel	Retained	1	12	1	12
Chichester	Chichester	Whole-time	1	28	1	25
		Retained	1	18	1	18
	Selsey	Retained	1	9	1	9
	East Wittering	Retained	1	8	1	8
	Midhurst	Retained	2	18	1	18
	Petworth	Retained	2	14	1	14
Crawley	Crawley	Whole-time	2	48	2	45
		Retained	1	10	0	0
Horsham	Horsham	Whole-time	2	48	1	25
		Retained	1	14	1	14
	Billingshurst	Retained	1	8	1	8
	Storrington	Retained	2	15	1	15
	Partridge Green	Retained	1	10	1	10
	Henfield	Retained	1	9	1	9
	Steyning	Retained	1	10	1	10
Mid Sussex	East Grinstead	Whole-time	1	9	1	9
		Retained	1	16	1	16
	Haywards Heath	Whole-time	1	10	1	9
		Retained	1	17	1	17
	Burgess Hill	Whole-time	1	9	1	9
		Retained	1	14	1	14
	Turners Hill	Retained	1	7	1	7
	Hurstpierpoint	Retained	1	8	1	8
Worthing	Worthing	Whole-time	2	48	2	45
		Retained	1	16	1	16
	Lancing	Retained	1	14	1	14
Crewing Optimisation Model*	Various	Whole Time	0	0	0	16

* New dedicated team developed to support the availability, reliability and resilience of fire-engines across West Sussex'

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

(a) For the amendment - 20

Mr Buckland, Mr Clark, Mr Glennon, Mrs Hall, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mr McAra, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oxlade, Mr Parsons, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mr R Rogers, Mr Smith, Mrs Smith, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

(b) Against the amendment - 38

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, 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 Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr O'Brien, Mr Peters, Mr J Rogers, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(c) Abstentions – 6

Dr Dennis, Mrs Jones, Mrs Millson, Mr Oppler, Mrs Rapnik and Mr Smytherman.

183 The following amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Mrs Smith and seconded by Mr M G Jones:

	£m
Increased Funding for Care Home capacity expansion	3.0
Funded by: Reduced Contribution to capital reserve	-3.0
Net Change	0
NB New, revised, Capital Reserve contribution 2015/16 (was £8.0m)	5.0

It is widely acknowledged that as residents in West Sussex are living longer there is increasing demand for residential beds. The Future West Sussex Plan recognises that by 2019 there will be a need for 10,749 care beds for West Sussex. There is therefore a need for increased investment to stabilise, strengthen and grow the supply base for the residential care market.

There is only a very minimal sum (£0.250m) indicated in the capital programme for increasing care home capacity in 2015/16, which lacks the scale of investment needed and this change proposes. This budget amendment seeks to set aside £3m funding to facilitate such investment should such opportunities arise during 2015/16.

Background Information

In October 2014 Adults' Services produced a report into the residential care market for adults and older people in West Sussex to provide a strategic outline case for further investment in the health and social care economy of West Sussex, to ensure an equity of supply and demand, mitigate reputational and financial risk and enable potential commercial opportunities in this sector to be explored. The report recognises the market in the north of the county continues to experience significant pressures on its capacity due to closures and suspensions and that it is vulnerable to market de-stabilisation.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care recently advised that work has started to stimulate the care market. This Council is having conversations with both existing care providers and other organisations who have expressed an interest in entering the residential care market in the county. The County Council intends to undertake more formal market testing in the New Year with the view to securing investment in this sector in West Sussex. However no funding has been provided in the capital programme for increasing care home capacity during 2015/16.'

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

(a) For the amendment - 15

Mr Clark, Mr Glennon, Mrs Hall, Ms James, Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oxlade, Mr Parsons, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mrs Rapnik, Mr Smith, Mrs Smith and Mr Sutcliffe.

(b) Against the amendment - 41

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, 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, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr O'Brien, Mr Peters, Mr J Rogers, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(c) Abstentions - 8

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr G L Jones, Mr Oppler, Mr Petch, Mr R Rogers, Mr Smytherman and Dr Walsh.

185 The amendment was lost.

186 The following amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Mr Quinn and seconded by Mrs Smith:

	£m
Reverse budget reduction re: Redesign of Highways team activities (item 29 in Table 3 re: Balancing the Budget)	+0.300
Reverse budget reduction re: Reduced transport costs by reviewing routes for SEN and Adult Day care transport Review of Passenger transport (items 13, 22 and partially in item 28 in Table 3 re: Balancing the Budget)	+0.154
Reinstate part of the temporary funding allocation to the Highways team staffing budget as a permanent allocation going forward	+0.250
Funded by: reduced base contingency sum	-0.704
Net change	0

The amendment means reducing the contingency from the proposed £4.723m in 2015/16 by £0.704m, taking the contingency in 2015/16 to £4.019m. At this level, contingency is still above the level which was set out for 2014/15 of £2.974m.

The recent 'What matters to you' survey has revealed that the issue of most importance to residents on three separate counts was highways and transport. Despite residents indicating that this is what matters most to them, following the cessation of a temporary funding allocation, the staff budget that would deliver this service is being required to accommodate a funding reduction and would also require changing current working practices to involve multi-functional officers, which employees have indicated to management would cause unnecessary risks.

This amendment would see an additional £0.550m which would assist funding the service to return its numbers of employees to existing levels, and enable them to continue to provide a level of service nearer to its existing capacity.

The proposed saving of £0.154m relates to re-planning the transport at a number of schools across the county and will impact on the travel arrangements for vulnerable children travelling to and from school.

This amendment seeks to reverse that budget reduction and protect those children and their parents from the impact of this.'

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

(a) For the amendment - 23

Mr Buckland, Mr Clark, Dr Dennis, Mr Glennon, Mrs Hall, Ms James, Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mr McAra, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade,

Minutes

Mr Parsons, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Smith, Mrs Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

(b) Against the amendment - 40

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, 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 Metcalfe, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr O'Brien, Mr Peters, Mr J Rogers, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(c) Abstentions - 1

Mr G L Jones.

188 The following amendment to the Draft Budget was proposed by Mr Lamb and seconded by Mr M G Jones:

	£m
Increase local welfare provision (Adult Social Care and Health) to £1.426m	+0.500
Funded by: Reduce 'Be the Business' budget to zero (in the non-portfolio budget)	-0.500
Net change	0

The local welfare provision grant (worth £1.2m in 2014/15) has been withdrawn by Government. The proposed revenue budget for 2015/16 therefore includes an allocation of £0.926m to mitigate this. This amendment supplements that £0.926m allocation by transferring across the 'Be the Business' budget of £0.5m in full, taking the budget for local welfare provision (also known as the Local Assistance Network) to £1.426m for 2015/16. Having established this as the base budget we propose that this sum be protected in cash terms from future budget alterations going forward.

The 'Be the Business' grant programme was launched in August 2013, funded by the Kick Start programme to help support businesses who were having difficulty borrowing from commercial banks at that time. As the Cabinet Member himself has stated it is important to recognise the importance of being able to support local-level projects with finance and advice. This amendment sees increased support for the poorest and most vulnerable residents in the County.'

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

(a) For the amendment - 22

Mr Buckland, Mr Clark, Mr Glennon, Mrs Hall, Ms James, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mr McAra, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oxlade, Mr Parsons, Mr Petch, Mrs Phillips, Mr Quinn, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Smith, Mrs Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

(b) Against the amendment - 39

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Brown, 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 Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr O'Brien, Mr Peters, Mr J Rogers, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(c) Abstentions - 2

Mrs Jones, Mr Oppler

Mr Bradbury left the room and did not take part in the vote on the above amendment due to a prejudicial interest.

190 The amendment was lost.

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

(a) For the revised recommendations – 43

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Clark, Mr Crow, Dr Dennis, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mrs Hall, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Ms James, Mrs Jones, Mr G L Jones, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr O'Brien, Mr Peters, Mrs Phillips, Mr J Rogers, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(b) Against the revised recommendations - 6

Mr M G Jones, Mr Lamb, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oxlade, Mr Quinn and Mrs Smith.

(c) Abstentions – 13

Mr Buckland, Mr Glennon, Mr McAra, Mrs Millson, Mr Oppler, Mr Parsons, Mr Petch, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe and Dr Walsh.

Minutes

192 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 2015/16, as set out in the Budget Pack at Appendix 2, subject to the revised recommendations as set out below, be approved.

That, taking account of member priorities, finance strategy, local government finance settlement and the results of internal and external consultation, the following items be approved:

- (1) any increase or decrease in funding coming to light before the budget setting meeting are managed through the Volatility Fund (paragraph 17 of the report);
- (2) net revenue expenditure of £528.9m (paragraph 35 of the report and Table 1);
- (3) service commitments and net additional funding of £23.2m (paragraph 38 of the report and columns 3 and 7 of Table 2);
- (4) savings of £39.0m (paragraph 69 of the report and Table 3);
- (5) capital payments in 2015/16 of £138.0m (paragraph 84 of the report and Table 8);
- (6) proposed methods of financing capital payments between 2014/15 and 2017/18 (paragraph 93 of the report);
- (7) a maximum operational borrowing limit of £571.546m for outstanding debt and an authorised borrowing limit of £611.546m, including £40m of borrowing for temporary cash flow purposes (paragraphs 97 and 98 of the report and Table 7);
- (8) a limit of 100% on borrowing at fixed rates and 25% on borrowing at variable rates (paragraph 99 of the report and Table 7);
- (9) the Executive Director Corporate Resources and Services' assessment of the robustness of estimates and the adequacy of reserves (paragraphs 100 to 111 of the report);
- (10) The following amounts be approved for the financial year 2015/16 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 2015/16 is

£528.886m, and the council tax requirement for 2015/16 is £360.786m;

- (b)** That the following sums be payable for the year into the County Council's revenue fund:

Settlement Funding Assessment	£148.354m
Business Rates Local Growth	£1.156m
Business Rate Cap Grant	£2.342m
Education Services Grant (ESG)	£8.649m
New Homes Bonus Grant	£3.810m
Government Returned top slice	£0.239m
Local Services Support Grant	£0.677m
Net surplus from District Council Collection Funds	£2.873m

- (c)** The council tax base for the year 2015/16 is the aggregate amount calculated by the billing authorities to which the County Council issues precepts totalling 310,490.10 Band D equivalents;
- (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 £1,161.99 to the nearest penny;
- (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	£774.66	E	£1,420.21
B	£903.77	F	£1,678.43
C	£1,032.88	G	£1,936.65
D	£1,161.99	H	£2,323.98

- (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	£23,420,605.64
Arun District Council	£65,956,876.38
Chichester District Council	£58,685,375.36

Minutes

Crawley Borough Council	£37,994,168.03
Horsham District Council	£66,043,328.44
Mid Sussex District Council	£66,198,570.30
Worthing Borough Council	£42,487,467.16

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

16 April 2015	21 May 2015	25 June 2015
30 July 2015	3 September 2015	8 October 2015
12 November 2015	10 December 2015	14 January 2016
18 February 2016		

- (h) Additionally, that payments be made by the district councils in respect of the estimated surplus on their collection funds on 31 March 2015:

	Council Tax	Business Rates
Adur District Council	£666,612.52	
Arun District Council	£312,000.00	
Chichester District Council	£171,853.00	
Crawley Borough Council	£454,549.70	£80,619.00
Horsham District Council	£1,173,176.00	
Mid Sussex District Council	£588,080.00	

And payments be made to the district councils in respect of the estimated deficits on their collection funds on 31 March 2015:

	Council Tax	Business Rates
Adur District Council		£11,810.00
Arun District Council		£283,424.00
Chichester District Council		£7,120.00
Horsham District Council		£144,300.00
Mid Sussex District Council		£67,713.00
Worthing Borough Council	£10,313.15	£49,454.00

- (11) the context of the Equalities Act 2010 in making budget proposals (paragraphs 114 and 115 of the report).

193 The report and recommendations on the Treasury Management Strategy 2015/16, as set out below, were approved.

194 Resolved -

That the Treasury Management Strategy 2015/16, as set out at the

Appendix to the report in Appendix 2, be approved.

Written Questions

195 Questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 15(2), as set out at Appendix 2, were circulated. Due to lack of time there were no supplementary questions.

Cabinet Member Question Time

196 Cabinet Members' reports were set out on pages 423 to 429 and a supplementary report on pages 429A and B had been circulated. Due to lack of time there were no questions to Cabinet Members.

Leader's Question Time

197 Due to lack of time there were no questions to the Leader.

Electoral Review Panel

Constitution of the Electoral Review Panel

198 The Council received a report from the Chairman on changes to the constitution of the Electoral Review Panel (pages 430 to 432).

199 The Chairman reported the outcome of the recent review of proportionality on the table on page 430 of the report which was to reduce the number of Conservative members by one to six on a panel of 10 members and to add one Independent member.

200 An amendment was moved by Mr Acraman and seconded by Mr Burrett that the Panel should be increased to 10 members rather than nine.

201 The amendment was carried.

202 Resolved -

(1) That the Council agrees to increase the size of the Electoral Review Panel from seven to ten members; and

(2) That the rule on proportionality should continue to apply to the Panel.

Appointments

203 The following changes to membership of the Electoral Review Panel were made which took effect from the end of the meeting:

Mr M G Jones in place of Mrs Smith

Minutes

Mr S J Oakley in place of Mr Hunt

Dr Dennis in place of Mr Oppler

Mr Crow, Mr McAra and Mr Waight to fill additional places

Notices of Motion

Notice of Motion by Mr G L Jones

204 At the County Council meeting on 12 December 2014 the following motion had been moved by Mr G L Jones and seconded by Mr Glennon, and referred to the Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations for consideration. A report by the Cabinet Member was included with the agenda (page 433).

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

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

We recognise that veterans can find making the transition to civilian life extremely challenging, particularly in finding and securing lasting employment and believe that the County Council has a leading role to play in helping ex-servicemen and women to fulfil their potential outside of the Services.

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

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

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

205 Due to lack of time the motion was deferred to the next meeting.

Notice of Motion by Mrs Mullins

206 At the County Council meeting on 12 December 2014 the following motion had been moved by Mrs Mullins and seconded by Mrs Smith, and referred

to the Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations for consideration. A report by the Cabinet Member was included with the agenda (page 434).

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

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

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

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

207 Due to lack of time the motion was deferred to the next meeting.

Report of Urgent Action

208 The report of urgent action taken under regulation 11 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 (pages 435 and 436) was noted.

Chairman

The Council rose at 4.30 p.m.

Minutes - Appendix 1

Agenda Item No. 1 - Interests

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

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 6 (Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and draft Budget 2015/16 to 2018/19 and Treasury Management Strategy 2015/16)	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council, Director of Warden Park Academy Trust and Trustee of Brantridge School (part of the Radius Trust) Prejudicial interest as Chairman of Building Heroes Education Foundation, which has applied for 'Be the Business' grant funding
	Mr Burrett	Trustee of Crawley Open House
	Ms James	Member of Hambrook and Chidham Parish Council
	Mrs Jones	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
	Mr Lamb	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Oxlade	Trustee of Crawley Open House
	Mr Parsons	Son-in-law works for the Fire & Rescue Service
	Mr Petch	Member of the Fire Brigades Union
	Mr Quinn	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Sheldon	Prejudicial interest as the Chairman of Horsham Matters, a charity that receives Local Assistance Network funding

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 6 (Future West Sussex Plan 2015-19 and draft Budget 2015/16 to 2018/19 and Treasury Management Strategy 2015/16) (cont)	Mrs Smith	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing BC and Town Crier for Worthing Town Centre Initiative
Item 7(a) Written Question 2	Mr Bradbury	Chairman of Building Heroes Education Foundation
Item 7(b) CMQT paragraph 1 (strategic economic priorities)	Mr Barrett-Miles	Member of Burgess Hill Town Council
Item 7(b) CMQT paragraph 5 (Care Act 2014)	Mr Catchpole	Spouse employed by West Sussex Carers Support
	Mr Griffiths	Registered carer
	Mrs Millson	Carer
Item 7(b) CMQT paragraph 17 (Civil Aviation Authority)	Mr Montyn	Member of Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee
Item 9(a) – Notice of Motion on veteran guaranteed interview scheme	Mr Barling	Member of the Royal British Legion
	Mr Bradbury	Chairman of Building Heroes Education Foundation
	Mr G L Jones	Member of Royal British Legion, Royal Signals Association, Parachute Regiment Association and Special Air Service Association
	Ms Kennard	Member of Royal British Legion
	Mr Lanzer	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Oxlade	Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Crawley Borough Council and Chair of the Crawley Civil Military Partnership
Item 9(b) – Notice of Motion on parking strategy	Mrs Duncton	Member of Chichester District Council

Minutes - Appendix 2

13 February 2015

1. Written question from **Mrs Mullins** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Children - Start of Life**

Question

The Children and Families Act 2014 and the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Code of Practice 0-25 (2014) came into effect on 1 September 2014 and introduced new arrangements for children and young people with SEND including the support they receive in learning settings.

Can the Cabinet Member please:

- (a) Provide details of the number of children at mainstream primary schools in Crawley who prior to the new legislation were in receipt of support for SEND;
- (b) Provide details of the number of pupils at mainstream primary schools in Crawley who, post introduction of the new legislation, are now in receipt of support for SEND;
- (c) Confirm he is satisfied that mainstream schools in West Sussex are able to provide adequate support for those young people with mental health issues (be they diagnosed or otherwise) and those with emotional and behavioural issues;
- (d) Advise me what arrangements are in place to monitor that schools are using 'best endeavours' in respect of the support they provide to those with special educational needs, and to ensure that this is not then having a detrimental impact (financial or otherwise) on other pupils in that educational setting?

Answer

- (a) Data from the Spring 2014 Department for Education (DfE) census and from County Council records shows that the number of children in those schools at School Action and School Action Plus (previous categories used by schools to describe children having SEN but not needing a statement) and with statements of SEN was 1,718.
- (b) Data from the Autumn 2014 DfE census and from County Council records show that the number of children in those schools at School Action and School Action Plus or SEN Support and with statements of SEN or Education, Health & Care Plans (EHCP) was 1,492.
- (c) All schools receive funding per pupil to provide additional support to meet the cost of services towards enabling children and young people to achieve. Furthermore, schools receive funding for SEN support and deprivation to target towards specific children and young people with a range of additional needs. Many schools incur expenditure on counselling services and learning

mentors to support children with high incidence low level mental health, behaviour or other needs that could otherwise affect their learning outcomes.

Children and young people can also access emotional wellbeing and mental health services in their community including via Find it Out Shops and schools are able to signpost young people to appropriate services. Where a child or young person has a more complex mental health need schools, and other professionals, can refer to specialist services such as those provided by Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust

- (d) The Annual Review meeting for each child or young person with a statement/EHCP is the statutory monitoring process. Either a Local Authority Special Needs Officer is present or the paperwork is returned to the Special Educational Needs Assessment Team (SENAT) where it is checked. If there are evidenced concerns about lack of 'best endeavours' (defined as doing everything possible to meet needs) then SENAT Managers contact the General Advisers SEN in the Learning Service.

The school's governing body/Academy Trust is responsible for monitoring the SEN Policy including the allocation of funding, which would include the need to ensure that it is being applied fairly in relation to all pupils. The policy and funding allocation should be reviewed annually at a full governors meeting as well as the allocated SEN Governor monitoring throughout the year.

2. Written question from **Mr Acraman** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance**

Question

The County Council has recently entered into an agreement to lease the former Court Meadow School building in Cuckfield to a charity, the Building Heroes Education Foundation.

Can the Cabinet Member explain:

- (a) Whether the business case for this arrangement is satisfactory and meets the Council's statutory obligations in ensuring best value?
- (b) Which of the Council's objectives does this charity help to satisfy?

Answer

- (a) The gross internal area of the main building is 11,227 sq. ft. There are also three temporary classrooms (huts) totalling about 3000 sq. ft.

The rent of £90,000 p.a. for this site equates to an overall rent of £7 per sq. ft. for the main building and £4 per sq. ft. for the huts. The property was not in the best condition, as a vacated school, and therefore this level of rent is one that meets the County Council's statutory obligation in

Minutes - Appendix 2

obtaining best value. The business case provided by the charity concerned demonstrated a cash flow adequate to meet this rental commitment.

- (b) Building Heroes is a charity founded to train and employ service leavers and young people in sustainable buildings refurbishment and horticulture. It therefore helps satisfy the County Council's objectives for Start of Life but particularly Economic Growth, as it provides an exciting work and training opportunity for those at an early stage in their economic lives or wishing to re-train after leaving the services. The charity has already transformed the empty swimming pool building into a fully-functioning plastering workshop and with the benefit of 'Be the Business' support hopes to see its first trainee in early 2015. The lease with the charity also helps the County Council to demonstrate real evidence of its Covenant with the Armed Forces.

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

Question

All of our communities have benefited from the Operation Watershed Active Communities Fund, either directly or indirectly. Within my own division the Fund has provided circa £30,000 to help deliver a specific community scheme to tackle road flooding in Lumley and indeed has released funding elsewhere.

The monies provided in Lumley although essential, represented just a fraction of the resultant voluntary community investment that has now been invested in parallel - involving people's time, expertise and efforts - this has effectively tripled the figure of £30,000 alone and is on-going.

Given that Operation Watershed funding will conclude at the end of March 2015 and that DEFRA's replacement flood defence funding allocation does not have the same focus, I am concerned that sustaining essential local projects, such as those along the course of the River Ems and within my division, will be jeopardised by the loss of financial support.

This means that villages along the River Ems could be cut off if flooding is repeated as occurred in the flooding of 2014, affecting community life and businesses.

Can the Cabinet Member therefore:

- (a) Provide assurance that the County Council and partner agencies maintain a prioritised list of flood prevention schemes, and that this includes local community schemes such as the River Ems project. Can I have assurance that the River Ems project will be on that list of priorities?
- (b) Confirm the other possible sources of financial support that may be available to provide seed funding for community schemes and the likely associated timeframe for such financing.

- (c) Explain how the County Council and partner agencies can assure local communities that, in the absence of funding, we will continue to support them in unlocking community capacity to tackle flooding and help achieve sustainable outcomes.

Answer

- (a) The responsibilities for flood management are set out in the West Sussex Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS). Tidal and fluvial flooding are the responsibility of the Environment Agency whilst surface water and groundwater flooding are the responsibility of the County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority.

The LFRMS includes a list of schemes from all Risk Management Agencies, (RMAs), which values more than £100m. This has been prioritised jointly with all the RMAs and is primarily based on the number of properties taken out of flood risk and contribution to the economy of the county.

The Environment Agency, in managing the Thames and South Region, spends around £100m per annum operating, maintaining, repairing and renewing flood defences. The majority of these costs are funded by government grant in aid to the Environment Agency. Funding for new or improved flood defences is identified through a six-year pipeline programme which was introduced last year, having previously been managed on an annual basis. Allocations are based on national prioritisation of the whole capital programme. £34m of schemes have been identified in West Sussex over the next six years and these are also supported through partnership funding and the County Council is contributing to schemes to a value of £2m over the next six years. This is supplemented by local levies raised through the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC). Around 30% of this figure is supported by Revenue Support Grant.

There is a scheme for Emsworth but it was not ultimately prioritised for inclusion in the six-year plan. However, the project was supported by the Southern RFCC this financial year with a £50,000 contribution from Local Levy. An 'initial assessment' of options will be completed for the scheme by April 2015 and, although it is unlikely that flood defence grant in aid funding will be available within the six-year plan, the County Council will request that the RFCC supports the project further in the future. The scheme will cost in the region of £1.15m and protect 90 houses from tidal, SW, fluvial flooding (from both main river and ordinary watercourses).

- (b) Highways and Transport manage the responsibility of Lead Local Flood Authority and annual drainage improvements budget of £1m. Additionally, bids can be made to the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee for local levy to support local issues.
- (c) Since the 2012 floods the County Council has been working with the National Flood Forum to form local Community Flood Action Groups, based on this work a government pathfinder grant was secured. The existing groups have recently formed a collective Forum and will be nominating two

Minutes - Appendix 2

representatives to sit on our Strategic Flood Risk Management Board (made up of senior officers from all the risk management authorities). This will be the first time this has been done anywhere in the country. The aspiration is to continue to grow this network of Flood Action Groups to cover the whole county to assist with the overall problem of the management of flood risk.

4. Written question from **Mr R Rogers** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

For a number of years I have asked that the Worthing County Local Committee (CLC) is treated fairly when it comes to the allocation of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). For example, Crawley as a Town similarly sized to Worthing, enjoys twice the number of TROs. Other CLCs with as few as four members also enjoy the same number.

I realise that this could have cost implications, but you will be aware that, on behalf of the Worthing members, I was requesting this some time ago when funds were available.

A year ago you promised to look at this inequality. I would like to know what has been done since this promise was made.

Answer

Following discussions with officers in summer 2013 an action plan was agreed to include the following:

- All existing TRO holding lists held by each CLC would be deleted;
- Restrictions on numbers of TROs each CLC could request were lifted;
- Only requests that had member-support and demonstrated good community support would be considered for inclusion in the Infrastructure Plan; and
- Once a package of TRO proposals had been agreed, a delivery programme would be developed that could span a number of years.

At the CLC meetings held January to March 2014, TRO requests were considered according to three concepts:

- (1) TROs that were deemed to be technically deliverable and had evidence of local support (Appendix A of the reports).
- (2) Requests that required further investigation to determine if a TRO was a viable solution (Appendix B).
- (3) Proposals for which a TRO is not a viable solution (Appendix C).

Worthing CLC considered the report at its meeting on 5 March 2014 and accepted the proposals it contained (minute number 96 of that meeting refers). Appendix A proposals for Worthing included six locations; one of which was withdrawn, two are completed, two more are currently awaiting implementation and the last scheme is being programmed for delivery in the 2015/16 year.

Appendix B proposals for Worthing included just two requests, which are currently being investigated for potential inclusion in the 2015/16 programme subject to being technically viable and with further CLC approval. In addition to this, Worthing has been the pilot scheme for the introduction of enforceable School Keep Clear markings, which has required a TRO for a further 21 sites, alongside the Controlled Parking Zone work that has taken place in the town.

I am therefore confident that Worthing has been treated as fairly as every other CLC in the selection and progression of TROs within the last twelve months.

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

Question

At their 28 January Evidence Session, the UK Parliament's Public Accounts Committee expressed considerable concern regarding access to super-fast and enhanced broadband, as broadly defined local areas often conceal stark inequalities, mainly for isolated rural communities and properties. The 5% of properties which are expected to remain outside of the superfast coverage programme are overwhelming in rural locations and can at best hope to access broadband at 2Mbps, significantly below the superfast 24Mbps.

Furthermore, initial commercial coverage assumptions which underpinned the early stages of the programme have been subsequently scaled back and considerably more properties - again in more rural and isolated areas - are therefore now reliant upon a share of the £2.5m of additional public funding to achieve superfast broadband.

As this project has been funded through general taxation, all our residents have effectively paid into this scheme, yet an increasing number are now excluded from the benefits, which will be shared amongst those in mainly urban areas.

Even worse, rural residents already excluded from the benefits of the programme may find their own tariffs from alternative providers increase as a significant portion of their existing customer base migrate to the enhanced BT services.

As a representative of a largely rural division, like myself, I'm sure the Cabinet Member shares my concern regarding this situation. I ask therefore:

- (a) How confident is the Cabinet Member that the additional £2.5m funding will prove adequate to the task of providing superfast broadband to meet the Government's own coverage targets for properties which now find themselves outside of the commercial rollout?

Minutes - Appendix 2

- (b) What assurance the Cabinet Member can provide to rural residents and businesses expected to remain outside of the superfast coverage programme - the '5%' - that the County Council will seek to address the third-tier service they must endure, with particular reference to:
- (i) Measures to ensure that excluded properties are not subject to tariff increases from their providers, should significant number of their existing customer base migrate to BT.
 - (ii) Assuring all those affected, that should solutions not be provided they will be adequately recompensed for the enhancements they have contributed toward but will not receive.

Answer

- (a) The question relates to those individual premises which have now become eligible for public funding through the Superfast Extension Programme ('Phase 2'), where previously they had been excluded as they are in postcodes served by the commercial roll out of broadband by suppliers. The County Council will not know the detail of how those premises may be served until it is presented with a solution by a bidder, for which the Council is currently in a procurement process.
- (b) The government target is for all premises to have access to broadband at 'basic' speeds of a minimum of 2mbps. This is driven by the Government's own policy of digitising public services and is the minimum speed required to access those services and complete application forms, download information etc.
- (i) Broadband is a commercial product and prices are set by commercial providers in the market place. The 'enhanced' services whilst provided over BT wholesale infrastructure will be offered by a range of Internet Service Providers to give consumers a choice and to guarantee fair pricing. The County Council has no influence over price setting and is not mandated to set price controls. The regulatory body is Ofcom.
 - (ii) This is a question about setting the levels of taxation and potentially allowing applications for a rebate. This is not within the jurisdiction of the County Council which can only set tax in accordance with the services it provides. The County Council, whilst investing public funds in improving broadband infrastructure, is not providing broadband services. The question would need to be addressed to the Secretary of State for his broader consideration.

6. Written question from Mr M G Jones for reply by the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services

Question

West Sussex Fire and Rescue Services (WSFRS) have recently stopped including details, in their 'Latest Fire and Rescue incidents' newsletter, of the stations that fire engines attending incidents are sent from. Such information has always been of considerable interest to the media and the public. The information has also been refused when formally requested by the public. Some significant incidents, such as the fire at South Terminal, Gatwick on Christmas Day, have also been excluded from the news report.

- (a) This has raised concerns that this may have been done to cover up deteriorating performance by the service. To allay those concerns will the Cabinet Member ensure that this information is included in all future incident news reports, and that all incidents requiring four or more fire engines are included, together with a selection of smaller incidents to demonstrate the range of incidents being dealt with;
- (b) Does the Cabinet Member believe this recent development, which restricts performance information for WSFRS is curiously at odds with the supposed direction of the Council's policy, given its recent unveiling in July 2014 of the online 'Performance Dashboard' which the Leader explained was: "about us being totally transparent and using brand new technology to make that happen... It brings an honest focus to the services we are not providing as effectively as we could or in comparison with other areas of the country and this helps our residents hold us to account."; and
- (c) To ensure that members are properly informed, will the Cabinet Member also ensure that the Chief Fire Officer provides monthly reports to all members of all occasions when the geographically nearest fire engine, or fire engines, does not attend an incident? The report to include a full explanation of why it, or they, did not attend?

Answer

- (a) West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service (WSFRS) recognises the interest from elected members and the public regarding its operational activity and will ensure that the detail requested is supplied in future incident summaries including the base location of the fire engine(s) attending.

Following consultation with Gatwick Airport and other partners, the agreed protocol for communication regarding incidents at the airport is through Gatwick Airport and not the local authority fire service. Although individual emergency services will be aware of their own attendance at any incident, the airport team will take a more holistic view of an incident, taking into account possible impacts on Air Traffic Control, airport security and passengers.

- (b) WSFRS publishes a wide range of information to raise awareness amongst the public of community safety issues. Members of the public are able to

Minutes - Appendix 2

subscribe to receive this information automatically through a link provided on the County Council's website. In addition, the Annual Report provides a comprehensive review of performance across a range of community and emergency response activities whilst also setting out the strategic plans for future development. A daily incident summary is also available via the County Council's website.

- (c) WSFRS is committed to providing the quickest emergency response possible. WSFRS has invested in Automatic Vehicle Location Systems to identify the exact location of each engine and which engine will provide the quickest response. For a range of reasons this will not always be a fire engine that is based at the fire station that appears to be geographically closest to the emergency. Vehicles are not always at the fire station and can be out in the community delivering prevention or response activities. WSFRS does not consider each engine to be a local resource but part of a county-wide network which are moved to meet risk and the exigencies of the service. It has formalised arrangements under the Fire and Rescue Services Act with neighbouring Fire & Rescue Services to provide mutual support for emergency response. This means that it will receive support from and provide support to neighbouring counties. This is also part of the National Resilience arrangements which provide support across the country for large scale incidents.

WSFRS has response times which have been agreed through public consultation. There is nothing in the response standard that determines where the response should come from; the standard is time-based and, as previously stated, WSFRS is committed to providing the quickest possible response. WSFRS investigates and analyses all occasions where the agreed response standard is not met. This detail will be provided quarterly.

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

Question

In the light of the changes to the Fire and Rescue Service will the Cabinet Member supply me with details, and other/all members, on a monthly or quarterly basis when:

- (a) The target of 88% for retained fire engine availability is not met.
- (b) More than 20% of the County's 40 fire engines are not available, and the reasons for the shortfall.
- (c) Any response time standard is exceeded by 15%, including the station area(s) affected.

Answer

- (a) The target for Retained Fire Engine Availability is not 88%, it is 75%.

Shortages will occur for a wide range of reasons, primarily the unavailability of retained duty system staff. This is a challenge faced by fire and rescue services locally and nationally. The main factor for the unavailability of retained staff in West Sussex is the demands of their primary employment. West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service (WSFRS) receives great support from local employers who support their staff who wish to be retained firefighters. It does, however, understand the demands that employers are facing during the period of austerity and the challenges that places upon them in terms of releasing their staff for fire and rescue purposes. For this reason WSFRS finds that during the working day its cover can reduce significantly. Through the Future Fire and Rescue programme WSFRS has implemented a number of initiatives to improve the availability, reliability and resilience of the Retained Duty System (RDS). These include:

- The formation of a Crewing Optimisation Group consisting of 16 whole-time firefighters and supervisory managers, providing a pool of firefighters who are able to supplement crewing where required;
- Fully trained staff who work in specialist roles such as training or business fire safety are also used to supplement crewing by organising their primary role to enable this;
- A rolling recruitment policy, supported by regular recruitment initiatives;
- A dedicated recruitment officer for retained firefighters
- Revised contracts which were launched in October 2013 to ensure compliance with the Working Time legislation and to also provide a structured system for staff that is more family friendly.

Each member of staff who leaves the fire and rescue service is encouraged to attend an exit interview. Many retained firefighters who leave the Service indicate that one of the major reasons for leaving is the lack of operational activity. The prevention of emergency incidents is at the heart of everything WSFRS does and the reduction in incident numbers is a success of this policy. This has, however, had an unintended consequence in terms of the firefighters employed on the RDS. There are a range of activities that RDS staff undertake, including prevention and community engagement, but for many the primary reason for joining the Service was to respond to emergency incidents.

WSFRS recognises, based on experience and historical data, it is not possible to recruit and retain sufficient numbers of RDS staff to achieve 100% availability. WSFRS staff work extremely hard to maintain the availability of their fire engine and the service needs to set realistic expectations for them. WSFRS will notify all members on a monthly basis when the average across the county falls below the 75% target.

- (b) After 1 April the total number of standard fire engines in WSFRS will be 35. This means that a 20% shortfall will be when the number of fire engines available is fewer than 28. The initiatives described in (a) are being implemented to increase the availability of fire engines to an average of 30. WSFRS will provide fire engine availability data monthly.
- (c) The WSFRS response standard is its agreement with the public which was developed through consultation in 2009. It therefore investigates and

Minutes - Appendix 2

analyses all occasions where the agreed response standard is not met. WSFRS will provide detail of **every** occurrence when it exceeds this standard and the reasons rather than those occurrences where the standard has been exceeded by 15%. This detail will be provided monthly.