

## West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

---

**15 April 2016**

At the Annual Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 15 April 2016, at the County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mrs P A C Arculus (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Mr P G Metcalfe
Mr D H Barling	Mrs M E Millson
Mr L H Barnard	Mrs J S Mockridge
Mr A J Barrett-Miles	Mr J A P Montyn
Mrs E A Bennett	Mr R J Oakley
Mr P J J Bradbury	Mr S J Oakley
Mr M J Brown	Mr J J O'Brien
Mr R D Burrett	Mr F R J Oppler
Mr P C Catchpole	Mr C G Oxlade
Mr P J Circus	Mr L W Parsons
Mr M R Clark	Mr A Patel
Mr M A Cloake	Mr A P Petch
Mr D G Crow	Mr N F Peters
Mrs J E Duncton	Mrs J E Phillips
Mrs E M Evans	Mr J G Rae
Mr P C Evans	Mrs A M Rapnik
Mrs C M Field	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
Mr R A Lanzer	

### Chairman

- 1 Mr Barnard, the Vice-Chairman of the Council, took the chair for the election of Chairman of the County Council.

### Election of Chairman

- 2 The Vice-Chairman stated that he had one nomination for the office of Chairman of the Council, that of Mrs Pat Arculus. Mrs Arculus was elected Chairman of the Council for the ensuing year.

## **Minutes: Item 2**

---

- 3 Mrs Arculus made the prescribed declaration of acceptance of office and took the chair.

### **Election of Vice-Chairman**

- 4 The Chairman stated that she had one nomination for the office of Vice-Chairman of the Council, that of Mr Lionel Barnard. Mr Barnard was elected Vice-Chairman of the Council for the ensuing year.
- 5 Mr Barnard made the prescribed declaration of acceptance of office.

### **Apologies and attendance**

- 6 Apologies were received from Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr Glennon, Mrs Jupp, Mr McAra, Mrs Mullins, Mr Quinn and Mr J L Rogers. Having given their apologies for arriving late, Mrs Smith arrived at 10.50 a.m. and Mr Oxlade at 11.10 a.m. Mr Barrett-Miles and Mr Rae were absent for the afternoon session. Mr Lamb arrived for the afternoon session at 3.05 p.m. and Mr S J Oakley at 4.05 p.m. Mr Brown, Mr Griffiths, Mr Metcalfe and Mr Tyler left at 3.40 p.m. Mr High and Mr R J Oakley left at 3.50 p.m., Mr Cloake at 3.55 p.m., Mr Oppler at 4.00 p.m. and Mr Petch and Mr Sheldon at 4.17 p.m.

### **Interests**

- 7 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

### **Minutes**

- 8 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 19 February 2016 (pages 3 to 23) be approved as a correct record.

### **Review of Proportionality**

- 9 The County Council was reminded of its statutory duty to review the proportionality on its committees annually. A paper on the application of the proportionality rules and how they were applied was set out at pages 24 and 25 together with a table showing the number of seats on committees.

- 10 Resolved –

That the review of proportionality on committees be agreed.

### **Notification of Appointment of Cabinet Members and Deputies to Cabinet Members**

- 11 The County Council was reminded that the Leader was required each year to give notice to the Council of her appointments to the Cabinet and

allocation of Cabinet portfolios, together with the appointment of Deputies to Cabinet Members.

- 12** The Council noted that Ms Goldsmith had given notice to the County Council of her appointments for the ensuing year, as set out on page 26.

### **Appointments**

- 13** Schedules setting out the nominations for the re-appointment of the chairmen, vice-chairmen and members of Select Committees and non-Executive committees and substitutes were circulated.

- 14** The schedules were agreed as set out at Appendix 2 attached.

### **Appointment of Chief Executive (Head of Paid Service)**

- 15** The Council was asked to approve recommendations from the Chairman's Appointing Committee to appoint a Head of Paid Service (Chief Executive) (pages 26A to 26C).

- 16** Resolved -

That Mr Nathan Elvery be appointed to the post of Chief Executive (Head of Paid Service) of West Sussex County Council with effect from a date to be agreed but no later than 1 July 2016.

### **Petition: Chichester Deserves Better**

- 17** The Council debated the following petition. A statement from the petitioners and a briefing note from the Executive Director Residents' Services had been circulated with the agenda.

#### **Chichester Deserves Better**

'We, the undersigned, call on Andrew Tyrie, MP for Chichester, along with Chichester District and West Sussex County Councillors, to oppose plans for a northern bypass of the A27 around Chichester.

The through traffic using the A27 represents a small proportion of the problem compared to local traffic, a problem that will not be solved by a bypass, whilst causing irreversible damage to the area. Instead we urge them to support a series of upgrades and improvements to the existing route which will benefit the City and the wider area to both the north and south.'

- 18** Ms Elaine Drummond, on behalf of the petitioners, addressed the Council for five minutes in support of the petition.

- 19** The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport responded to the petition for five minutes on behalf of the County Council.

## Minutes: Item 2

---

- 20 The Council debated the petition.
- 21 Mr Nick Reynolds, on behalf of the petitioners, and the Cabinet Member were each given three minutes to make a closing statement.
- 22 A proposition was moved by Ms James and seconded by Mr Parsons as set out below:
- 'That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport be invited to set up now a Chichester A27 Improvements Forum to include representatives from the District Council and affected parishes.'
- 23 The proposition was lost.
- 24 A proposition was moved by Dr Walsh and seconded by Mrs Millson as set out below:
- 'West Sussex County Council welcomes the decision by the Highways Agency to remove the possibility of a northern A27 bypass for Chichester. It welcomes the forthcoming public consultation and urges full public participation, including a Chichester A27 Forum set up by the Leader. The Council expects the earliest possible delivery of agreed improvements for the benefit of the A27 through traffic and of local road users.'
- 25 The proposition was lost.

### **Future West Sussex Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016/17 to 2019/20: Budget Update**

- 26 The Cabinet Member for Finance moved the report on proposals for changes to 2016/17 portfolio and non-portfolio budgets to take account of the impact of the funding changes in relation to the Transitional Grant and the Public Health Grant allocations on the budget approved by the Council on 19 February (pages 27 to 40).
- 27 The recommendations were put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 36(1).
- (a) For the revised recommendations – 58

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Mr Barling, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Bennett, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Circus, Mr Clark, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mrs Evans, Mr Evans, Mrs Field, Ms Goldsmith, Mr Griffiths, Mrs Hall, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Ms James, Mrs Jones, Mr G L Jones, Mr M G Jones, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lamb, Mr Lanzer, Mr Metcalfe, Mrs Millson, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr O'Brien, Mr Oxlade, Mr Parsons, Mr Patel, Mr Petch, Mr Peters, Mrs Phillips, Mr Rae, Mrs Rapnik, Mr R Rogers, Mr Sheldon, Mrs Smith, Mr Smith, Mr Smytherman, Mr Sutcliffe, Mr Turner, Mr Tyler, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight, Dr Walsh, Mr Watson, Mr Whittington and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(b) Against the revised recommendations - 0

(c) Abstentions - 3

Mr Bradbury, Mr Brown and Mrs Mockridge.

### **28** Resolved -

That, as a result of the proposals outlined in this report, the following changes to 2016/17 portfolio and non-portfolio budgets be approved:

- (1) Highways and Transport £40.727m (was £38.227m) - as set out in paragraphs 11 to 16 of the report;
- (2) Education and Skills £16.584m (was £16.259m) - as set out in paragraphs 17 to 19 of the report;
- (3) Community Wellbeing £3.879m (was £4.499m) - as set out in paragraphs 20 to 26 of the report;
- (4) Net transfer from Earmarked Reserves £12.798m (was £13.892m) in Non Portfolio - as set out in paragraphs 27 to 35 of the report;
- (5) Net additional Spending available from final settlement £0 (was £6.169m); and
- (6) Reduction required from Public Health Grant £0 (was -£2.870m).

### **Notice of Motion by Ms James**

**29** The following motion was moved by Ms James and seconded by Mr Parsons.

'In advance of the Referendum on the UK's membership of the European Union, the Prime Minister has overseen a 'deal'.

Unfortunately this 'deal' fails to deliver a sustainable and fair welfare and immigration policy for the UK to help the pressure on local public services; does not secure unambiguous sovereignty of decision making for the UK Parliament and public bodies; nor does it remove the unnecessary bureaucracy and interference by the EU with residents, businesses and local authorities, such as West Sussex County Council.

West Sussex County Council therefore believes that the economy of the UK and West Sussex would be better positioned to prosper outside of the EU.'

**30** An amendment was moved by Mr Waight and seconded by Mr Tyler as set out below.

## Minutes: Item 2

---

'In advance of the Referendum on the UK's membership of the European Union, the Prime Minister has **negotiated changes to the UK's relationship with the EU** ~~overseen a 'deal'~~.

**The residents of West Sussex will judge whether what has been negotiated will** ~~Unfortunately this 'deal' fails to deliver a sustainable and fair welfare and immigration policy for the UK to help the pressure on local public services; does not secure unambiguous sovereignty of decision making for the UK Parliament and public bodies; nor does it~~ **and** remove **any** the unnecessary bureaucracy and interference by the EU with residents, businesses and local authorities, such as West Sussex County Council.

West Sussex County Council therefore **welcomes the opportunity granted to the British electorate to vote on the UK's membership of** ~~believes that the economy of the UK and West Sussex would be better positioned to prosper outside of the EU.'~~

**31** The amendment was carried.

**32** The revised motion, as set out below, was carried.

'In advance of the Referendum on the UK's membership of the European Union, the Prime Minister has negotiated changes to the UK's relationship with the EU.

The residents of West Sussex will judge whether what has been negotiated will deliver a sustainable and fair welfare and immigration policy for the UK to help the pressure on local public services; secure unambiguous sovereignty of decision making for the UK Parliament and public bodies; and remove any unnecessary bureaucracy and interference by the EU with residents, businesses and local authorities, such as West Sussex County Council.

West Sussex County Council therefore welcomes the opportunity granted to the British electorate to vote on the UK's membership of the EU.'

### Written Questions

**33** Questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 15(2), as set out at Appendix 3, were circulated. Members asked questions on the answers as set out at Appendix 3. The Council agreed to waive Standing Order 15(2)(b) to remove the right of other members to put one question arising from the original reply.

### Cabinet Member Question Time

**34** Members asked questions of Cabinet Members on matters relevant to their portfolios, including those in the Cabinet Members' reports (pages 41 to 51), as set out at Appendix 4.

### Leader's Question Time

- 35** Members questioned the Leader on matters currently relevant to the County Council, including on the Leader's report (page 52), and a supplementary report on page 52A, as set out at Appendix 4.

### **Governance Committee: Integration of the County Council's Legal Services with those of other Authorities: Establishment of Joint Committee**

- 36** The County Council considered the establishment of a Joint Committee as the governing body for the partnership to oversee the discharge of the Councils' Legal Services functions following the creation of a Legal Services partnership arrangement with East Sussex County Council, Brighton & Hove City Council and Surrey County Council with effect from 1 April 2016 (pages 53 to 55).

- 37** Resolved -

That the establishment of a Joint Committee as the governing body for the partnership to oversee the discharge of the Councils' Legal Services functions, using the terms of reference set out in the Appendix to the report, be approved and that the terms of reference be included in the Scheme of Delegation in the Constitution.

### Chairman

The Council rose at 4.24 p.m.

## Minutes: Item 2 - Appendix 1

### Agenda Item No. 1 – Interests

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

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
All items	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
Agenda Item 10 – Petition on A27	Mrs Evans	Member of Chichester City Council
	Mr Evans	Member of Chichester City Council
	Mr Hunt	Member for Chichester North
	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council
Agenda Item 11 Future West Sussex Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016/17 to 2019/20: Budget Update	Mr Lamb	Member of Crawley Borough Council
Agenda Item 12 Notice of Motion on the European Union Referendum	Mr Circus	Cabinet Member for Housing at Horsham District Council
	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council
Agenda Item 13(a), 13(b) and 13(c) – Question Times	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council
Agenda Item 13(c) – Leader’s Question Time Paragraph 1 (Chichester Law Courts)	Mrs Evans	Member of Chichester City Council
Agenda Item 13(b) CMQT paragraph 6 (Education Reforms)	Mr Bradbury	Director of Sussex Learning Trust and Chairman of Mid Sussex Science Week
	Mr Griffiths	School Governor at Chailey Heritage Trust, Albourne C of E Primary School and Downlands Community College
	Mrs Jones	School Governor of Oakmeeds Community College, Burgess Hill

## Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 1

<b>Item</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Agenda Item 13(b) CMQT paragraph 7 (Big Bang Event)	Mr Bradbury	Director of Sussex Learning Trust and Chairman of Mid Sussex Science Week
Agenda Item 13(b) Paragraph 9 (Creative Digital Hub)	Mr Turner	Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Planning Policy of Worthing Borough Council
Agenda Item 13(b) CMQT Paragraph 10 (Carers Roundtable Forum)	Mr Catchpole	Spouse employed by Carers Support West Sussex
Agenda Item 13(b) CMQT Paragraph 12 (LGBTQ Carers Support Group)	Mr Catchpole	Spouse employed by Carers Support West Sussex
Agenda Item 13(b) CMQT paragraph 20 (Trading Standards West Sussex Scams Conference)	Mr G L Jones	Member of the Police and Crime Panel
Agenda Item 13(b) CMQT paragraph 25 (Fairtrade Fortnight)	Mrs Millson	Member of the Fair Trade county steering group
Agenda Item 13(b) Paragraph 26 (New Homes Bonus Consultation)	Mr Oppler	Member of Arun District Council
Agenda Item 13(b) CMQT Paragraph 27 (Pension Fund Pooling)	Mr Burrett	Deferred member of the Local Government Pension Scheme
	Mr Lanzer	Member of Local Government Pension Scheme

Nominations for Committees – April 2016  
(excluding non-Council members\*)

Children and Young People's Services Select Committee (12)	Environmental and Community Services Select Committee (12)	Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee (12)	Performance and Finance Select Committee (15)
Mrs Bennett (Ch) Mr Cloake (V-Ch) <b>Mrs Evans</b> Mr High Mrs Jones Mrs Jupp Mrs Mullins Mr R J Oakley Mr Oppler Mr Parsons Mr Smith Mr Wickremaratchi	Mr Bairrett-Miles Mrs Brunson Mr Circus Dr Dennis Mr G L Jones Mr M G Jones Mr S J Oakley Mrs Phillips Mr Rae (V-Ch) Mr J L Rogers (Ch) Mr Tyler Mr Whittington	<b>Mr Evans</b> Mr Griffiths Mrs A F Jones Mrs Jupp Ms Kennard Mr Peters Mrs Rapnik Mr Sheldon Mrs Smith Mr Sutcliffe Mr Turner (Ch) Mr Turner (V-Ch) Dr Walsh	Mr Cloake Mr Glennon Ms James Mrs Kitchen Mr Lamb Mr McAra Mr Metcalfe Mrs Millson (V-Ch) <b>Mr Montyn</b> Mr R Rogers Mr Turner Mr Tyler Mrs Urquhart Mr Waight Mr Watson



Proposed changes shown  
in bold, italic text



## Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

---

**15 April 2016**

1. Written question from **Mrs Mullins** for reply by the **Leader**

### Question

Can the Leader outline the benefits received from membership of the EU in respect of:

(a) this County Council; and

(b) the County,

both directly and indirectly?

### Answer

The County Council has benefited from a number of EU grants and funding initiatives. The funding received since 2007 is listed in the table below. An assessment of broader benefits to the County Council would be difficult to consider or quantify.

It is not considered feasible, without a disproportionate allocation of officer time, to provide a quantified account of the impact of EU membership on the county as a whole especially if indirect as well as direct effects are to be researched.

The EU funding which the County Council receives brings the following benefits to the County Council:

- European funding programmes can provide funding for projects that support socioeconomic development
- European funding can be used for pilot projects and subsequent mainstream implementation of ideas.
- European funding is also used for networking and low cost international marketing of places, access to best practice from national and international partners, importing ideas from other regions and partners and securing long term resources and partnerships for innovative projects.

### EU Funding received by the County Council since 2007

<b>Funding already attracted</b>	<b>'In preparation' projects</b>
LEADER ('Liaison Entre Actions de Développement de l'Économie Rurale'/'Links between the rural economy and development actions'.) 2007-13 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• £3,337,377</li></ul>	2 Seas programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• €359,675</li></ul>
LEADER 2014-2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• £3,200,000 (€3,997,000)</li></ul>	North West Europe Programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• €359,675</li></ul>

Funding already attracted	‘In preparation’ projects
CIBUS 2011 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £48,000</li> </ul>	Coast to Capital region ESIF (European Structural and Investment Fund) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £2,500,000</li> </ul>
SWAP NOW <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• €312,795.43</li> </ul>	
CONGREEN <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• €9582.93</li> </ul>	
ESPACE (finished 2007) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £640,000</li> </ul>	
BISEPS (Business Clusters Integrated Sustainable Energy Packages) starts 2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £285,758</li> </ul>	
Spark (starts 2016) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £252,090</li> </ul>	

**2. Written question from Mr Clark for reply by the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health**

**Question**

I am sure that the Cabinet Member shares my concern that, as part of the Council’s savings programme, the support provided to district and borough councils for sheltered accommodation is being reduced from £9.1m in 2015/16 to £6.4m in 2018/19 (and in the case of Adur District, the current value of the contract is £101,000).

As a consequence, warden-assisted communities such as Shadwell’s Court in Lancing, home to some of our most vulnerable residents, face losing their wardens, who perform an invaluable role in ensuring their residents’ health, safety and wellbeing.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm:

- (a) The ways that the County Council can continue to support our district and borough colleagues to ensure that these vital roles are retained;
- (b) Whether consideration is being given for the 2% increase in council tax levied for adult social care to be used for purposes such as this; and
- (c) Whether the required funding can be allocated from the two year transition funding settlement to provide more time for a sustainable solution to be found.

### Answer

- (a) The value of schemes, such as Shadwells Court, which provide purpose built flats for residents of retirement age with access to a 24-hour community alarm service, is widely recognised. Members, and residents themselves, can be re-assured that planned changes in the pattern of commissioning of housing support will do nothing to undermine the potential of these schemes to provide the basis for independent living for residents who might otherwise require more institutional care.

Changes in the way housing support is being commissioned in these schemes reflect the need to focus resources on those most at risk, by providing a more flexible service, with choice for residents and in line with national best practice. In large parts of the county, and throughout the districts of Arun, Chichester and Mid Sussex, social landlords have already successfully remodelled the way their sheltered housing schemes operate so that they are no longer dependent on County Council funding. Adur District Council, which is one of only two district and borough councils which receive funding for this kind of service, is now embarking upon this process which will involve consultation with its tenants and staff.

Though sometimes described as 'warden assisted' schemes such as Shadwells are managed by scheme managers who are generally employed to cover two or more schemes. The scheme manager's role involves housing management and provision of low level 'housing related support' to residents as part of their tenancy. In some cases residents with higher incomes are charged for this; regardless of whether it is required. It should be emphasised that this kind of low level 'housing related support' does not involve provision of any personal care, which is commissioned separately and subject to different funding arrangements.

Since 2003 the 'housing related support' element of this role has attracted specific funding as part of a contract with the County Council. This originates from the 'Supporting People' programme under which the County Council used to receive earmarked government funding which could be used to fund a range of prescribed activities under the general heading of 'housing related support'. 'Supporting People' funding was effectively abolished by the coalition government in 2011.

As the County Council's ability to fund discretionary services of this kind has reduced, social landlords providing sheltered housing (both local authorities and housing associations) have recognised the need to adapt the 'offer' which their schemes provide to older people. Although reductions in funding have been one of the drivers for this, providers have also recognised that a significant proportion of their residents do not require the traditional model of support based on 'morning calls' by scheme managers. At the same time landlords appreciate the value residents attach to seeing staff in their schemes on a regular basis.

In recognition of this, many social landlords have replaced their traditional 'support service' which was offered to all residents with an enhanced housing management model through which they maintain a regular daily

presence in their schemes. Some providers refer to this as a 'concierge' service. The 24-hour community alarm/telecare service which all residents have access to remains unaffected.

The County Council is clearly concerned to ensure that sheltered housing schemes still provide a sustainable, independent style of life for vulnerable adults who might otherwise require residential care. So to mitigate the risk to vulnerable residents which reductions in scheme managers' roles might involve, separate commissioning arrangements are being made with specialist support providers. As indicated earlier, this is already happening in a number of other areas where sheltered housing residents have opportunities for periodic assessment and can access 'floating support' should they need it.

So called 'floating support' generally involves short-term assistance to residents facing specific risks which can be provided more flexibly to protect the wellbeing of particularly vulnerable residents; without being tied to a tenancy or residence at a specific address. Linking this service to needs rather than to tenure is a more effective way of allocating limited County Council funding and will ensure that the interests of the most vulnerable residents are protected.

- (b) It is the case that the County Council has chosen to levy the 2% precept which is being used to support the wider Adult Social Care portfolio and is one of the reasons why that budget has increased by 6.5% since 2015/16. This will generate in the region of £7.4m, whereas members may recall that the demographic and financial pressure facing Adult Social Care for 2016/17, including the impact of the National Living Wage equated to £17m which means that the 2% precept is effectively already spent.
- (c) The changes in the way local authorities and housing associations provide sheltered housing described above are part of a transition which has been taking place in West Sussex and elsewhere for several years. The specific changes in schemes such as Shadwells represent the last phase of this process which many other landlords have already undertaken.

### **Supplementary Question**

Sheltered housing residents have opportunities for periodic assessments and can access 'floating support' – how is the outcome of the change being monitored and reported to the County Council?

### **Supplementary Answer**

There is regular monitoring of performance. The contract will also be reviewed formally including the provision of an opportunity for service users to provide feedback to allow any concerns to be addressed.

## Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

---

### 3. Written question from **Dr Walsh** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health**

#### Question

The Government and regulatory bodies have indicated that adult social care home visits of 15 minutes or less are unacceptable, and that travel time should not be included in care delivery times.

Will the Cabinet Member confirm that no Social Care home visits in West Sussex take only 15 minutes or less, and that travel time is not included in the care visit timings?

#### Answer

I was pleased to answer a similar question from Dr Walsh at County Council on 20 July 2012 and 19 July 2013. My response to his question is as follows:

The new Care and Support at Home Framework, which commenced in August 2015, sets out the Council's expectation in terms of providers delivering Care and Support to people in their own home. This framework states that:

"The Service Provider must take account of the realistic time required to travel between Service Users' houses when organising care rotas, to avoid Care Workers rushing or reducing the time spent with Service Users. In addition, the Service Provider must ensure that time allocated for visits will be sufficient to meet the needs and outcomes of the Service User."

This reflects the requirement on providers to ensure sufficient time is allocated when working with the customer to meet their needs and required outcomes. There is a clear expectation that that the provider should allow for travel time separately.

The County Council has moved away from a time and task service and over the last six years the Council has focused its contract arrangements for the provision of domiciliary care on delivering positive customers' outcomes. Providers are expected to work with customers on achieving outcomes within the customer's personal budget. The County Council does not currently collate information on the length of calls because the information is recorded in respect of the customer's budget rather than time slots

In some cases 15-minute calls will be sufficient for the activity being undertaken and outcome required, for example for medication administration, and this will be part of a larger package of care throughout the day or week.

Although the Specification for the Care and Support at Home Framework was drafted and the contract let before the publication of the recent National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) guidance, I can confirm that it reflects the spirit of the guidelines which highlight that "They (service contracts) should ensure that workers have time to do their job without being rushed or compromising the dignity and wellbeing of the person who uses services."

NICE suggests that visits of less than half an hour should only be made if:

- “the home care worker is known to the person, and
- The visit is part of a wider package of support, and
- It allows enough time to complete the specific, time limited tasks or to check is someone is safe and well”

During the term of the agreement, the Council has confirmed to providers that it will also be exploring the use of Electronic Call Monitoring Systems which can be used to monitor and provide assurance that visits are completed, and that care workers are having sufficient time to deliver care and support services.

### **Supplementary Question**

Why are outputs largely financially driven rather than outcome-driven - can the Cabinet Member confirm that the clear expectation that the provider should allow for travel time is more than an expectation and whether it is monitored and acted upon?

### **Supplementary Answer**

Providers are required to ensure that sufficient time is given to the service user to ensure the desired outcome is achieved - travel time is on top of that. This is a change from the original situation. This is monitored and there is also a mechanism for feedback for individual budget holders.

#### **4. Written question from Mrs Mullins for reply by the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills**

### **Question**

The Government recently published its White Paper – ‘Educational Excellence Everywhere’ – which sets out the Government’s intention that all schools will be expected to become, or be in the process of becoming, academies by 2020, with all converted by 2022.

Alongside the Local Government Association, the National Union of Teachers, and 125,000 members of the public who have petitioned the House of Commons, the Labour Group is opposed to these proposals.

- (a) Can the Cabinet Member please advise me whether he will write to the Government to express opposition to these proposals on behalf of the residents of West Sussex and call for them to re-think this policy given that forced academisation will see the transfer of significant power relating to education to unelected civil servants who parents and residents will be unable to hold to account at the ballot box?

Furthermore, can he advise me:

- (b) Of the remaining schools in West Sussex which have not yet converted to academy status, how many (i) primary and (ii) secondary schools have expressed an interest in becoming academies?

## Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

---

- (c) Whether he is concerned that the proposals to end national wage agreements and remove the requirements for qualified teacher status will exacerbate issues around the supply, recruitment and retention of teaching staff in West Sussex?
- (d) The approximate cost to this Council in terms of (i) supporting the conversion to academy status of schools which are not currently academies and (ii) the value of the land that would be transferred to the Secretary of State under the proposed forced academisation programme;
- (e) What timescale he would consider appropriate, achievable or desirable if all schools in West Sussex are required to become Academies?
- (f) Whether there are any particular successful academy chains that he would like to see running West Sussex schools; and
- (g) Whether he is confident that, in the event that all schools are required to convert to academies, this Council would (i) be provided with sufficient funding and (ii) be able to fulfil its remaining responsibilities in education described in the aforementioned White Paper. These include place planning, ensuring the needs of vulnerable pupils are met and acting as champions for all parents and families.

### Answer

- (a) The Leader and I will be writing to the Government about the White Paper. We support schools having the opportunity to take on the extra responsibilities and accountabilities of becoming an academy where they decide that is right for their children and parents, or where there is a need for a significant change in leadership to turn the school into a good one. We support the role of the local authority as the champion of children and parents. It is in this role that we do not see why children and parents of already good and outstanding schools should have such a change thrust upon them without choice, and we will be making that clear.
- (b) There are currently six schools (five primary and one secondary) making the transition to academy status.
- (c) National proposals on wage agreements and changes to Qualified Teacher Status should not change the teacher supply, recruitment and retention issues any more in West Sussex than elsewhere in England.
- (d) Currently, any additional costs over and above officer time are charged to the academy. About 10 West Sussex schools a year have converted; in the Government's time scale, this would increase to 50 to 60 a year with a very significant increased workload. The Government has set aside £140m to offset some of this cost, but the County Council does not have any further details as yet of how this might be available to local authorities, so an estimate of real cost is not yet practicable. Land value varies from year-to-year and is very different for educational use than for many others.

Below are the balance sheet figures for 31 March 2015. The 2016 figures will include any changes due to academy transfers completed during the year:

**All Educational assets - asset values total £1.1bn**

Buildings £683m (values based on "replacement" costs)

Land £423m (values based on market equivalent - what would it be likely to cost us to buy in the market?)

The breakdown is roughly:

<b>Primary Schools</b>	
Buildings	£305m
Land	£215m
<b>Secondary Schools</b>	
Buildings	£301m
Land	£185m
<b>Special Schools</b>	
Buildings	£63m
Land	£16.5m
<b>Pupil Referral Units</b>	
Buildings	£13m
Land	£6m

- (e) If all schools have to become academies, I would be looking for the time scale to extend well into the next Parliament.
- (f) There are already many successful Multi-Academy Trusts overseeing academies in West Sussex, for example linked to the Universities of Brighton, Sussex and Chichester or the Church of England Diocese. The County Council keeps in close touch with the Regional Schools Commissioner over prospective sponsors of new free schools or failing schools. Otherwise, it is for schools to make their own choice, based on finding a match of culture, values and aspirations, or to start their own groupings. Like a number of local authorities, West Sussex will be scoping the opportunity for key officers to set up a West Sussex MAT, as suggested by the Schools Minister.
- (g) No, I am not yet confident of either of these two issues and will be working with other local authorities to get greater clarity and understanding from the Government about the implications.

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

**Question**

As with many of my colleagues, I have become increasingly concerned at the

## Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

---

implications of the 'Educational Excellence Everywhere' White Paper - for the County Council as Education Authority, the County's schools and, most importantly, parents and children.

Can the Cabinet Member therefore confirm:

- (a) How the Ofsted performance of academies in the County compares with authority controlled schools – for single academies and Multi-Academy Trusts – at primary and secondary level;
- (b) His degree of confidence that forced academisation will improve our children's education, particularly in cases where parents have previously rejected such proposals?
- (c) His level of confidence in the capacity of the Department of Education and regional schools commissioners to cope with the additional workload arising from their increased roles, as outlined in the White Paper?
- (d) How he will ensure that the knowledge and experience of the County Council, developed over many decades of supporting our local schools, is not simply lost through forced academisation?
- (e) How the valuable relationships and networks between schools in the county will be maintained and nurtured without the support of the local education authority?

### Answer

- (a) Although occasionally referred to as authority 'controlled' schools, more accurately they are 'maintained' by the authority. That is, the authority passes on their budgets and carries out core responsibilities around audit, health and safety, employment and landlord duties for sites and buildings. It is also only fair to remind members that a number of schools which have become academies have been forced to do so because of inadequate OfSTED inspection outcomes. Similarly, once a school has become an academy, it starts again in the OfSTED cycle of inspections. Therefore, direct comparison between maintained schools, academies and Multi-Academy Trusts (MAT) is almost impossible.

### Ofsted Outcomes for Primary and Secondary Academies and Maintained Schools

Primary and Secondary	Academies		Maintained Schools	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Ofsted Grade				
Outstanding	5	16	27	13
Good	13	42	146	68
Requires Improvement	12	39	39	18
Inadequate	1	3	3	1
Total	31	100	215	100

<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Academies</b>		<b>Maintained Schools</b>	
<b>Ofsted Grade</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Outstanding</b>	3	21	5	22
<b>Good</b>	4	29	16	70
<b>Requires Improvement</b>	6	43	2	9
<b>Inadequate</b>	1	7		0
<b>Total</b>	14	100	23	100

<b>Primary</b>	<b>Academies</b>		<b>Maintained Schools</b>	
<b>Ofsted Grade</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Outstanding</b>	2	12	22	11
<b>Good</b>	9	53	130	68
<b>Requires Improvement</b>	6	35	37	19
<b>Inadequate</b>	0	0	3	2
<b>Total</b>	17	100	192	100

- (b) The Leader and I will be writing to the Government about the White Paper. We support schools having the opportunity to take on the extra responsibilities and accountabilities of becoming an academy where they decide that is right for their children and parents, or where there is a need for a significant change in leadership to turn the school into a good one. We support the role of the local authority as the champion of children and parents. It is in this role that we do not see why children and parents of already good and outstanding schools should have such a change thrust upon them without choice, and we will be making that clear.
- (c) The Government has set aside £140m in additional resources to support the change and clearly the Department for Education and Regional Schools Commissioners (RSC) will need to gear up for this very rapidly. However, the focus quite rightly needs to be on good educational leadership and management, both in schools and elsewhere. The change process, as currently laid out, will guarantee this will be needed and at a premium in schools, in MATs, in the RSC’s office and still in local authorities all at the same time.
- (d) See (b) above. Like a number of local authorities, West Sussex will also be scoping the opportunity for key officers to set up a West Sussex MAT, as suggested by the Schools Minister.
- (e) Schools have for many years developed relationships and networks with each other which have not depended on the local authority. However, the local authority has also tried to facilitate these for a number of particular purposes. The locality groups are generally strong and it will be for schools to decide whether they continue to be fit for purpose and worthy of maintaining. Under the White Paper proposals, the local authority continues to be a key partner for schools in relation to school places and expansions, admissions, transport, Special Educational Needs, attendance, exclusions, safeguarding, alternative education and a number of other areas. The Education and Skills Forum can continue to provide a

## **Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3**

---

partnership environment for policy discussion and co-operative working for as long as that is valuable.

### **Supplementary Question**

Can the County Council give particular help to primary and special schools with becoming academies?

### **Supplementary Answer**

The County Council will always help schools, resources permitting.

### **6. Written question from Dr Walsh for reply by the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills**

#### **Question**

The Chancellor announced that choice for parents and local authorities was to be abolished and that all schools would effectively be nationalised and turned into Academies.

In view of the great cost of these measures at a time of austerity, of the loss of the national curriculum requirement, the removal of parent governors, and of the opposition of several Conservative controlled county councils in the South East, will the Cabinet Member provide a full report on the implications of cost, impact on parental choice, and on teacher recruitment to the relevant Select Committees, and does he have a view on the government proposal?

#### **Answer**

I shall be happy to provide a report on 'Educational Excellence Everywhere' for the Children and Young People's Services Select Committee, should the Select Committee ask me to do so, although I think some of the full implications have yet to be worked through.

I welcome the recognition of local authorities as the champion of pupils and parents. It is in that role that I intend to ask the Secretary of State how forcing good and outstanding schools to become academies will improve children's learning outcomes.

### **Supplementary Question**

Does the Cabinet Member agree it is timely to ask the Children and Young People's Services Select Committee to have a full report, including the costs of transition and what was effectively a land-grab from council-owned land to nationally-owned land?

### **Supplementary Answer**

I would be happy to do so if asked by the Select Committee.

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

**Question**

Given that the County Council was placed in the embarrassing position of seemingly not knowing of Highways England's decision to delay its consultation on the A27 at Chichester until the very last minute, can the Cabinet Member:

- (a) Outline his level of confidence going forward in Highways England's commitment to open and honest dialogue with all stakeholders - including local councils, businesses and most importantly, residents?
- (b) Affirm his commitment to ensuring the Council's own transparency in its engagement with local stakeholders; and
- (c) Confirm whether the £10m set aside to support 'major improvements' to the A27 will be revised depending on the scope of options progressed by Highways England, particularly given that the latest figures indicate that funding for the A27 works at Chichester will now cover only changes to existing junctions rather than a northern or southern bypass.

**Answer**

- (a) Following the decision by Highways England to delay the consultation on options for A27 Chichester, the County Council and Chichester District Council have established new working arrangements with Highways England to ensure that issues can be escalated to senior officers within each organisation as and when they arise.

Although decisions about the scheme will continue to be taken by Highways England and not the local authorities, these working arrangements will provide greater insight into the project and opportunities to share concerns at a senior level within Highways England. This should reduce the likelihood of a repeat of recent events.

Highways England remain committed to a full public consultation on options for Chichester. Highways England have reported that the consultation will focus, in line with the expectations set out in the Government's Roads Investment Strategy, on upgrading four junctions and will not include alternative routes which have been previously considered, including northern route options.

Technical work is currently taking place to assess the options and ensure that an open, honest and well-informed dialogue can take place on the options before consultation comments are provided by all stakeholders, including residents. The County Council has not yet had sight of the outputs from the technical work.

- (b) The County Council will consider the options during the consultation and set out an appropriate response following consideration of the available

## Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

---

technical evidence. The County Council's democratic process, including scrutiny of any response, will ensure there is transparency.

- (c) In 2013, the County Council offered to contribute to the implementation cost of the A27 Chichester scheme. Financial provision for the contribution has been made within the Capital Programme which will need to be approved as part of the annual budget approval process. The County Council remain committed to supporting improvements to the A27, including being prepared to provide a financial contribution. Once the options are published, the contribution will be considered with regards to how it will help to deliver the best outcomes for residents.

### Supplementary Question

How much money is the Government allocating for the Chichester A27 scheme and is it under any threat?

### Supplementary Answer

The allocation is in the region of £100m to £250m depending on the options which are put forward by Highways England.

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

#### Question

The Cabinet Member will be aware that changes were agreed to the Horsham Controlled Parking Zone at the North Horsham County Local Committee (CLC) in July 2015. Councillors were assured at that time that these changes would be implemented shortly. Responses to subsequent enquiries during the autumn assured members that the lines would be painted in January 2016, which did concern us, due to the likely weather conditions at that time of the year.

At the CLC's March meeting, Dr Dennis raised the concerns of local residents, the Neighbourhood Councils, and local members that there was still no definitive date for the lines to be painted. Further enquiries of the parking team have revealed that even a provisional date cannot be given, due to a delay in the contract drawings, as well as the contractual information required for implementation having changed.

There are already additional roads that are experiencing new parking problems that cannot even be considered until the existing orders have been implemented and have bedded down. This is causing frustration to local residents and embarrassment to local members and officers, particularly at meetings in public, such as the CLC meetings.

Can the Cabinet Member:

- (a) Confirm that he is aware of the situation, and the embarrassment it is causing local members and the County Council as a whole?

- (b) Clarify that there adequate numbers of staff in the parking team to deal with this work, given their other commitments, and to work on new local problems as soon as it is practical to do so?
- (c) Ensure that this problem has been solved and all outstanding Traffic Regulation Orders have been fully implemented by the date of North Horsham CLC's July meeting - and the first anniversary of the agreement of the orders?

### **Answer**

- (a) The Cabinet Member is aware of the current delays in the implementation of the parking schemes and the impact of the delays. The Cabinet Member is therefore working with officers to ensure that such works are complete as soon as possible.
- (b) As with any team there is a need to prioritise workload according to the resources available. The parking team consist of 3 fte with one of the posts being vacant and so is currently being advertised. The parking team deliver much of their work via consultancies and therefore the new Highways and Transport Professional Services Framework is expected to provide additional resources as and when work commitments demand.
- (c) Staff and consultancy resources have been allocated to ensure the contract drawings and associated information is both accurate and complete. Until such information is available, the contractor is unable to programme the works definitively so it is not currently possible to give a precise start date. That said implementation of the Horsham Parking Scheme will immediately follow the completion of the East Worthing Parking scheme and so is currently expected to start during July 2016 and be complete during August 2016. Members, residents and businesses will be advised of definitive start dates as soon as they are available.

### **Supplementary Question**

Given that the east Worthing and Horsham schemes has been around for about four years, is the Cabinet Member confident that there are enough staff and is he recruiting to the vacancy?

### **Supplementary Answer**

Parking schemes are difficult to develop and get consensus on and then there are number of processes in order to produce and install the signs on site. I am aware of the delays in Horsham and am liaising with staff as to how best to progress the schemes. The vacancy is being filled and, in future, there will also be additional support to officers from consultants.

## Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

---

### 9. Written question from **Ms James** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Residents' Services**

#### Question

West Sussex County Council has reorganised its Fire and Rescue Service with the number of front-line fire engines reduced from 46 to 35 in the past six years.

Within Chichester District the number of fire engines has reduced from nine to six and there is concern that the average response times have increased, especially to rural areas.

Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service plan to replace most of the fire engines that provide first response into parts of West Sussex with smaller vehicles carrying as few as two firefighters.

A detailed task analysis, carried out by West Sussex, determined the minimum number of firefighters needed at different incident types. None of them required less than four firefighters to ensure safe and effective initial action. At building fires, the minimum was not less than nine firefighters.

The Hampshire consultation report indicates that West Sussex supported the Hampshire firefighter proposals.

Can the Cabinet Member therefore confirm:

- (a) What was the full response by the County Council to the consultation and who was it made by?
- (b) Given the concerns on the reduction of firefighters attending incidents, on what grounds was support given to Hampshire's proposals and what impact analysis on the implications for West Sussex was undertaken?
- (c) Please confirm the average response time data for the first fire engine over the last 10 years within West Sussex?
- (d) Please confirm the average response times for second and third fire engines attending incidents in each parish within the Bourne and Midhurst County Council Divisions, for each of the last ten years; and
- (e) In the areas where Hampshire currently provide first response, including Bourne Division, how much longer will it take to get four firefighters to minor calls and nine firefighters to building fires, if Hampshire vehicles respond with only two firefighters?

#### Answer

- (a) The County Council itself did not formally respond to the consultation. The response given was the professional opinion of the Fire and Rescue Service. The Fire Service were contacted as part of the consultation and asked to submit a response, as a neighbouring emergency service (notwithstanding the authorities' different governance models). A copy of

the full response has been provided to Ms James and can be provided to any member, on request.

- (b) Hampshire's plans are designed to improve overall station/appliance availability, particularly for retained 'on-call' fire stations where availability has proved an ongoing national challenge. Hampshire believe this will lead to a faster response time for the nearest available firefighters with a first strike capability supported by new technology, albeit on occasions this will be with two to four firefighters in a new style smaller fire appliance instead of the current 'standard' fire engine with a minimum crew of four.

On many occasions, a crew of two will be perfectly adequate, but there will also be other call types when this will not be sufficient to safely resolve an incident. In these instances further crew and appliances will be required and these could be mobilised at the time of the call being received based on the information available.

Hampshire acknowledges that this will be 'a substantial change' in terms of policy, procedure and mind set. This is a different approach to the one currently taken by West Sussex. Throughout the development of 'Fire Redesign' and 'Future Fire & Rescue', the Fire Service undertook an impact analysis using the minimum crew of four for a standard fire appliance in West Sussex. As part of its ongoing analysis, the Fire and Rescue Service continues to meet and engage with Hampshire on their future plans. Both Services remain committed to working closely together and developing processes and procedures that support each other's operational strategies and meet local needs.

As part of its analysis the Fire and Rescue Service have carried out 'what if' modelling scenarios, including estimated attendance times. However, it should be noted that the HFRS plans will be implemented over a four-year period, and it is believed the change closest to county border (Emsworth) will be towards the end of this programme. This means the County Council will have up to four years of data, evidence, and operational experience to give us a more informed impact analysis on any potential future impact for West Sussex.

- (c) The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) recognise that data prior to 2009/10 is not comparable due to the introduction of their new incident recording system, and so only six years data is included.

Fire Services are classed in 'family groups' of authorities judged to be of similar make-up. Comparing our published average attendance times with that of the County Council's family group members shows that West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service performance is in line with these (see table below).

## Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

<b>Average Response Times for Primary Fires by fire and rescue authority areas, 2009 to 2014-15, England</b>							
<b>Family Group two</b>							
Fire and rescue authority area	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>% increase over six years 2009/10 to 2014/15</b>
Oxfordshire	10.0	10.4	9.9	10.4	10.6	11.5	14.9
Wiltshire	10.4	10.7	10.4	10.9	11.1	11.8	13.7
Northamptonshire	9.2	9.4	9.5	9.9	10.4	10.3	11.8
Suffolk	10.3	10.5	10.5	10.7	11.1	11.3	10.3
East Sussex	7.7	7.7	7.6	7.4	7.6	8.4	9.4
Berkshire	8.6	8.7	9.1	8.8	8.8	9.4	8.5
Norfolk	9.5	9.4	9.1	9.2	10.1	10.3	7.8
Cambridgeshire	9.9	10.5	10.4	10.5	10.7	10.6	6.4
West Sussex	<b>9.6</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>5.7</b>
Durham	8.6	8.8	8.3	8.4	8.2	8.9	3.6
Bedfordshire	8.4	8.3	8.1	8.1	8.6	8.6	2.7
Dorset	8.9	8.7	8.5	8.6	8.7	9.0	1.2
Buckinghamshire	10.4	10.6	10.3	9.6	9.9	10.2	-1.4

DCLG also publishes a subset of Primary fire response times (table, below) but this only represents around 40% of our actual primary fire attendances. Significantly, it excludes incidents such as “heat and smoke” only incidents, e.g. appliance faults, defective wiring, cooking incidents where no flames have caused damage. Please note that DCLG statistics show less damage from heat, smoke, fire and water.

<b>First Response times to: (mins)</b>	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16 to end Feb</b>
critical fires	08:09	07:58	07:55	07:35	07:46	08:20	07:52
critical special services	09:22	09:16	09:02	08:26	09:07	09:37	09:16

The tables demonstrate that West Sussex responses are timely and that the interventions we make are highly effective; our staff are extremely well trained, using better technology, and we have a greater understanding of fire development, which means better community education, prevention and better fire protection.

DCLG statistics show how attendance times in West Sussex actually fell year on year between 2009-14 even with the removal of six fire engines

and closure of three fire stations in 2011 as part of Fire Redesign.

The figures show an increase in the 2014-15 attendance times for ten of the thirteen Fire Services in the West Sussex family group. Please note this is prior to the implementation of West Sussex's 'Future Fire & Rescue' model. Notwithstanding the ongoing challenges with retained availability across the UK, a contributory factor to this one year rise is believed by DCLG to be the many periods of industrial action taken by the Fire Brigades Union in their national dispute on pensions. Although the dispute has not been formally resolved, the new pension scheme was implemented in April 2015.

However, performance standards in West Sussex are risk-based. We believe that it is more important to concentrate our efforts to life risk incidents and hence we measure attendance times to Critical Fires and Special Services Only, which are not directly comparable with the DCLG statistics that include attendance times to outdoor structures and fields etc.

NB The 2014/15 rise appears to be an impact of the national industrial action, however the overall trend is good, which is supported by the latest data showing another pleasing fall post 'Future Fire & Rescue' in attendance times (to February 2016), with the average critical fire attendance time now less than eight minutes for West Sussex.

- (d) WSFRS does not have systems set up to readily calculate this data, or the impact of supporting appliances to back up those first in attendance whether they be the third or subsequent appliances. Our agreed attendance performance standards are based on the first and second appliance times (those likely to have the most direct impact on the outcome) for critical incidents and special service incidents at Station, Group and County level.

To calculate ten years' worth of attendance time data for all incident types, second and third appliance times, matched to all parish boundaries in Bourne and Midhurst, would involve significant manual process and data preparation. We estimate over one week's worth of work, for one member of staff would be a disproportionate use of resources to achieve no real added value in terms of performance data.

- (e) Classifying incidents as: 'minor calls' and 'building fires' is too generic to respond in terms of the number of firefighters required to resolve the incident. Minor calls can range from cutting a ring off someone's finger to a bin fire. Building fires can range from a small garden shed to a high rise block.

In the instances of 'minor calls' described above therefore Hampshire believe it is not maximising its resources by mobilising four firefighters on every occasion, especially if more flexible risk-based options were available.

Hampshire FRS and all other FRS will respond to each incident type, with

## Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 3

---

the appropriate level of resources (including the number of firefighters) deemed suitable through task analysis, to effectively deal with the initial incident. Whilst en-route or on arrival the incident commander would request additional resources if required.

Until we have a full understanding of the mobilisation criteria, vehicle equipment and capabilities that HFRS are proposing, we are unable to model to an incident specific level of precision.

### Supplementary Question

I notice that the response to the Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service consultation was from an officer rather than the Cabinet Member. Given the lack of a response in relation to question (d), the average response time to incidents in the Bourne division, will the Cabinet Member provide incident log sheets for Bourne division for independent scrutiny?

### Supplementary Answer

As Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service is a stand-alone authority, it was appropriate that a senior officer provided a technical response. However, as Cabinet Member, I was consulted on the response. As Hampshire does not attend incidents in West Sussex that often, it would be disproportionate to go through all the parish records for 10 years as requested.

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

#### Question

A year ago the County Council was promised a quarterly report on West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service performance indicators that I had requested. Why have these indicators not been published as promised and for what reason, and when will publication commence?

#### Answer

Performance data has been provided on a quarterly basis to all members. First quarter data was issued directly to all members via Democratic Services. Second and third quarter data was published on the MINE (Members' Information Network) on 10 February 2016. Notification with a hyperlink to the data was sent to members via Democratic Services.

Performance data from 1 May 2016 will also be publically available on the County Council website tiles under the wider Communities & Public Protection heading. It will also be available for members on the MINE.

### Supplementary Question

I should be grateful if the Cabinet Member would go back to the original written

question request as not all the information which was promised to the Council is being provided.

### **Supplementary Answer**

If Dr Walsh will remind me of what was promised, I will consider the request.

## **Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 4**

---

### **Agenda Item No. 13(b) - Cabinet Member Question Time**

Members asked questions of the Cabinet Members and Leader (in respect of the Economy portfolio) as set out below. In instances where a Cabinet Member or Leader undertook to take follow-up action, this is also noted below.

#### **Start of Life**

##### **Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 1, New group offer to support young carers, from Mr Smith.

Paragraph 2, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services, from Mrs Jones and Mr Peters.

##### **Cabinet Member for Education and Skills**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 8, West Sussex Graduation Ceremonies for Apprentices, from Mrs Duncton.

Imminent closure of Central Sussex College Haywards Heath campus, from Mrs Bennett, Mr Bradbury, Mr Hillier, Mrs Jones and Mr Wickremaratchi.

In relation to a question from Mrs Bennett as to whether there would be adequate provision within the East Grinstead area for vocational studies, the Cabinet Member said he would find out and respond to her.

Performance of secondary school academies, from Mr Parsons.

#### **The Economy**

##### **Leader**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 9, Creative Digital Hub, from Ms James.

##### **Later Life**

##### **Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 10, Carers' Roundtable Forum, from Mrs Smith.

The Cabinet Member agreed to provide Mrs Smith with the names of representatives in the Crawley area or the north of the county who served on those bodies.

Paragraph 11, Raise It, from Mrs Millson and Mr Wickremaratchi.

In response to a question from Mr Wickremaratchi as to whether the scheme could be extended to include warden assisted housing, the Cabinet Member said he would contact Mr Wickremaratchi about an issue he had raised in his division.

Also on paragraph 11, in relation to a comment from Mrs Millson about problems uploading the poster to the Horsham County Local Committee Facebook page, the Cabinet Member said that the issue would be looked at.

Paragraph 12, LGBTQ Carers' Support Group, from Ms Kennard and Mrs Smith.

The Cabinet Member agreed to provide Mrs Smith with the names of representatives in the Crawley area or the north of the county who served on those bodies.

Local Housing Allowance, from Mr Sheldon.

In relation to a question from Mr Sheldon about whether there had been a response to the letters to MPs about the Local Housing Allowance and how supported housing could continue to be adequately funded, the Cabinet Member said he had yet to receive a reply but would let Mr Sheldon know as soon as he did.

### **Stronger Communities**

#### **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 13, A27, from Mr Montyn, Dr Walsh and Mr Whittington.

Paragraph 14, Consultation on proposals for a revised airspace change process, from Mrs Kitchen.

Planning enforcement, from Mr Griffiths.

In response to a question from Mr Griffiths about planning enforcement the Cabinet Member said he would discuss the matter with him outside the Chamber.

Road repairs, from Mr Watson.

In response to a question from Mr Watson about the money spent on road repairs and the lack of visible response to reports of problems, the Cabinet Member said he would provide all members with the latest information.

#### **Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters:

Paragraph 17, Gypsy and Traveller Transit Site, from Mrs Evans and Mrs Smith.

## **Minutes: Item 2 – Appendix 4**

---

In response to a question from Mrs Smith about how many unauthorised encampments were in the north of the county, the Cabinet Member said she would find out and respond to her.

Performance of new patient transport provider, from Dr Walsh.

### **Cabinet Member for Residents' Services**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Paragraph 19, Inter Authority Waste Group, from Mr Bradbury and Mrs Urquhart.

Paragraph 20, Trading Standards Pan-Sussex Scams Conference, from Mr G L Jones and Mrs Millson.

### **Effective Council**

#### **Cabinet Member for Finance**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 26, New Homes Bonus consultation, from Mr Oppler and Mrs Rapnik.

In response to a request from Mr Oppler for the Cabinet Member to take the lead in submitting a joint county/borough and district response to the Government the Cabinet Member suggested they discuss the issue outside the Chamber.

### **Agenda Item No. 13(c) - Leader's Question Time**

The Leader answered questions from members on the following matters.

Paragraph 1, Chichester Law Courts, from Mrs Evans.

Paragraph 3, Devolution, from Mr Crow, Ms James and Dr Walsh.

Legal services agreement, from Mr Hillier.

Imminent closure of Central Sussex College Haywards Heath campus, from Mr Bradbury