

Draft minutes - subject to confirmation at next meeting  
**West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting**

---

**20 July 2018**

At the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 am on Friday, 20 July 2018, at the County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mr Barnard (Chairman)

Lt Cdr Atkins, RD	Mrs Kitchen
Mr Baldwin	Mr Lanzer
Mr Barling	Ms Lord
Mr Barrett-Miles	Mr Markwell
Lt Col Barton, TD	Mr Marshall
Mrs Bennett	Mr McDonald
Mr Boram	Mrs Millson
Mr Bradford	Mr Mitchell
Mrs Bridges	Mr Montyn
Mr Buckland	Mrs Mullins
Mr Burrett	Mr R J Oakley
Mr Catchpole	Mr S J Oakley
Mr Cloake	Dr O'Kelly
Mr Crow	Mr Oppler
Mrs Dennis	Mr Oxlade
Dr Dennis	Mr Parikh
Mrs Duncton	Mr Patel
Mr Elkins	Mrs Pendleton
Mr Fitzjohn	Mr Petts
Ms Flynn	Mrs Purnell
Ms Goldsmith	Mr Quinn
Mr High	Mrs Russell
Mr Hillier	Mr Simmons
Mr Hunt	Mrs Smith
Mrs Jones, MBE	Mr Smytherman
Mr M G Jones	Mrs Urquhart
Mrs Jupp	Mr Waight
Mr Jupp	Dr Walsh, KStJ, RD
Ms Kennard	Mr Whittington

**50 Apologies for Absence**

- 50.1 Apologies were received from Mrs Arculus, Mr Bradbury, Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Edwards, Mrs Hall, Mr Lea, Mr Purchase, Mrs Sparkes, Mr Turner and Mr Wickremaratchi. Mr Acraman and Mr Markwell were absent.
- 50.2 Apologies for the afternoon session were received from Lt Col Barton and Ms Lord. Mr Oxlade gave his apologies and left at 2.30 pm. Mr S J Oakley and Mr Buckland were absent for the morning and afternoon sessions respectively. Mr Oppler left at 2.50 p.m., Ms Flynn and Mrs Pendleton at 3.15 p.m. and Dr Walsh at 3.50 p.m.

## **51 Members' Interests**

51.1 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

## **52 Minutes**

52.1 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 8 June 2018 (pages 9 to 38), subject to the correction of Mrs Dennis' name in minute 45, be approved as a correct record.

## **53 Appointments**

53.1 The Council approved appointments as set out below.

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Change</b>
Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee	Mr Barling to fill vacancy
Rights of Way Committee substitute	Mrs Pendleton to fill vacancy

## **54 Motion on Academies**

54.1 The following motion was moved by Mr High and seconded by Mr Jones:

'This Council recognises the concerns raised with members by a number of parents and residents about recent events at Thomas Bennett Community College in Crawley. The Council also recognises that many people have been looking to the County Council to provide a lead on this issue and to intervene in a way which many would expect of their Local Education Authority, but that whilst the Director of Education and Skills has been able to raise her concerns about the matter with the Regional Schools Commissioner, the Council has been unable to take any more proactive action on this as the school is an Academy under the control of a Multi-Academy Trust.

This Council is concerned that, whilst schools which have been judged to be Inadequate by OFSTED can be the subject of a Directed Academy Order imposed by the Regional Schools Commissioner, there is no legal mechanism via which an Academy which is experiencing difficulties can be returned to local authority control, even if it is clear that that is the outcome which parents want. This leaves the County Council powerless to act directly in response to parents' concerns.

The Council therefore requests the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills to write to the Secretary of State for Education urging him to change the law to enable local authorities to have greater powers of intervention, challenge and support when

Academies are causing concern, and to introduce a mechanism to enable Academies to be returned to local authority maintained status when circumstances deem that to be in the best interests of the individual school in question.'

54.2 The motion, as set out in minute 54.1, was agreed.

## **55 Motion on Cycling**

55.1 The following motion was moved by Dr O'Kelly and seconded by Ms Lord.

'This Council recognises the significant work being done by the Cabinet to promote the benefits of increasing cycle journeys, in terms of improving fitness, reducing congestion and the need to provide additional parking spaces, and improving air quality, as well as opening up the countryside for both residents and visitors. Along with the undoubted benefits of making cycling easier, there are also a number of issues that need to be addressed for the benefit of all residents and visitors to West Sussex. There are also new developments, such as electric bikes and increasing numbers of motorised scooters, which should, ideally, be segregated from pedestrians as far as possible in town centres.

The Council therefore calls on the Cabinet to hold a county-wide Cycling Summit to explore all the issues more fully, involving the whole range of stakeholders to address at least the following issues:

- (1) The health benefits of increasing cycling miles and how this can be achieved;
- (2) The role of cycling in addressing congestion and air quality;
- (3) Increasing cycle commuting and the role of employers in encouraging this;
- (4) Cycling Safety;
- (5) Cycle tourism - opportunities and threats, including a presumption against road closures for large cycle events and damage to popular off-road routes;
- (6) Cycling education, and involving schools and other educational establishments in promoting cycling;
- (7) Involving businesses, and encouraging them to promote cycling through their travel plans;
- (8) Maximising grant funding and exploring other ways of funding new high quality infrastructure;
- (9) Design standards and increasing cycling infrastructure and capacity; and

- (10) Recognising the different challenges of promoting cycling in urban and rural environments and working with district, borough, parish and neighbourhood councils, and the South Downs National Park Authority.'

55.2 The motion was referred to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure for consideration.

## **56 Motion on Velo South**

56.1 The following motion was moved by Dr O'Kelly and seconded by Mrs Millson.

'This Council recognises that the forthcoming Velo South on-road cycle event will raise the profile of West Sussex. This Council equally acknowledges the impact the proposed road closures will have on those residents and businesses who are along and within the loop of the route and therefore calls on the Leader and the Cabinet for Highways and Infrastructure to take steps to minimise that impact by working with the event organisers to either abandon the road closures or introduce 'short rolling road closures for the elite cyclists only', noting that 'rolling' closures have been the norm for previous major cycle events in the county.'

56.2 The motion was lost.

## **57 Motion on Costs of Citizenship for Children**

57.1 The following motion was moved by Mrs Mullins and seconded by Mr Oxlade.

'In the UK today, there are significant numbers of children who do not currently have British citizenship, but have rights to register as British citizens. Many of these children were born in the UK, and others have lived here from a young age, been raised here, educated here, and have never known any other home. Without access to their citizenship rights, children may find themselves denied opportunities extended to their peers, such as the chance to participate in a school trip, or to be eligible for funding, so they can undertake higher education.

There are a number of barriers to children registering their citizenship. Registration can be a complex process of prohibitive cost. Children are charged £1,012 for a process whose administrative cost is published at £372, meaning government is making a profit of £640 from every child who claims their rights. No child should be denied their citizenship rights by reason of a fee. There is no substitute for citizenship, which is vital to future security and sense of belonging.

This Council recognises:

- (a) That the profit-making element of the fee, to register citizenship, discourages the best outcomes for many of the

UK's children;

- (b) Because of their duties as corporate parents, the fee for children to register will fall on councils, in the many cases where children looked after qualify for citizenship; and
- (c) The fee puts councils, in the unacceptable position, of having to weigh the benefits of citizenship, to a child in their care, against the cost to the council of assisting a child in claiming that right.

This Council therefore resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People:

- (1) To write to the Minister of Immigration, demanding that the fee for children to register as British citizens is reduced to the administrative cost; and demanding that children looked after are exempted from the fee in its entirety; and
- (2) To identify children in the Council's care who are entitled to citizenship, and make sure they are aware of their rights and supported to claim them.'

57.2 An amendment was moved by Mr Hillier and seconded by Mrs Jones.

'In the UK today, there are significant numbers of children who do not currently have British citizenship, but have rights to register as British citizens. Many of these children were born in the UK, and others have lived here from a young age, been raised here, educated here, and have never known any other home. Without access to their citizenship rights, children may find themselves denied opportunities extended to their peers, such as the chance to participate in a school trip, or to be eligible for funding, so they can undertake higher education.

***It is reported that*** there are a number of barriers to children registering their citizenship. Registration can be a complex process of prohibitive cost. Children are charged £1,012 for a process whose administrative cost is published at £372, meaning government is ***apparently*** making a profit of £640 from every child who claims their rights. No child should be denied their citizenship rights by reason of a fee. There is no substitute for citizenship, which is vital to future security and sense of belonging.

This Council recognises:

- (a) That ***there is a risk that*** ~~the profit-making element of the fee, to register citizenship, discourages the best outcomes for many~~ ***some*** of the UK's children;
- (b) Because of their duties as corporate parents, the fee for children to register ~~will~~ ***may*** fall on councils, in the ~~many~~ ***few***

cases where children looked after qualify for citizenship **and put an application in**; and

- (c) **in such instances**, the fee **could** puts councils, in the unacceptable position, of having to weigh the benefits of citizenship, to a child in their care, against the cost to the council of assisting a child in claiming that right.

This Council therefore resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People:

- (12) To identify children in the Council's care who are entitled to citizenship, and **to continue to** make sure they are aware of their rights and supported to claim them;-
- (21) To write to the Minister of Immigration, ~~demanding that~~ **suggesting that the level of** the fee for children to register as British citizens ~~is~~ **could be a barrier to a young person wishing to regularise their citizenship and asking that consideration be given to** ~~demanding that~~ the fee **being** reduced to the administrative cost; and ~~demanding that~~ children looked after **being** are exempted from the fee in its entirety; and
- (3) **To also ask that the Home Office undertakes to take up its statutory responsibilities in relation to those young people who have been refused refugee status in more timely fashion and not leave the burden on local authorities.'**

57.3 The amendment was carried.

57.4 An amendment was moved by Ms Lord and seconded by Mrs Millson.

'In the UK today, there are significant numbers of children who do not currently have British citizenship, but have rights to register as British citizens. Many of these children were born in the UK, and others have lived here from a young age, been raised here, educated here, and have never known any other home. Without access to their citizenship rights, children may find themselves denied opportunities extended to their peers, such as the chance to participate in a school trip, or to be eligible for funding, so they can undertake higher education.

There are a number of barriers to children registering their citizenship. Registration can be a complex process of prohibitive cost. Children are charged £1,012 for a process whose administrative cost is published at £372, meaning government is making a profit of £640 from every child who claims their rights. No child should be denied their citizenship rights by reason of a fee. There is no substitute for citizenship, which is vital to future security and sense of belonging.

This Council recognises:

- (a) That the profit-making element of the fee, to register citizenship, discourages the best outcomes for many of the UK's children;
- (b) Because of their duties as corporate parents, the fee for children to register will fall on councils, in the many cases where children looked after qualify for citizenship; and
- (c) The fee puts councils, in the unacceptable position, of having to weigh the benefits of citizenship, to a child in their care, against the cost to the council of assisting a child in claiming that right.

This Council therefore resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People:

- (1) To write to the Minister of Immigration, demanding that the fee for children to register as British citizens is reduced to the administrative cost; and demanding that children looked after are exempted from the fee in its entirety; and
- (2) To identify children in the Council's care who are entitled to citizenship ***or other leave to remain***, and make sure they are aware of their rights and ***fully financially and administratively*** supported to claim them, ***including those aged between 21 and 25 if requested by the care leaver.***

57.5 The amendment was lost.

57.6 The motion as amended and set out below was agreed.

'In the UK today, there are significant numbers of children who do not currently have British citizenship, but have rights to register as British citizens. Many of these children were born in the UK, and others have lived here from a young age, been raised here, educated here, and have never known any other home. Without access to their citizenship rights, children may find themselves denied opportunities extended to their peers, such as the chance to participate in a school trip, or to be eligible for funding, so they can undertake higher education.

It is reported that there are a number of barriers to children registering their citizenship. Registration can be a complex process of prohibitive cost. Children are charged £1,012 for a process whose administrative cost is published at £372, meaning government is apparently making a profit of £640 from every child who claims their rights. No child should be denied their citizenship rights by reason of a fee. There is no substitute for citizenship, which is vital to future security and sense of belonging.

This Council recognises:

- (a) That there is a risk that the fee, to register citizenship, discourages the best outcomes some of the UK's children;
- (b) Because of their duties as corporate parents, the fee for children to register may fall on councils, in the few cases where children looked after qualify for citizenship and put an application in; and
- (c) in such instances, the fee could put councils in the position of having to weigh the benefits of citizenship to a child in their care, against the cost to the council of assisting a child in claiming that right.

This Council therefore resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People:

- (1) To identify children in the Council's care who are entitled to citizenship, and to continue to make sure they are aware of their rights and supported to claim them;
- (2) To write to the Minister of Immigration, suggesting that the level of the fee for children to register as British citizens could be a barrier to a young person wishing to regularise their citizenship and asking that consideration be given to the fee being reduced to the administrative cost; and children looked after being exempted from the fee in its entirety; and
- (3) To also ask that the Home Office undertakes to take up its statutory responsibilities in relation to those young people who have been refused refugee status in more timely fashion and not leave the burden on local authorities.'

## **58 Motion on the Military Covenant**

58.1 The following motion was moved by Lt Cdr Atkins and seconded by Mrs Dunton.

'This Council congratulates the work undertaken by the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities for the work she has undertaken to obtain the Military Covenant Silver Award. As demonstrated at the last County Council meeting, the Council:

- (a) Applauds the work of our military service personnel, acknowledges the personal sacrifices in battle and peace time.
- (b) Acknowledges the challenges faced on entering civilian life.
- (c) Is deeply conscious of the impact of PTSD on veterans.

The Council therefore calls on the Cabinet Member to make every effort to achieve the Gold Award for the Military Covenant in this coming year by:

- (1) Actively ensuring that the County Council's workforce is aware of the positive policies towards defence people matters.
- (2) Actively promoting the County Council's good practice to other councils, our contractors and suppliers and other partner organisations.
- (3) Working with the Military Covenant Board to develop more 'drop in centres' across West Sussex similar to the Littlehampton Veterans Breakfast Club.'

58.2 The motion, as set out above, was agreed.

## **59 Adoption of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan**

59.1 The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure moved the report on West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (pages 39 to 42), subject to a correction to the fourth line of paragraph 6.10.12 on page 75 of Appendix B to read 'This railway link is safeguarded **for** this form of development'.

59.2 Resolved –

That the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan, incorporating the main modifications recommended by the Inspector and other minor changes (Appendix B to the report), subject to the correction set out in minute 59.1 above, be adopted to replace the West Sussex Minerals Local Plan (2003).

## **60 West Sussex County Council Annual Report 2017/18**

60.1 The Leader moved the report on West Sussex County Council Annual Report 2017/18 (pages 43 to 44).

60.2 Resolved - That the West Sussex Annual Report 2017/18 be noted.

## **61 Governance Committee: Review of the Constitution**

61.1 Members were informed that a technical review had been undertaken of the County Council's Constitution, with an aim of making it a more accessible document, removing duplication and simplifying some of the more technical language. The Council considered the proposed changes, in the light of a report by the Governance Committee (pages 45 to 52).

61.2 Resolved –

- (1) That the proposed changes to governance arrangements set out in paragraph 8 of the report be approved;
- (2) That the revised the Constitution be approved; and

- (3) The Director of Law and Assurance be authorised to make any minor consequential changes to the Constitution arising from the review.

## **62 Standards Committee: Review of the Constitution - Codes of Conduct**

62.1 The Council considered changes to the Codes of Conduct with the intention of simplifying and streamlining the Constitution in the light of a report from the Standards Committee (pages 53 and 56).

62.2 Resolved –

- (1) That the proposed revisions to the Code of Conduct included in Part 5, Sections 1 and 2 be approved;
- (2) That the proposed removal of Part 5, Sections 8 to 13 and the proposed removal of the Corporate Advice Notes be approved; and
- (3) That authority be delegated to the Director of Human Resources to make and amend future policies relating to staff conduct, in consultation with the Director of Law and Assurance.

## **63 Governance Committee: Independent Remuneration Panel Review of Member Allowances**

63.1 The Council was reminded that a new Members' Allowances Scheme had come into effect in May 2017, based on a Scheme recommended by the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) to Council in December 2016. The Council had asked the IRP to review the Scheme after about a year of operation and the IRP had now completed that review. The Council considered the IRP's proposals, in the light of a report by the Governance Committee (pages 57 to 64).

63.2 The Chairman agreed to raise with the IRP a comment that for members with children in nursery settings where there was usually a need to commit to using care every week, the maximum annual amount might not be sufficient.

63.3 Resolved –

That the Independent Remuneration Panel's report and recommendations be approved.

## **64 Governance Committee: Staff Appeals Panel - Proposals for Change**

64.1 The Council considered changes to the working of the Staff Appeals Panel in the light of a report from the Governance Committee (supplement pack pages 3 to 8).

64.2 Resolved -

- (1) That the changes to the constitutional arrangements for the Appeals Panel to deal with staff disciplinary or grievance appeals, as set out in Option 1 in the report, be approved; and
- (2) That the Discipline and Grievance policies, and other relevant procedures and guidance be amended accordingly.

## **65 Governance Committee: Pay Policy Statement 2018/19**

65.1 The Council considered changes to the Pay Policy Statement 2018/19 in the light of a report from the Governance Committee (supplment pack pages 9 to 19).

65.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources informed the Council that the words 'in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources', should be added to paragraph 4.2 of Appendix 1.

65.3 Resolved –

That the proposed revisions to the text of the Pay Policy Statement, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, subject to the addition of the words 'in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources' in paragraph 4.2 of Appendix 1, be approved.

## **66 Annual Report of the Standards Committee**

66.1 The Council considered the report from the Standards Committee on its activities for the period May 2017 to April 2018 (pages 65 and 66).

66.2 Resolved –

That the report be noted.

## **67 Question Time**

67.1 Members asked questions of members of the Cabinet on matters relevant to their portfolios and asked questions of chairmen, as set out at Appendix 3. This included questions on those matters contained within the Cabinet report (pages 67 to 78) and a supplementary report (supplement pages 1 and 2) and written questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 15(2) (set out at Appendix 2).

## **68 Motion on the EU**

68.1 The following motion was moved by Dr Walsh and seconded by Dr O'Kelly.

'West Sussex County Council believes:

- (1) That there is mounting and indisputable evidence of damage that a 'hard Brexit' would cause both to the national economy and to our regional economy.
- (2) The damage to our international relationships, the reducing influence with other states and the complete loss of say and control over the rules of the European Single Market and Customs Union, the largest market in the world will be very severe.
- (3) That the Government has totally mismanaged the Brexit negotiations and has failed to work closely with Scotland/Wales/regions and local authorities and listen to our concerns.
- (4) That businesses within our region, like those elsewhere in the UK, are reconsidering investment plans in new production and new jobs while they await the Brexit deal.
- (5) That the current rights of EU citizens living in the UK should always be fully protected and not used as a bargaining chip by the UK Government.

The Council notes:

- (1) The increasing problems that the NHS is having in recruiting nurses and doctors since the decision to leave the European Union was made and that this is having a real impact on the health of local residents.
- (2) With concern, the potential impact of Brexit both on our local economy and on established mutually beneficial partnerships and links with European businesses.
- (3) That the UK economy is now the slowest growing economy in Europe, reducing the prosperity of the UK and our local residents.
- (4) That new investment in the region is being jeopardised and new job opportunities are being lost.
- (5) That Inflation caused by Brexit-related depreciation of the pound is driving up living costs for all our residents, and a further squeezing on living standards.
- (6) That Bristol, Brighton & Hove and Hammersmith & Fulham councils have already passed motions that back a vote on the final deal with an option to stay within the European Union.

West Sussex County Council resolves to:

- (1) Request the Leader of the Council to write to our local Members of Parliament and the Secretary of State for

Housing, Communities and Local Government, expressing this Council's strong desire for a public referendum on the final deal, including the option to maintain full EU membership; and

- (2) Request the Leader of the Council to write to all Leaders of local authorities and/or the Local Government Association urging them to also adopt a policy calling for a public referendum on the final deal including an option to maintain full EU membership.'

68.2 The motion was lost.

Chairman

The Council rose at 4.05 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

## Interests

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

<b>Item</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Item 6(a) – Notice of Motion on Academies	Mr Patel	Director of RCAL Regis School
	Mr Smytherman	Chairman of Local Governing Committee of St Mary’s Primary School (part of the Bosco CET(MAT))
Item 6(c) – Notice of Motion on Velo South	Mr Marshall	Trustee of RSPCA Sussex and Chichester
Item 6(e) – Notice of Motion on the Military Covenant	Lt Cdr Atkins	Veteran and member of Royal Naval Association for Veterans
	Mr Barling	Member of Royal British Legion and Trustee of Building Heroes
	Lt Col Barton	Armed Forces Champion for Adur District Council
	Mr Jupp	Armed Forces Champion for Horsham District Council
	Mrs Smith	Portfolio Holder for Armed Forces at Crawley Borough Council
Item 15 – QT all paragraphs	Mrs Jones	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and Burgess Hill Town Council
	Mr Patel	Member of Arun District Council
Item 15 – QT paragraph 13 (Govia Thameslink Railway)	Dr Dennis	Annual season ticket holder between Horsham and London
Item 15 – QT (Gatwick Airport Legal Agreement)	Mr Lanzer	Member of Crawley Borough Council
Item 15 – QT paragraph 24 (review of the Pension Fund Investment Strategy)	Mr Burrett	Deferred member of Local Government Pension Scheme

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 15 – QT paragraph 24 (review of the Pension Fund Investment Strategy) (cont)	Mr Lanzer	Member of Local Government Pension Scheme
Item 15 – QT paragraph 26 (Homes England – Northern Arc)	Mr Barrett-Miles	Member of Member Steering Group of Burgess Hill Growth Project
	Mrs Dennis	Member of Member Steering Group of Burgess Hill Growth Project
Item 15 – QT any question relating to the proposed closure of the Wrenford Centre, Chichester	Ms Flynn	Daughter works at the Wrenford Centre

---

**Written Questions: 20 July 2018****1. Written question from Mr Jones for reply by the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People****Question**

I would be grateful if the Cabinet Member could outline for me what financial, emotional and practical support the County Council provides for children looked after aged 18 or over who express a desire to search for their birth parents.

Can he also outline what financial costs are required of any individual, if they wish to pursue the search for their birth parents, in terms of this Council's charges, the request for records from external bodies such as other local authorities, and other services such as advice from qualified staff in advising whether to proceed with such a search.

Can he confirm whether there is any discretion for the Council to waive charges, should they exist, if the individual concerned is a former child looked after either:

- (a) by this authority; or
- (b) another local authority?

**Answer**

Children Looked After have a legal right to see their original birth certificate when they reach age 18, without cost, and the County Council will fully support them to exercise this wish. In practice, most care leavers maintain some personal contact with their birth families during their time in care. For the remaining 20%, the County Council maintains records of birth families and these can be made available on request at the appropriate time. Where further action was required beyond the supply of records, we would look sympathetically at each case on an individual basis.

The Customer Relations team oversees this process and Children's Services considers it is well and sensitively managed. Pre-access counselling is offered, recognising that the details to be disclosed to the young person may be emotionally charged.

All care leavers have a Personal Adviser (PA) who will give practical and emotional support automatically to age 21, and to age 25 on request. This enables them to build their adult lives more securely, which naturally includes understanding their own original circumstances where they wish to do so.

In the particular case of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children, the County Council will put the young person in touch with the Red Cross Family Finding service. Inevitably, due to their circumstances, no outcome can be guaranteed for these enquiries. No costs are charged either by the County Council, or any other local authority.

In addition, adopted adults have a legal right to access their original birth

certificate at the age of 18. This costs £9.25 from the general register. In the case of post commencement adoptions - those taking place after December 2005 – the original birth certificate is required under the regulations to be placed on the adoption file. In practice most adopted adults know their birth name because when they were placed they should have had a life story book/letter, and many will have had letterbox exchange with birth family members up until the age of 18.

Should young adopted adults wish to access their adoption records and/or trace birth parents there is a specialist worker within the adoption support service who will offer counselling support and help with access to records. Should they wish to trace their birth parents/siblings/other relatives then support can be provided to do this through to reunion and beyond. The intermediary service would be offered at no cost. If it is not possible to trace birth family members then an independent researcher would be suggested. A cost would be applicable for this service – this is usually on a sliding scale depending on individual circumstances (ranging from £30 upwards to around £400). On occasion the County Council has financed this for young adults and also paid for the birth certificates.

The adoption service has a contract with the Post Adoption Centre (PAC) and is able to signpost young people to this provider if they do not wish to use the County Council's adoption service. This is free at the present time. PAC can offer counselling and access to birth records and support through to reunion. They will charge for tracing, but West Sussex has funded this in the past.

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

**Question**

Young people are required to continue in education or training until at least their 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, choosing to participate through full time education, a job or volunteering combined with part time study, or by undertaking an apprenticeship or traineeship.

I understand that local authorities have a statutory duty to encourage, enable and assist them to participate in education or training.

Furthermore, under the September guarantee all 16 and 17 years olds are entitled to an offer of a suitable place in education or training regardless of what qualifications they have gained when they left school. I understand that West Sussex is performing well below its peer authorities in the South East and nationally with regard to the percentage of young people with an unknown education, employment or training (EET) status.

Can the Cabinet Member please:

(a) Confirm the figures of those young people with an unknown EET status. In respect of West Sussex, the South East region and nationally for April 2018 and how this compares to the figures for April 2017 and April 2016?;

- (b) Explain how it is possible to lose track of these young people after they have finished their secondary school education, outlining the steps he is planning to take to address this area of poor performance and confirm what support is provided to those missing young people once they have been identified, to encourage them back in education or training?; and
- (c) Confirm how many young people in West Sussex aged 16-24 are currently identified as not in education, employment or training, and of those, what percentage:
- (i) Have a low GCSE attainment level?
  - (ii) Have special educational needs or disabilities?
  - (iii) Are/were previously children looked after?
  - (iv) Are of black, Asian or ethnic minority origin?

### Answer

- (a) Below are the figures for young people with an Unknown EET status for West Sussex, the South East region and nationally for April 2018 with comparison to April 2017 and 2016:

	<b>National (England)</b>	<b>South East</b>	<b>West Sussex</b>
<b>April 2018</b>	2.9%	3.6%	7.1%
<b>April 2017</b>	3%	4%	7.4%
<b>April 2016*</b>	6.2%	6.5%	13.8%

\*At this time local authorities were measured on 16-18 year olds as opposed to 16-17 year olds.

- (b) Once young people leave statutory education the local authority is reliant on robust information sharing procedures involving schools, colleges, training providers and others so that we can update our database. The majority of young people are successfully tracked in this way but if young people are not participating, or the information sharing procedures break down, it becomes much more difficult to keep up to date with every young person's EET status.

Responsibility for tracking Unknowns has only recently transferred across to Education and Skills from the Integrated Prevention and Earliest Help Service (IPEH). It should not be underestimated how huge a task it is to track the EET destinations for all 16- and 17-year-olds in the county. At the beginning of every academic year every 16- and 17-year-old's EET status moves to Unknown until we can prove otherwise. Despite the efforts of individual staff within IPEH there has been a need for a robust strategy and sufficient resource to make a significant impact on improving our Unknowns figures – we are currently in the bottom quintile nationally. Education and Skills are committed to addressing these challenges over the coming year. We have already started to do this by:

- Better data sharing from schools and colleges.
- More responsibility given to delivery teams to ensure better information sharing within their local networks.
- Recruitment of apprentices to focus on calls and texts to Unknowns.
- Additional resource through our new European Social Inclusion Fund (ESIF) programme to look strategically and innovatively at improving our data collection approach.

We are likely to lose contact with three times as many Year 13s as Year 12s so we will need to ensure a focus on those coming to the end of one-year courses.

Our Post-16 Support Team delivers 1:1 careers support for young people who are NEET. Careers advisers aim to work with all NEETs but some are difficult to engage. During this summer term the team has also been providing 1:1 careers support to over 260 Year 11s who have no intended Post-16 destination in an attempt to prevent these pupils becoming NEET.

Our new ESIF Think Futures programme will enhance our work with NEETs and Unknowns. The programme brings £984,382 of new money which is match-funded through in-kind contributions. The County Council is the Lead Partner working with our Delivery Partners - Surrey County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council. The funding split involves the County Council contributing 60% and the remainder being funded by Surrey County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council. The programme commenced on 1 July 2018 and ends on 31 December 2020.

We believe this programme, together with our existing work and focus, will aid our aim of being in the top tier of local authorities for NEETs and tracking performance by 2022.

- (c) We have currently 425 NEETs aged 16 to 24 years.
- (i) We are not able to extract this information
  - (ii) 7.2%
  - (iii) 0.47%
  - (iv) 2.6%

**3. Written question from Mr Quinn for reply by the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills**

**Question**

I understand that a meeting between officers from West Sussex County Council and the Governors from Woodlands Mead School, Burgess Hill took place on 4 July 2018 to discuss the results of the recent feasibility study with a number of options identified for further discussion with the Cabinet. Could the Cabinet Member confirm what progress has been made with those discussions and confirm

to members what has been agreed and when action will be taken on this matter.

### **Answer**

On 4 July 2018 a meeting was held between officers of the County Council and Woodlands Meed School Governors to discuss the feasibility study into the various options for improving the facilities for Woodlands Meed College students.

Following a lengthy discussion, County Council officers and School Governors agreed that the option of replacing the current Woodlands Meed College buildings and facilities on the College site, also known as the Newick House site, was to be presented to Cabinet Members for further consideration.

The County Council's Cabinet Members met on 17 July 2018 and considered all the proposals in the feasibility study. Cabinet Members resolved to ask officers to commission detailed design work on the proposal for a new build on the College site, noting that this was the School Governors' preferred option.

All the options presented and considered would require a significant amount of financial investment from the County Council over a long period of time in order to progress from concept, through detailed specification and planning to delivery.

If this project is to progress the County Council would need to look at resourcing this programme of work from the Capital Programme. This would require very difficult choices on other projects if this scheme is to be accommodated.

Therefore, the cost of any scheme would need to be kept as low as possible while ensuring that we are still meeting the needs of the children and young people to get the education they deserve, recognising the financial constraints of the County Council. We look forward to continuing our partnership working with the School's Governors in order to enable us to achieve a solution that is in the interests of the children yet is able to be delivered within the financial purse of the County Council.

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

### **Question**

At a recent meeting of the Performance and Finance Select Committee members learnt that the County Council had recently purchased the Kamelia Kids Children's Centre in Worthing in order to provide medium term security for the services being delivered there.

I understand that the County Council has been providing financial support in addition to advice and direct support over the past few years in recognition of the fact that the Centre fulfils an essential need for young children in the locality, particularly those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities. Can the Cabinet Member provide me with the following information:

- (a) How much the County Council has paid for the purchase of the Centre, when members agreed to the purchase of the site and when the purchase was completed;
- (b) Details of how much funding the County Council has provided to the Centre in each of the last five years, including any Community Initiative Fund (CIF) funding, but excluding payments directly related to individual nursery places, and what that funding was for;
- (c) Confirm the basis on which the Centre is currently being used by Kamelia Kids Children's Centre and how long the current arrangement is anticipated to be in place for; and
- (d) Confirm the long term plans for both the site and the services for young children in the locality.

**Answer**

There are two separate plots adjacent to each other in Marlborough Road, Goring by Sea:

- The larger plot is occupied by the Kamelia Kids nursery (formerly the Camelia Botnor Children Centre) and leased from the County Council on a long term basis.
  - Camelia Hall –a small, separate but linked, site previously owned by Camelia Botnor Centre, sold to the County Council in 2017.
- (a) The County Council paid £200,000 for the site (as valued by the District Valuer), completing the purchase on the 7 September 2017. Being under £250,000, the decision was taken by the Director of Economy, Planning and Place in accordance with capital programme governance rules and the County Council's Scheme of Delegation. Consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources took place after the purchase, owing to the urgency of the transaction, and the acquisition was later noted in the capital programme performance report.
  - (b) Kamelia Kids is the nursery name for what was formerly Camelia Botnor Children Centre. The nursery was funded using a large trust fund which became exhausted in 2016/17. The purpose of the trust fund was to provide childcare for young children with highly complex additional needs. The following funding was made available to support the nursery's transition from being Trust fund dependent to becoming a viable inclusive nursery to support a more diverse mix of 0 to 4-year-old children whilst retaining their specialist skills and high reputation for this specialist provision.

2014/15 - £112,000  
2015/16 - £ 60,000

The transition payments were approved by the Acting Director of Children's Services and the Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life in 2014/15 and 2015/16. Other than funding for Early Years places, including SEND

---

support for Early Years children, there have been no further payments.

- (c) The County Council owns the freehold of the Kamelia Kids Day Nursery site which is leased to The Camelia Botnar Centre on a long-term leasehold from September 1978 for 99 years. The extension to the site at the rear was also leased to the Camelia Botnar Centre by the County Council under long-term leasehold from 1984 until the expiry of the main lease. The freehold of Kamelia Hall (previously known as Camelia Hall) is now owned by the County Council and it is anticipated that this will continue to be used by the Worthing Portage Team. The Portage Team supports children with disabilities, including their parents and carers, in the Worthing area. A number of these children attend the Kamelia Kids Day Nursery.
- (d) **Property strategy:** There are no other plans in the developing Asset Strategy for these sites.

**Childcare in Worthing area:** Data currently shows that across the area, there is currently sufficient childcare to meet the needs of the families needing or wanting it. Officers will monitor and analyse sufficiency and the impact of the 30 hours Extended Free Entitlement based on information gathered from parents, settings and other local knowledge such as building developments and setting openings and closures that may affect sufficiency of childcare.

5. Written question from **Mr Jones** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities**

### Question

I remain concerned about the delays with the Sussex Fire Control Centre such that West Sussex emergency calls are still being managed using an outdated West Sussex computer system. Can the Cabinet Member please tell me:

- (a) What progress has been made since the last Council meeting to ensure that the Rescue 4i system is compatible with, and will work seamlessly with, the various West Sussex County Council and West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service systems and equipment necessary for reliable operation;
- (b) When members can expect to learn whether it is still intended that West Sussex emergency incidents will be managed using the Rescue 4i system; and
- (c) Whether any alternative options are being explored.

Furthermore, I understand that grants from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in respect of £1.8m for each Fire Authority was provided for transitional costs (including IT) to complete the project. Can she advise if it is decided not to proceed to using the Rescue 4i system, will there be a need to return any of that grant funding to the DCLG?

**Answer**

Our current NX mobilising system is operating to its designed specification and mobilising fire engines and other resources successfully to emergency incidents. We are enhancing the maintenance and resilience of the system to ensure operational requirements for the current period.

- (a) We are working with East Sussex Fire Service to ensure the Rescue 4i system is compatible and will work seamlessly with West Sussex County Council and West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service systems and equipment necessary for reliable and consistent operation.
- (b) Members will be informed of progress as and when there is progress or change to report.
- (c) We are always open to exploring new and improved options as opportunities arise.

There have been no discussions with the DCLG.

## **Question Time: 20 July 2018**

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

### **Best Start in Life**

Paragraph 4, Home Education – Call for Evidence (Cabinet Member for Education and Skills), from Mrs Jones, Mrs Millson and Mrs Mullins.

In response to a request from Mrs Millson for clarification as to what the definition of a child's home education experience should encompass, the Cabinet Member said he would write to all members.

In response to questions from Mrs Mullins as to how many home-educated children had special educational needs and how many unregistered schools there were in the county and where they were, the Cabinet Member said he would provide the figures that were available.

Paragraph 8, Recognition for the Young Carers Service Volunteers (Cabinet Member for Children and Young People), from Mrs Dunton.

### **A Prosperous Place**

Paragraph 10, Bognor Regis Digital Hub – MP visit (Leader/Economy), from Mr Patel.

Paragraph 11, Bus Strategy Consultation Results (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Dr Dennis.

Paragraph 12, A27 Chichester: Submission to the Government's Roads Investment Strategy (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Dr Walsh.

Paragraph 13, Govia Thameslink Railway (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Dr Dennis, Mr Jones and Dr Walsh.

In response to a request from Dr Dennis as to whether the Cabinet Member could investigate whether the infrastructure on the Brighton line and adjoining routes, which dated from the 1980s, was responsible for the growing number of signal and points failures and, if so, what measures Network Rail were taking to address the problem, the Cabinet Member said he would contact GTR.

Dr Dennis also commented that the Gatwick Express Services usually had spare capacity whereas many London Victoria to Gatwick Airport passengers were using Southern Services to save money on the fare. He asked if the Cabinet Member would raise the matter with the operator, as both services were run by GTR, to see whether a more sensible pricing structure could be developed to get as many airport passengers as possible onto the Gatwick Express trains thereby freeing up capacity on other trains, the Cabinet Member said he would make representations.

In response to a request from Dr Walsh for a delegation to be made to the Secretary of State for Transport, facilitated by one of the county's MPs, to request an end to the GTR franchise, the Leader said she would raise the matter with MPs during the summer recess.

Paragraph 14, Care Worker Recruitment (Cabinet Member for Adults and Health), from Mr Simmons.

Road-side verge cutting (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure) from Mrs Dennis, Mr Elkins, Mr High and Mrs Millson.

In response to a request from Mrs Dennis for grass cutting in rural areas to be based on safety and road visibility, the Cabinet Member said he would look at the suggestion.

Safety around schools (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Mrs Millson.

In response to a request from Mrs Millson for a publicity campaign to raise the profile of road safety around schools, the Cabinet said he was happy to consider the suggestion.

A27 Ikea Housing Development planning application and access to Coombes Road, Lancing (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Mr Barling.

Mr Barling asked to see a copy of the representations made to Adur District Council on highways matters and asked the Cabinet Member to reconsider what was the best solution for residents. The Cabinet Member said he would consult officers.

Gatwick Airport legal agreement (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Mrs Kitchen and Mrs Smith.

### **A Strong, Safe and Sustainable Place**

Paragraph 19, Armed Forces and Veterans Breakfast Club (Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Lt Cdr Atkins.

Paragraph 20, Westminster Energy Environment and Transport Forum (Leader), from Mr Quinn.

Paragraph 26, Homes England – Northern Arc (Leader/Economy), from Mr Barrett-Miles and Mrs Dennis.

Additional archive storage space (Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Mrs Mullins.

In response to a question about whether money in the capital programme 2016 for additional archive space had been spent yet, the Cabinet Member said she would provide Mrs Mullins with a time line for the project.

Fire fighter numbers (addressed to the Leader), from Mr Barling and Mr Jones.

Withy Patch Gypsy, Roma and Traveller site (Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Mr Jones.

Beacon Project on domestic abuse advice services (Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Mrs Smith.

Your Energy Sussex (Leader/Cabinet Member for Environment), from Mr Quinn.

### **Independence in Later Life**

Housing associations and quality of care (Cabinet Member for Adults and Health/Leader), from Mrs Jones.

In response to a question from Mrs Jones about Housing Associations and the quality of care provided, the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health offered Mrs Jones a briefing with herself and the officers responsible.

Wrenford Centre (Cabinet Member for Adults and Health), from Dr O'Kelly and Mrs Smith.

This page is intentionally left blank