

Public Document Pack

Tony Kershaw
Director of Law and Assurance

If calling, please ask for

Adam Chisnall on 033 022 28314
Email: adam.chisnall@westsussex.gov.uk



CLC Development Team
Room 102
County Hall
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RQ



www.westsussex.gov.uk

@DemService

<https://www.facebook.com/northchichestertalkwithus>

25 February 2019

A meeting of the North Chichester County Local Committee will be held at 7.00 pm on Tuesday, 5 March 2019 at Northchapel Village Hall, Pipers Lane, Northchapel, Petworth, GU28 9JA

Tony Kershaw
Director of Law and Assurance

Your local County Councillors



David Bradford
Rother Valley



Janet Duncton
Petworth



Kate O'Kelly
Midhurst



Viral Parikh
Bourne

Invite you to come along to the North Chichester County Local Committee

County Local Committees consider a range of issues concerning the local area, and where relevant make decisions. It is a meeting in public and has a regular 'talk with us' item where the public can ask questions of their local elected representatives.

Agenda

7.00 pm 1. **Welcome and introductions**

The members of the North Chichester County Local Committee are David Bradford, Janet Duncton, Kate O'Kelly, and Viral Parikh.

7.02 pm 2. **Declarations of Interest**

Members and officers must declare any pecuniary or personal interest in any business on the agenda. They should also make declarations at any stage such an interest becomes apparent during the meeting. Consideration should be given to leaving the meeting if the nature of the interest warrants it. If in doubt, contact Democratic Services before the meeting.

- 7.03 pm 3. **Minutes** (Pages 5 - 12)
- To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6 November 2018 (cream paper).
- 7.05 pm 4. **Urgent Matters**
- Items not on the agenda that the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances.
- 7.05 pm 5. **Progress Statement** (Pages 13 - 14)
- The document contains brief updates on statements of progress made on issues raised at previous meetings. The Committee is asked to note the document.
- 7.20 pm 6. **North Chichester Community Initiative Funding (NC05(18/19))** (Pages 15 - 22)
- Report by the Director of Law and Assurance.
- The report summarises the Community Initiative Funding applications received via The West Sussex Crowd. The Committee is invited to consider the applications and pledge funding if appropriate.
- 7.45 pm 7. **Nominations for Local Authority Governors to Maintained Schools and Academy Governing Bodies (NC06(18/19))** (Pages 23 - 30)
- Report by Director of Education and Skills.
- The Committee are asked to approve the nominations of Authority School Governors as set out in the report.
- 7.55 pm 8. **Talk With Us**
- To invite questions from the public present at the meeting on subjects other than those on the agenda. The Committee would encourage members of the public with more complex issues to submit their question before the meeting to allow a substantive answer to be given.
- 8.15 pm 9. **Date of Next Meeting**
- The next meeting of the Committee will take place at 7.00 pm on Tuesday 11 June 2019 at a venue to be confirmed.
- Members wishing to place an item on the agenda should notify Adam Chisnall via email: adam.chisnall@westsussex.gov.uk or phone on 033 022 28314.

To: All members of the North Chichester County Local Committee

Filming and use of social media

During this meeting the public are allowed to film the Committee or use social media, providing it does not disrupt the meeting. You are encouraged to let officers know in advance if you wish to film. Mobile devices should be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

North Chichester County Local Committee

6 November 2018 – At a meeting of the Committee at 7.00 pm held at Tillington Village Hall, Upperton Road, Tillington, Nr Petworth, GU28 9AF.

Present:

Mrs Duncton (Chairman) (Petworth;), Mr Parikh (Bourne;), Mr Bradford (Rother Valley;) and Dr O'Kelly (Midhurst;)

Officers in attendance: Chris Dye (Area Highways Manager), Peter Lawrence (Partnerships Area Manager (South)), Edwards (Communications Lead) and Adam Chisnall (Democratic Services Officer)

12. Welcome and introductions

12.1 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members and Officers introduced themselves.

12.2 The Chairman noted the high level of attendance from Tillington residents who wished to discuss their concerns with the speed of vehicles on the A272. Several residents had sent technical queries in advance of the meeting and had been advised that the questions were not appropriate for the Committee meeting. A separate meeting would be organised to focus on the particular issues.

12.3 The Tillington residents expressed their concerns with signage inconsistency and the speed of vehicles; and the impact this had on residents' safety. Speeds at the weekend were also highlighted, which could be significantly higher than in the week.

12.4 The Committee members shared the concerns of the residents and felt it was important to harness the energy in the room and channel it into appropriate action.

12.5 Chris Dye, Area Highways Manager, explained that there were processes in place such as Traffic Regulation Orders that could change speed limits, subject to the proposals meeting the County Council's Speed Limit Policy. Officers would be able to look into requests to see what could be supported to ease the residents' concerns.

12.6 Residents queried what mitigations could be possible, such as physical highway changes and speed camera implementation. – *Chris Dye explained that speed cameras were the responsibility of the police and not the County Council. The County Council had a Road Safety Team which looked for patterns in injury accident data to establish if there were problem areas. Any proposals for the highway needed to be supported with evidence.*

12.7 The Committee supported the proposal for a local meeting to allow residents and officers to discuss the issues in detail and work out the feasibility of actions to improve safety. Residents asked if someone from

the police would attend the meeting. – *Chris Dye resolved to invite the police to the meeting, but could not guarantee their attendance. Residents were advised to approach Sussex Police to highlight their concerns and ask if there was resource to undertake patrols and enforcement in the area.*

12.8 Chris Dye resolved to contact the Tillington Parish Council Chairman to make arrangements for the meeting. Progress on this issue would be monitored by the Committee.

13. **Declarations of Interest**

13.1 Mr Parikh declared a personal interest as he had changed his energy supplier to Your Energy Sussex.

14. **Minutes**

14.1 Resolved – that the minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

15. **Refill**

15.1 The Committee received a presentation from Heather Barrie, a volunteer for the Refill scheme, and Diana Morgan, Transition Chichester, on the Refill Scheme (copy appended to the signed minutes).

15.2 Heather Barrie explained the scheme which would allow people to refill water bottles at local businesses that had signed up to the scheme. The aim of the scheme was to reduce the level of single use water bottles that were used. People could download an app that would highlight local businesses that were signed up to the scheme.

15.3 The scheme had been launched in January and was supported by the County Council and Chichester City Council. Social media campaigns were due to launch soon. The public were asked to pass on the message. The scheme also included twinning activities to install water fountains in areas such as Africa.

15.4 The Committee made comments including those that follow.

- Highlighted that County Hall had advertised a water fountain on the app.
- Queried if the scheme was being promoted through schools and universities. – *Heather Barrie explained that this would be included in the next step of the campaign. The Greater Brighton Metropolitan College was already involved in the project.*

15.5 An attendee extended an invite to have the campaign at the Petworth Famers Market and agreed to pass the message on to Parish Councils. – *Heather Barrie accepted the offer and expressed her appreciation for the support to the campaign.*

15.6 The Committee thanked Heather Barrie and Diana Morgan for their attendance and gave support to the Refill scheme.

16. Your Energy Sussex

16.1 The Committee received a presentation from David Edwards from the County Council's Energy Team on Your Energy Sussex (copy appended to the signed minutes).

16.2 David Edwards explained that the County Council had launched Your Energy Sussex in February to offer an alternative energy supplier to residents for gas and renewable electricity. It was estimated that an average household could save £300 per year if it switched to a fixed tariff.

16.3 Your Energy Sussex was not for profit, with surplus funds going towards fuel poverty funds. Locally generated energy was used and it was hoped to increase this over time.

16.4 Mr Parikh reported that he had switched to Your Energy Sussex and had made monthly savings.

16.5 The Committee made comments including those that follow.

- Asked how the County Council was promoting this. – *David Edwards explained that officers needed to be careful with marketing as costs impacted the level of surplus going to fuel poverty funds. There was a steady growth of people signing up to the supplier. As returns approached breakeven more marketing options would be explored.*
- Proposed advertising the supplier with council bills. – *David Edwards confirmed this had been done and that sign up levels had increased 2-3 months after the bills had been sent.*

16.6 The public made comments including those that follow.

- Queried if locally generated solar energy by residents could be connected to the scheme. – *David Edwards explained that it was a complicated process to join the grid. There were community energy groups that the County Council hoped to be able to offer a route to the market in the future.*
- Asked if the locally produced energy was mixed with national energy. – *David Edwards explained that the energy went into the grid and was traceable.*
- Queried if there would be more electric car charging ports installed. – *David Edwards highlighted that the County Council was currently trialling electric cars within its car pool fleet and hoped to increase this.*

16.7 The Committee thanked David Edwards for the presentation.

17. Plaistow Road - Traffic Regulation Order - NC03 (18/19)

17.1 The committee considered a report by the Director of Highways & Transport (copy appended to the signed minutes).

17.2 Chris Dye introduced the report and explained that the County Council had received an application for a community led Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) from Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council to lower the speed limit through the village of Ifold, from 40 mph to 30mph.

17.3 The Chairman allowed Alan Pearson, Parish Councillor, to speak for 5 minutes on the proposals.

17.4 Alan Pearson explained that the population of Ifold had increased to over 1800 residents which had led to Plaistow Road becoming increasingly dangerous. There were no pavements on Plaistow Road which meant that school children using bus stops that were in a dangerous position. There had been recent accidents on the road which highlighted the issues outlined in the request.

17.5 Chris Dye explained that there were 2 sets of criteria to consider for speed change requests; route and speed assessments. The route assessment for this request passed the criteria; however the speed assessment did not meet the criteria as the average speeds on the road were between 36.8 and 37.6 mph. Officers were only able to consider evidence based data for decisions, and could not consider near misses. The police had confirmed with officers that they would not support the speed limit change.

17.6 Chris Dye explained that a County Council decision in February 2010 had given County Local Committees the discretion to override policy in order to promote 30mph speed limits in villages. If the Committee agreed to the proposal the next step would be advertisement and consultation.

17.7 The Committee queried the timescales for the proposal if it was approved. – *Chris Dye explained that the scheme would be designed and put out for consultation next year. If less than 5 objections were received, the scheme would be implemented the following year. If 5 or more objections were received, the application would come back to the Committee for a decision on implementation.*

17.8 Dr O'Kelly welcomed the policy that allowed County Local Committees the flexibility to consider individual requests for speed limit changes that did not fit the wider policy. Having undertaken a site visit, and noting the comments from the police, Dr O'Kelly felt that the road in question was particularly narrow with bends and that the scheme should be progressed for assessment.

17.9 The Committee agreed with the comments discussed and agreed to progress the scheme to the consultation stage.

17.10 Resolved – That the North Chichester County Local Committee agrees to include the request in the Committee’s Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Programme.

18. Prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Orders 2018/19 - NC04 (18/19)

18.1 The committee considered a report by the Director of Highways & Transport and the Head of Highways Operations (copy appended to the signed minutes).

18.2 Chris Dye introduced the report and explained that following the discussion for the previous item there was only 1 Traffic Regulation Order for the Committee to consider.

18.3 Resolved – That the North Chichester County Local Committee agreed to progress the highest scoring TRO from the list attached at Appendix A

- Plaistow Road (Ifold) – Speed Limit

19. Community Highway Schemes

19.1 The committee considered an information report by the Director of Highways & Transport (copy appended to the signed minutes).

19.2 Chris Dye introduced the report and highlighted the crossing request for Petworth that had been successful in the moderation process. The scheme was currently out for design, scope and consultation.

19.3 Residents thanked Chris Dye for his support with their application and requested details on the funding process. – *Chris Dye explained that section 106 funding could be used towards a community highway scheme if it had not already been allocated to another proposal and the contribution in question was relevant to the proposal.*

19.4 The Committee queried what alternative options were available for funding. – *Chris Dye explained that the moderation process looked into resourcing factors. If an application was not successful in the moderation stage, third party applications would be required which was a complicated route.*

19.5 Resolved – That the Committee notes the update.

20. North Chichester Community Initiative Funding

20.1 The Committee considered a funding summary document for the Community Initiative Fund (copy appended to the signed minutes).

20.2 The Committee noted that there were no applications to consider in the report.

20.3 The Committee noted that there was £14,792.84 available for allocation and encouraged applications for the next meeting of the Committee.

21. Nominations for Local Authority Governors to Maintained Schools and Academy Governing Bodies

21.1 The Committee considered the current Authority Governor Vacancies for the North Chichester County Local Committee Area (copy appended to the signed minutes).

21.2 The Committee highlighted the vacancy list to the public. Mr Bradford resolved to look into the vacancy for Camelsdale Primary School.

22. Talk With Us

22.1 The Chairman introduced the item and advised that the open forum was an opportunity for comments and questions to be raised on items not already on the agenda, and over which the County Council has jurisdiction. The following issues were raised and responses made.

- A resident had submitted a question in advance on excessive speeds on the A272, especially the Petersfield Road, Midhurst by motor cyclists. – *Pete Lawrence, Partnerships Area Manager (South), reported that the Police regularly spoke to motorcyclists at Whiteways Lodge to discuss appropriate road behaviour. Pete Lawrence resolved to raise this issue at the Arun and Chichester Road Safety group and provide an update via the progress statement for the next meeting.*
- A resident queried the Velo South Parish engagement plan and asked when the meetings were taking place. – *Mr Bradford explained that lessons had been learnt from the previous Velo discussions. Adam Chisnall, Democratic Services Officer, explained that the message from the South Chichester County Local Committee was that no statement would be made on future cycling events until parishes had been engaged. Dr O'Kelly requested that consideration was needed on who was invited to these meetings, how they were selected, and an appropriate method to inform of the engagement dates.*
- A resident queried the Wisborough Green TRO not being eligible for criteria and sought clarity on the alternative exception route that had been used for Halnaker. – *Chris Dye explained that this route would be a decision by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure. Chris Dye added that officers were looking to provide a supplement document to the 2010 report to remove ambiguity.*
- Concerns were raised on the danger of Hughes Hill on B2133 following the severe accident in January. – *Chris Dye reported that officers had looked into the road specification and found it not to be linked to the traffic incident. The police were investigating the issue and could serve a notice to the County Council if they felt highways were at fault.*

23. **Date of Next Meeting**

23.1 The Committee noted that its next scheduled meeting would take place on 5 March 2019 at Northchapel Village Hall, Pipers Lane, Northchapel, Petworth, GU28 9JA.

Chairman

The meeting closed at 9.20 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

North Chichester County Local Committee

5 March 2019

Progress Statement

Date & Minute No.	Subject:	Action / Progress	Officer Contact:
6 November 2018 Minute 12.8	Tillington – Speed of vehicles on A272	Scheduling of meeting with Tillington Parish Council	Chris Dye
March Update	<p>Officers met with representatives of Tillington Parish Council on the 10th January 2019. A number of items were discussed, principally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sussex Safer Road Partnership (SSRP) role • WSCC Road Safety Team Role • Speed and Accident Data for Tillington • WSCC Speed Limit Policy • County Local Committee TRO process • Community Highway Scheme process • Local Area Office Licences • Community Speed Watch process and options <p>The meeting was positive, with some ideas being considered such as Gateways, Community Speed Watch and Speed Indicator Devices.</p>		
6 November 2018 Minute 22.1 1 st Bullet	Talk With Us	Conversation on A272 speeding in Midhurst	Pete Lawrence and Chris Dye
March Update	<p>Pete Lawrence raised the issue at the Arun and Chichester Road safety Group where the Police advised that they continue to provide education and advice to bikers at Whiteways Lodge and where KSI data identifies hotspots they will undertake enforcement and focus on those hotspots.</p> <p>If local communities are interested in starting a Community Speedwatch in an area contact details can be provided for Chichester Police, speedwatch would allow a community to directly monitor bike speeds in their local area and the Police provide equipment and training to support new groups.</p>		

Date & Minute No.	Subject:	Action / Progress	Officer Contact:
<p>16 March 2017</p> <p>Minute 75 1st Bullet</p>	<p>Talk With Us</p>	<p>Holmbush Play Area – following a community request to look into the replacement of damaged fencing along the border of the play area Officers were asked to approach land owner Hyde Housing.</p>	<p>Pete Lawrence</p>
<p>A partnership approach to the whole play area was agreed with Chichester District Council to address the overall poor state of the play area and fencing. In Summer 2018 a community day of action was undertaken including Hyde, WSCC Community Volunteer Team, local residents, the Fire Service and the Police enabled the area to be cleared of vegetation, opening up the front of the site and generally improving the appearance. With the support of Councilors from both Authorities and the Town Council, Hyde have now not only repaired the original fencing but also improved the fencing at the frontage of the site. Following ongoing discussions with Hyde there will be some significant improvement works to the play equipment and entrance in late March 2019 that will make it more attractive for young families and young people to use. It is very much hoped the community support already shown will form a group to influence the future of the park for the whole of the local community. Dr Kate O’Kelly has been closely involved with the work during the summer.</p>			

North Chichester County Local Committee**Community Initiative Funding****5 March 2019****Report by Director of Law and Assurance**

Ref: (NC05(18/19))
Key Decision: No
Part I
Electoral Divisions: All in North Chichester CLC Area

Recommendation

- i) That the Committee considers the pitches made to the Community Initiative Funding as set out in Appendix A and pledge funding accordingly.

Proposal**1. Background and Context**

- 1.1 The Community Initiative Fund (CIF) is a County Local Committee (CLC) administered fund that provides assistance to local community projects. Bids should show evidence of projects which can demonstrate community backing, make a positive impact on people's wellbeing and support [The West Sussex Plan](#).
- 1.2 The terms and conditions, eligibility criteria and overall aim of the CIF have been agreed by all CLC Chairmen and these can be found on the County Local Committee pages of the West Sussex County Council website using the following link
http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/your_council/meetings_and_decision-making/county_local_committees/community_initiative_funding.aspx
- 1.3 For projects to be considered for funding they must upload their project idea to the West Sussex Crowd (www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk) funding platform and pitch to the Community Initiative fund.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 That the Committee considers the pitches to the Community Initiative Funding as set out in Appendix A.
- 2.2 Pledges can be considered in the preparation and fundraising stage. When considering pitches in the preparation stage, decisions are subject to the applicant receiving full verification from locality and starting fundraising by the end of the financial year.

3. Resources

- 3.1 For the 2018/19 financial year, North Chichester CLC had a total of £15,792.84 for allocation, of this £14,792.84 is still available for allocation. Details of awards made in the current and previous financial year are included in Appendix B.
- 3.2 There are five new pitches for consideration by the Committee.
- One pitch is in fundraising stage with a total project cost of £18,183.00.
One pitch is in fundraising stage with a total project cost of £6,308.00.
One pitch is in fundraising stage with a total project cost of £18,295.00.
One pitch is in fundraising stage with a total project cost of £1,660.00.
One pitch is in fundraising stage with a total project cost of £191.00.
- 3.3 The projects are outlined in Appendix A and can also be viewed at: www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk
- 3.4 CIF is intended for applications up to £5,000.

Factors taken into account

4. Consultation

- 4.1 Before a project can be added to the West Sussex Crowd it must be eligible for the [Spacehive](#) platform, and then before beginning crowd funding must be verified by [Locality](#). This involves inspecting the project to make sure it's viable and legitimate. The Democratic Services Officer, in consultation with the local County Councillor, will preview all projects that have then gone on to pitch to the Community Initiative Fund to ensure they meet the criteria.
- 4.2 District and Borough Council colleagues are consulted on whether applicants have applied to any funds they administer. In addition, some CLCs have CIF Sub Groups that preview pitches and make recommendations to the CLC.

5. Risk Management Implications

- 5.1 There is a risk in allocating any funding that the applicant will not spend some or all of it or that it might be spent inappropriately. Therefore the terms and conditions associated with CIF provide for the County Council to request the return of funds.
- 5.2 Projects that do not reach 95% of their funding target on The West Sussex Crowd within their project timescales, will not receive any funds. Any pledges made to unsuccessful projects will therefore be returned to the CLC CIF allocation and be detailed in Appendix B.

6. Other Options Considered

- 6.1 The pitching process asks for information about whether a project could proceed if the organisation only received 90 per cent of the funding applied

for. The CLC is invited to take this into consideration in deciding the level of any award.

- 6.2 The Committee do have the option to defer or decline pitches but must give valid reasons for doing so. If they defer a project they need to take into account the timescales for the project and whether a deferral would allow the CLC to pitch at the following meeting.

7. Equality Duty

- 7.1 Democratic Services Officers consider the outcome intentions for each pitch. It is considered that for the following pitches, the intended outcomes would:

- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

The CLC in considering any pitch should be alert to the need to consider any equality implications arising from the bid or the way the money is to be used if any are indicated in the information provided.

8. Social Value

- 8.1 The Community Initiative Fund's eligibility criteria requires applicants to explain how their project will support one or more of the County Council's priorities as set out in [The West Sussex Plan](#).

9. Crime and Disorder Act Implications

- 9.1 The applications for decision contain projects that will positively benefit the community and contribute toward the County Council's obligations to reduce crime and disorder and promote public safety in section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

10. Human Rights Act Implications

- 10.1 The County Council's positive obligations under the Human Rights Act have been considered in the preparation of these recommendations but none of significance emerges.

Tony Kershaw

Director of Law and Assurance

Contact: Adam Chisnall – 033 022 28314

Appendices

Appendix A – Current pitches for consideration by the Committee

Appendix B - Summary of awards for 2018/19 and 2017/18

Background Papers:

Pitches are available to view at www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Current pitches

The following projects have pitched to the Community Initiative Fund since the last meeting:

Actively Fundraising –

- **289/NC – Loxwood FC Ground Development, £18,183.00 –Towards improving ground facilities.**
<https://www.spacehive.com/loxwood-fc-ground-development>
- **293/NC – Easebourne Parish Council, Easebourne Park inclusive access area, £6,308.00 – Towards removing loose stones and resurfacing.**
<https://www.spacehive.com/easebourne-park-inclusive-access-project>
- **296/NC – Lodsworth Village Hall, Keeping fit for the whole community, £18,295.00 – Towards purchasing and installing outdoor fitness equipment.**
<https://www.spacehive.com/keeping-fit-for-the-whole-community>
- **305/NC – Petworth Community Garden, Men's Shed - refit, transform and grow, £1,660.00 – Towards purchasing and fitting a new kitchen cooker.**
<https://www.spacehive.com/mensshed-refit-transform-grow>
- **309/NC – The Red Box Project Chichester & Midhurst, Little things make big differences, £191.00 – Towards replacing toys and gaining a trademark.**
<https://www.spacehive.com/little-things-make-big-differences>

In Preparation -

There are currently no pitches in preparation stage.

This page is intentionally left blank

Community Initiative Funding: Summary for 2018/19 and 2017/18

The following applications have received funding during the **2018/19** financial year to date:

Applicant	Summary	Member	Awarded	Evaluation
229/NC - Teens Construct to Connect	Towards the cost of materials for adopted teens to build a hen coop	Janet Duncton	£1,000	Feedback received

The following applications received funding during the **2017/18** financial year:

Applicant	Summary	Member	Awarded	Evaluation
15/NC Lodsworth Village Hall	towards the replacement of Tables, crockery and chairs	Previous Member	£1875.00	
26/NC Petworth and District Community Association	The Fete in the Park purchase of new marquee	Janet Duncton	£2,000.00	
28/NC Sutton Village Hall	towards the restoration of the hall floor	Previous Member	£1875.00	
57/NC Petworth Town Youth Band	Equipment and instruments	Janet Duncton	£1200.00	
64/NC Petworth Youth Association	to support the band Petworth Youth Association restructuring	Janet Duncton	£1250.00	
73/NC Redford Village Hall	Towards external hall refurbishment	Kate O'Kelly	£1250.00	
78/NC Midhurst & Easebourne Football Club	Towards a Club Tractor	David Bradford	£1250.00	
81/NC INTERIM Counselling	Towards start-up office supplies	Kate O'Kelly	£510.00	
134/NC Sussex Clubs for Young People	Towards setting up the Duke of Cornwall award	Janet Duncton	£250.00	
156/NC Easebourne Parish Wheelbarrow Castle Community Space and Playground Group	Easebourne Parish Community Space and Playground Group	David Bradford	£630.00	

Agenda Item 6
Appendix B

162/NC Midhurst Tourism Partnership	Discover Midhurst	Kate O'Kelly	£250.00	
168/NC Heyshott Playground Committee	Towards rubber matting	David Bradford	£630.00	
169/NC Midhurst Youth Trust	Provision of a dining shelter	Kate O'Kelly	£630.00	

North Chichester County Local Committee**5 March 2019****Nominations for Local Authority Governors to Maintained Schools and Academy Governing Bodies****Report by Director of Education & Skills****Ref:
(NC06(18/19))****Key Decision:
No****Part I****Electoral
Divisions: All in
CLC Area****Executive Summary**

The County Local Committee (CLC) duty regarding school governance is to stimulate interest and commitment to the governance of maintained schools and academies in the area and to identify and nominate suitable persons to serve as school governors on behalf of the County Council.

This report asks the Committee to make nominations of Local Authority Governors as outlined below.

Recommendation

That the nomination for appointment of Local Authority Governor set out in Appendix A, be approved.

Proposal**1. Background and Context**

- 1.1 The function of the nomination of school governors to maintained schools and academies is delegated to County Local Committees (CLCs) because it enables local county councillors to maintain a valuable link with the schools and helps promote to the wider public the important role of school governors.
- 1.2 Local authority governors are nominated by the local authority but appointed by the governing body. The CLC can nominate any eligible person as a local authority governor, but it is for the governing body to decide whether their nominee has the skills to contribute to the effective governance and success of the school and meets any other eligibility criteria they have set. The duty of the CLC is therefore to identify and nominate suitable persons to serve as school governors for maintained schools and academies on behalf of the County Council. The CLC, as representatives of the local authority, should make every effort to understand the governing body's requirements and identify and nominate suitable candidates. Without a CLC nomination a school is not able to appoint a Local Authority Governor.

- 1.3 CLCs' delegated powers include the ability to appoint Authority, Community and Parent Governors to temporary governing bodies. Further changes are expected in due course in relation to temporary governing bodies.
- 1.4 CLCs also have the function to make nominations for the County Council to governing bodies of academies in accordance with either the funding agreement with the relevant government department or instrument of governance, as appropriate.

2. Nominations for Local Authority Governors

- 2.1 All county councillors are entitled to nominate for any school, although normal practice has dictated that the local county councillor's nomination can take precedence. County councillors should aim to familiarise themselves with the schools in their local area and are advised to consult the chairman of governors and/or head teacher concerning any local authority governing body vacancies.
- 2.2 The role of a governor can be complex as specific actions or ways of operating will vary depending on the type of school, its individual ethos and current circumstances. Governors provide the strategic leadership for schools alongside the head teacher. They should look to provide support and challenge for the school. Experience gained through a range of activities e.g. work, voluntary service or family life, where relevant, should be given equal consideration.
- 2.3 The 2012 Regulations (as amended) require that any newly-appointed governor has, in the opinion of the person making the appointment, 'the skills required to contribute to the effective governance and success of the school'. This could include specific skills such as an ability to understand data or finances as well as general capabilities such as the capacity and willingness to learn.
- 2.4 The following criteria are in place for the nominations of local authority governors:
 - i) governors are nominated on the basis of suitability and not in accordance with political party affiliations,
 - ii) applicants will not normally be nominated as local authority governors at a school if they are the husband, wife or partner of a permanent member of staff at that school,
 - iii) where the local authority appoints additional members to the governing body of a school identified by Ofsted as having serious weaknesses or requiring special measures, such governors will be appointed by the relevant Cabinet Member on the nomination of the relevant Executive Director since it is usually advantageous to bring in experienced governors from other areas

iv) if a county councillor is appointed as a local authority governor, and either does not stand for re-election or does not retain the seat during the quadrennial County Council elections, his/her term of office will automatically end on 31 August next following the elections. A county councillor, who resigns his /her seat on the Council, will within 4 months of his/her resignation cease to be a local authority governor. In either case, he/she is, of course, eligible for re-appointment if nominated by a county councillor.

2.5 If there are more applications than vacancies this will be made clear in Appendix A. Any discussion of the relevant merits of the candidates will be discussed in Part II of an agenda, in the absence of the press and public. This should then not discourage any potential candidates from applying, knowing that any discussion of their application will occur in private session.

3. Reappointments

3.1 Details of local authority governors seeking nomination for reappointment are forwarded to the governing body chairman and to the local county councillor. These nominations automatically progress to the next CLC meeting for decision unless an objection is received from a member by the given closing date. The governing body would be asked for comments on the nomination, and an objection may be lodged on the grounds of poor attendance.

4. Current Vacancies

4.1 The current vacancies in the CLC area are detailed in Appendix B.

4.2 Information about the role of school governors is available on the County Council website via this link:

<https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/education-children-and-families/schools-and-colleges/information-for-governors/>

5. Proposal

5.1 That the Committee makes the nomination (s) of Governors as set out in the recommendation above and Appendix A.

6. Resources

6.1 There are no resource implications arising from this decision as it is a nomination to a governing body.

Factors taken into account

7. Consultation

- 7.1 Local county councillors, head teachers and chairmen of governors have been consulted on all applications received. It is assumed that all are in support unless objections are received by Governor Services and/or the local county councillor.

8. Risk Management Implications

- 8.1 There may be a risk that on-going vacancies on a school governing body above a level of 25% will weaken its effectiveness.

9. Other Options Considered

- 9.1 County Councillors can decide not to make a nomination to a governing body. They may defer an application if they require further information or consultation to enable them to come to a decision.

10. Equality Duty.

- 10.1 The Equality Duty does not need to be addressed as it is a decision making an appointment or nomination to a governing body.

11. Social Value

- 11.1 None

12. Crime and Disorder Act Implications

- 12.1 None

13. Human Rights Implications

- 13.1 None

Paul Wagstaff Director of Education & Skills

Contact: Governor Services Administrator – 033 022 28887

Appendices

- Appendix A: Local Authority Governors - Appointments, Reappointments
or Nominations
Appendix B: Current Vacancy List

Background Papers

None

Local Authority Governors - Nomination Under the 2012 Regulations

Maintained Schools

Nomination for Appointment:

Plaistow & Kirdford Primary School

Mr Dean Wheeler for a four year term

This page is intentionally left blank

Authority Governor Vacancies for North Chichester County Local Committee Area

School	Division	Division Member	Vacant From	Current Status	Chairman	Head
Hollycombe Primary School	Midhurst	Kate Francesca Bacon O'Kelly	Jul-17	Outstanding		Louise Pearce
Plaistow and Kirdford Primary	Petworth	Janet Elizabeth Dunton	Oct-14	Outstanding	Dean Wheeler	Mr C King

This page is intentionally left blank