

Public Document Pack

Tony Kershaw
Director of Law and Assurance

If calling, please ask for

Jenna Barnard on 033 022 24525
Email:
jenna.barnard@westsussex.gov.uk



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



www.westsussex.gov.uk

@DemService

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

11 November 2019

A meeting of the Chanctonbury County Local Committee will be held at 7.00 pm on Tuesday, 19 November 2019 at Ashurst Village Hall, The Street, Ashurst, Steyning BN44 3AP

Tony Kershaw
Director of Law and Assurance

Your local County Councillors



Pat Arculus
Pulborough



David Barling
Bramber
Castle



Lionel Barnard
Henfield



Paul Marshall
Storrington

Invite you to come along to the Chanctonbury 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 Chanctonbury County Local Committee are Lionel Barnard, Pat Arculus, David Barling, and Paul Marshall.

7.05 pm 2. **Declarations of Interests**

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.

- 7.10 pm 3. **Minutes** (Pages 5 - 10)
- To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3 July 2019 (cream paper).
- 7.15 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.
- 7.15 pm 5. **Progress Statement** (Pages 11 - 14)
- The document contains brief updates on statements of progress made on issues raised at previous meeting. The Committee is asked to note the report.
- 7.25 pm 6. **Prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Orders (CBY03(19/20))** (Pages 15 - 20)
- Report by Director of Highways and Transport and Head of Highways Operations. The Committee is asked to prioritise the progression of Traffic Regulation Orders in the area based on the attached report and supporting documents.
- 7.35 pm 7. **Highways Service Level Update** (Pages 21 - 26)
- The Committee to receive a service level update from the Area Highways Manager and the Area Communities Manager based on the attached decision report.
- 7.50 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 request, where possible, that members of the public submit their questions at least 3 working days before the meeting** to allow a substantive answer to be given. Questions should be submitted to jenna.barnard@westsussex.gov.uk.
- 8.20 pm 9. **Chanctonbury Community Initiative Funding (CBY04(19/20))** (Pages 27 - 34)
- 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.

8.40 pm 10. **Nominations to School and Academy Governing Bodies (CBY05(19/20))** (Pages 35 - 40)

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.

8.45 pm 11. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee will take place at 7pm on Wednesday 11 March 2020, at a venue to be decided.

Members wishing to place an item on the agenda should notify Jenna Barnard via email: jenna.barnard@westsussex.gov.uk or phone on 033 022 24525.

To: All members of the Chanctonbury 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

Chanctonbury County Local Committee

3 July 2019 – At a meeting of the Committee at 7.00 pm held at The Storrington and Sullington Parish Hall, Thakeham Road, Storrington, West Sussex, RH20 3PP.

Present:

Mr Barnard (Henfield;), Mrs Arculus (Pulborough;) and Mr Marshall (Storrington;)

Apologies were received from Mr Barling (Bramber Castle;)

Officers in attendance: Dean Wadey (Principal Community Officer), Chris Stark (Area Highways Manager), Jenna Barnard (Democratic Services Officer) and Gareth Rollings (Commissioning and Infrastructure Manager)

1. Election of Chairman

1.1 RESOLVED that Mr David Barling be elected Chairman of the Chanctonbury County Local Committee for the municipal year 2019/20.

1.2 In the absence of Mr David Barling, it was agreed that Mr Lionel Barnard would act as the chair of this meeting.

2. Welcome and Introductions

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

2.2 Apologies had been received from Mr David Barling.

3. Declarations of Interests

3.1 None declared

4. Minutes

4.1 Resolved – that the minutes of the Chanctonbury County Local Committee meeting held on 13 March 2019 be approved as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

5. Urgent Matters

5.1 The Committee agreed to consider an additional Micro Fund application (ref: 390/CBY) which would be discussed under the relevant item (item 11).

- 5.2 The Committee also agreed to consider a late Governor nomination which would be discussed under the relevant item (item 12).

6. Update on Recycling

- 6.1 Gareth Rollings, Commissioning and Infrastructure Manager attended the meeting and gave an update on the Materials Recycling Facility at Ford. It was agreed that this will be appended to the signed minutes.

- 6.2 The following questions and subjects were raised:

- **What happens to food waste that is collected?** *Food waste is taken through anaerobic digestion which is the natural process in which microorganisms break down organic materials.*
- **Is “check local recycling” just an easy option for big companies and why aren’t they regulated in to making more effort to provide recyclable packaging?** *There are several measures already in place, which have over the years helped to streamline the packaging being placed on the market, but they probably don’t push producers enough. There was a recent consultation on Extended Producer Responsibility and it will be interesting to see how government responds and whether taxes/levies are implemented to help mitigate these issues.*
- **Do we recycle black plastics at the MRF?** *In West Sussex we have access to specialised sorting facilities that are able to sort black plastic, which allows us to collect any colour plastic bottle or container such as yoghurt pots, margarine tubs or food trays regardless of their colour, just pop them in your recycling bin.*
- **Further to the above then why can we not recycle black/terracotta plant pots?** *End-use markets are limited and often plant pots were made from different types of plastic, as we couldn't be certain plant pots would be recycled we have chosen not to collect this material via your recycling bin. We continue to monitor with interest the developments in plastic plant pot production, the retailers commitment to switching and the trials for plant pot recycling that are being conducted. Depending on the outcomes of these trials and our own trials we may look to include this material stream in the future. Some garden centres will accept them back for reuse.*
- **Yoghurt pots and lids – are they both recyclable?** *Yes, yoghurt pots and their plastic formed lid can be recycled, the only thing we can't take is the plastic film sealing lid.*
- **Why don't we encourage the recycling of ink cartridges just as we do batteries?** *This is something we are working with our Contractor Viridor on currently to see if there is a way we can accept them for recycling at your local HWRS, but for now the advice is either opt for refillable, return them to a recycle point (sometimes in shops or supermarkets) or see if a local charity will accept them.*

7. Progress Statement

7.1 Members considered the statements on matters arising from previous meetings (copy appended to the signed minutes) and noted the updates

8. Talk With Us

8.1 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 a reasonable interest. The following issues were raised and responses made.

- Mr Ray Querstedt attended to ask about the regulations and eligibility of Yellow House Builder Directional Signage and House Builder Advertisement signage. *The Area Highways Manager responded that the enquiry relates to 2 separate types of Developer signs: "Advertising" which are the responsibility of the Local Planning Authority (District Councils) and "Directional" which are the responsibility of the local Highway Authority (WSCC).*

The signs referred at the meeting to are the latter, but the text quoted refers to placement of the former and should not be confused.

- *The West Sussex County Council's policy on temporary developer signs is available at on the website at: <https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/information-for-developers/temporary-development-signs/>*
- *All developer sign applications must be made in writing to West Sussex County Council 4 weeks prior to erection.*
- *Permission must be sought to place signs on all highway infrastructure – when this is granted the applicant is given a permit number which must be displayed on the rear of every sign.*
- *There is a fee, based on number of signs, and the fee is annual.*
- *Developments must have a minimum of 30 bedrooms to be eligible for a permit.*
- *Only the name of the site is permitted on each sign – no other advertising allowed (for example the developer name).*
- *All signs must be placed no more than 1 mile or 2 junctions from the site entrance and from the nearest A or B road (though this is subject to size of development and complexity of local highway network).*
- *There are to be a maximum of 10 signs per development.*
- *The size of a sign is controlled by legend and siting criteria apply.*
- *Signs can be placed on infrastructure containing other road signs*
- *All signs must be reflective.*

West Sussex County Council does not have the resource for widespread removal at the present time but will address any potential safety issues. A trial is currently underway in Mid Sussex for Town Councils to remove the signs currently in place which were not placed with a valid permit – the effectiveness is being monitored

for potential roll-out elsewhere.

- Mr Ray Requested also asked a question regarding the Peer Challenge Report and whether the 100-day plan has yet been implemented – *The Committee agreed this was a question for the Cabinet Member. The Democratic Services officer agreed to seek a response from the Cabinet Member and append to the Signed Minutes.*

9. **CLC Review - Committee Feedback**

- 9.1 Further to the current CLC review that was taking place, members agreed to take 10 minutes to discuss their collective views, the format and purpose of CLC and different options for the future.
- 9.2 Mr Burrell, Senior Advisor Democratic Services, ran through the details of the recent Member Survey which was carried out as part of the review, explaining that it was planned to roll this out to Towns and Parishes to gain their formal feedback.
- 9.3 The main items that arose from this item were:
- Several residents took the opportunity to stress that they felt that the Committee meetings were a vital tool for members of the public to be heard but also to hear from Committee Members about what is going on in their local areas.
 - Advertising of the meetings needs consideration and could be pushed more, to create much greater awareness of the meetings.
 - A resident asked what has now, if anything replaced "Better Tomorrow's"? *The Democratic Services Officer agreed to look in to this and the response will be appended to the signed minutes.*
 - As the Committee covers such a rural area, should the meeting venue be fixed, would this help attendance? *Committee agreed to discuss this at their next Pre-Agenda Meeting.*

10. **Allocation of the Community Initiative Fund**

- 10.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Law and Assurance (copy appended to the signed minutes).
- 10.2 Mr Burrell introduced the report and explained that the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities had made the decision to introduce a micro fund following feedback received from groups relating to small projects. Applications to the micro fund would be for projects with a total cost of £750 and would be made via a paper application form. Applications would come to the CLC meetings for a decision. CLCs were expected to allocate a maximum 30% of their budget to micro fund applications, but this was discretionary.
- 10.3 The decision had cleared call-in and was now live, so the fund was available for applications.

10.4 Resolved – That the Committee note the report.

11. Chanctonbury Community Initiative Funding (CBY01(19/20))

11.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Law and Assurance (copy appended to the signed minutes).

11.2 The Chairman informed the Committee that following a decision by the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities the Community Initiative Funding budget had been reduced from £280,000 to £140,000. The decision was linked to the CLC Review Working Group. Pending consideration from the CLC Review Working Group, the Committee had £8000 for allocation for the year. 390/CBY – Pulborough Lunch Club, was accepted as a late application, as agreed under urgent matters.

11.3 Resolved –

(a) That the following awards be made:

- 385/CBY – Thakeham Village Hall – Towards chairs with arms for a new Village Hall: £750.00 (total project cost) – To purchase 20 new chairs with arms and a trolley for transportation.
- 386/CBY – Storrington Community Partnership, Later life planning event, £464.00 – Towards publicity and marketing materials costs and event venue hire.
- 390/CBY – Pulborough Lunch Club, £740.00, Towards providing hot cooked meals for more than 50 members in 2019/20.

12. Nominations to School and Academy Governing Bodies (CBY02(19/20))

12.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Education and Skills (copy appended to the signed minutes).

12.2 Resolved – that the Committee approved the following nominations:

- Ms Claire Maye: West Chiltington Community School, for a four-year term.
- Mr John Evans: Arun Villages Federation, for a four-year term.

13. Date of Next Meeting

13.1 The Chairman confirmed that the next meeting of the Committee will take place on 20 November at 7pm at The Steyning Centre.

Chairman

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Chanctonbury County Local Committee

19 November 2019

Progress Report

Date & Minute No.	Subject:	Action / Progress	Officer/Member Contact:
Misc	A27 Arundel Bypass	Members wrote to the South Downs National Park Authority with their collective views about the parks decision to seek judicial review on the A27 option for Arundel.	Committee
UPDATE	<p>Members met the South Downs National Park (SDNP) Chairman. Highways England (HE) have since announced that a further consultation will take place and the SDNP have dropped the case for Judicial Review.</p> <p>Highways England: The consultation, which is planned for spring 2019, will give local people a fresh look at all the viable options for upgrading the A27 using the latest available information.</p>		
Misc	Updates on Traffic Regulation Orders and Community Highways Schemes attached.		

This page is intentionally left blank

TRO No.	Area	Road	Update
CHA1901	Washington	Storrington Road	1 objection received during public consultation. Delegated Officers Report currently being prepared
CHA1902	Cowfold	Oakfield Road	Sent to Legal Team with a request to advertise
CHA1903	Pulborough	Swan Bridge	Details of design under consideration

This page is intentionally left blank

Chanctonbury County Local Committee.

19 November 2019.

Prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Order Requests Received between July 2018 and July 2019.

Report by Director of Highways and Transport and Head of Highways Operations.

Ref No: CBY03(19/20)
Key Decision: No
Part I
Electoral Divisions: All in CLC area

Executive Summary

Community requests for Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that cost under £3,000 to implement are considered annually by County Local Committees (CLCs). More complex TROs are considered for progression as a Community Highways Scheme and so fall outside the process.

The TRO Requests received between July 2018 and July 2019 have been assessed and scored and the results are attached for the CLC to consider and prioritise in line with the Cabinet Member Report for Traffic Regulation Orders – Assessment and Implementation Process for progression in the 2019/20 works programme.

Recommendation

That the Committee reviews the proposals and agrees to progress up to the allocated resource as detailed in 2.4 below for the highest scoring TROs from the list attached at Appendix A, subject to any adjustments made at the meeting.

Proposals

1. Background and Context

1.1 Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are legal orders that support enforceable restrictions and movements on the public highway. For the purposes of this report the term TRO includes speed limits, parking controls, and moving offences such as width restrictions and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) restrictions.

1.2 TROs are generated from four sources including:

- County Local Committees (requests from members of the public)
- 3rd party / developer schemes
- Highway improvement schemes through the Integrated Works Programme (IWP) – traffic calming, school safety, etc.)
- Parking schemes in partnership with District & Borough Councils.

This report deals with County Local Committee TROs only.

- 1.3 The framework for assessing TROs was approved by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport in March 2016. In summary, the framework assesses TROs against four criteria: Safety, Traffic Conditions, Environment & Economy and People which give the acronym STEP. A new assessment framework was considered necessary to align with the County Council’s corporate priorities and the increasing demand for TROs across the county. Full details of the criteria can be found in the Cabinet Member Decision report (see background reading for further details).
- 1.4 Following a review of County Local Committees (CLC) in 2016/17 the number of CLCs reduced from 14 to 11. Therefore the TROs have been reallocated as detailed in the table below. There has been no reduction in the number of TROs.

CLC and Number of Members	No of TRO’s
Adur (6 Members)	2
Worthing (9 Members)	3
Joint Eastern Arun Area (6 Members)	2
Joint Western Arun Area (7 Members)	2
North Chichester (4 Members)	1
South Chichester (7 Members)	2
Crawley (9 Members)	3
Chanctonbury (4 Members)	1
North Horsham (8 Members)	3
North Mid Sussex (5 Members)	1
Central & South Mid Sussex (8 Members)	3
 NEXT TOP Scoring TRO County Wide	 15
Total TRO’s (Indicative)	38

- 1.5 Appendix A lists the TROs identified as being viable for progression, and from which the CLC will prioritise up to the above allocation for progression.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The Committee is asked to consider the list of TRO requests and, subject to any desired changes, to approve the applicable quota as a programme of work to be initiated over the coming year and delivered in the 2020/21 works programme.
- 2.2 The CLC is requested to progress the highest scoring TRO within the CLC area. Whilst there is scope to progress a lower scoring TRO as a preference, sound justification should be provided for doing so as this will be at the expense of a request that is considered by application of the approved framework to be a higher priority.

- 2.3 Any TROs not selected as the highest priorities for CLCs may be considered on a priority basis for progression on a county-wide basis at the Cabinet Members discretion.
- 2.4 In accordance with the report detailed in the background papers, the list in Appendix A details all the CLC requests that have been received in the last year (July 2018 – July 2019) as well as those that were available to be selected, but were not, in the 2017-2018 round of TROs.
- 2.5 To get best value from officer and member resources the Cabinet Member has confirmed that TROs that score 9 or under offer little wider community value or have not demonstrated suitable community support, and will not progress to the CLC to be considered. A link to the report can be found in the background reading.
- 2.6 In subsequent years Traffic Officers will reject any requests that score 9 or below following application of the approved framework. Due to the timing of the Cabinet Member decision, for transparency all requests made that were not rejected in 2018-19, that have scored 9 or below have been detailed in Appendix A, however the CLC may not select these.
- 2.7 County Wide Summary of requests
- **Adur** – 2 new requests. 1 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 2
 - **Worthing**– 5 new requests. 1 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 3
 - **Joint East Arun**– 3 new requests. 1 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 2
 - **Joint West Arun**– 2 new requests. 1 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 2
 - **North Chichester**– 2 requests made, both scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of 1
 - **South Chichester**– 2 new requests. 1 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 2.
 - **Crawley**– 14 new requests. 9 of these scored over 9. 1 request (437397) carries over from the previous year. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 3
 - **Chanctonbury**– 5 new requests. 2 of these scored over 9. 1 request (438363) carries over from the previous year. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 1
 - **North Horsham**– 12 new requests. 7 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 3
 - **North Mid Sussex**– 0 requests made and can select up to 2
 - **Central and South Mid Sussex**– 0 requests made and can select up to 2
3. **Resources**
- 3.1 The proposals contribute to the County Council’s objectives for transport and meet the community needs and the ongoing demand for TROs within the resources available

- 3.2 Section 1.4 of this report confirms the CLCs can choose up to a maximum of 23 TROs. The maximum allowable cost of a TRO requested through this community process is £3,000. Hence the proposals by the CLCs could potentially cost £69,000. However, many of the requests such as Double Yellow Line Parking Restrictions have a low implementation value, so it is currently anticipated that the CLC requests will be managed within the £50,000 budgeted within the Highways Capital Budget for TRO's which is part of the Integrated Forward Works and Annual Delivery Programme budget approved in April 2019 decision ref HI03 (19/20)
- 3.3 Administrative work associated with the TRO's will be carried out internally by the TRO Team.
- 3.4 Due to the ongoing challenges to the Revenue budget it should be noted that Highway Operations currently only maintains / refreshes safety related road markings.

Factors taken into account

4. Consultation

- 4.1 Individual member support has been gained for each proposal and reasonable local community support has been demonstrated for those that can be selected. As with any TRO, wider consultation will be carried out in the usual way as each of the TRO requests is processed.

5. Risk Management Implications

- 5.1 The higher the priority score, the greater the potential benefit to the communities who use West Sussex Highways. Should the CLC not select the top scoring TROs consideration should be given if this could expose the county council to any risk if challenged.

6. Other Options Considered

- 6.1 The proposals must also pass a feasibility test and STEP assessment undertaken by WSCC Officers and reasonably supported by the public as well as the local member. Given this, the attached list of schemes represents the most viable options for consideration for prioritisation. Hence no further options are considered.

7. Equality Duty

- 7.1 This report is seeking the consideration of schemes for prioritisation and does not have direct implications under the Equality Act, though it should be noted that it is unlawful to prioritise a scheme which discriminates against people with protected characteristics. The schemes chosen by the CLC for progression will be individually assessed under the Equality Act as they are developed further.

8. **Social Value**

- 8.1 The proposed approach allows for the community via the CLC to progress and deliver their concerns through a consistent route to enable social, economic or environmental benefits to the County.

9. **Crime and Disorder Act Implications**

- 9.1 There are no identifiable Crime and Disorder Act implications associated with the process of choosing the forthcoming CLC TRO priorities. Any schemes formally proposed will be have further appropriate considerations with regards to crime and disorder, which will include consultation with the police and other key stakeholders.

10. **Human Rights Act Implications**

- 10.1 There are no Human Rights Act implications associated with the process of choosing the forthcoming CLC TRO priorities.

Matt Davey
Director of Highways & Transport

Michele Hulme
Head of Highway Operations

Contact: Area Highway Manager

Appendices

Appendix A – CLC TRO Priority List

Background Papers

Cabinet Member Report – TRO Assessment

http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/ds/edd/ht/ht14_15-16.pdf

Cabinet Member Report – TRO Prioritisation

<https://westsussex.moderngov.co.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=717>

APPENDIX A

CHANCTONBURY

Confirm Enquiry Number	Division	Parish	Dominant Road Name	Local Member	TRO Type Parking / Speed Limit / Moving	Summary	Approx Cost (implementation only)	Score
M3006713	Storrington	Thakeham	Greenhurst Lane	Pat Arculus	Speed Limit	Request to reduce NSL to 40mph	£1,500	16
M3004833	Storrington	Wiston	Hole Street	Paul Marshall	Speed Limit	Request for 40mph at north and south end of road	£2,100	13
M438363	Ashington	Ashington	Rectory Lane	Paul Marshall	Speed Limit	Request to reduce speed limit	£2000	10
The CLC can only select requests that score 10 or above.								
M3004504	Storrington	Storrington	Washington Road	Paul Marshall	Speed Limit	Request for a speed reduction to 40mph	£2,500	9
M3003125	Pulborough	Thakeham	Harbolets Road	Pat Arculus	Speed Limit	Speed reduction to 50 or 40mph along existing NSL zone at the eastern end of Harbolets	£1,500	8
M3007282	Storrington	Storrington	Mill Lane	Paul Marshall	Parking Issue	Request for DYLS along only section of road not currently subject to restrictions	£420	7

Mr Roger Elkins, Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure	Ref No: H&I 11 19/20
July 2019	Key Decision: Yes
Highways, Transport and Planning Service Area Review & Highway Maintenance Infrastructure Plan	Part I
Report by Executive Director Place Services and Director of Highways, Transport and Planning	Electoral Divisions: All
<p>Summary</p> <p>The County Council, in its capacity as Highway Authority, has a duty to maintain the highway under Section 41(1) of the Highways Act 1980. However, the Act does not specify the levels of service required, in order to meet that duty. In previous years an annual Highway Maintenance Plan has been produced which detailed the highway maintenance service levels customers could expect to receive.</p> <p>A document named "Well-managed Highway Infrastructure" was published in October 2016, replacing "Well-maintained Highways", "Management of Highway Structures" and "Well-lit Highways". Like its predecessors, "Well-managed Highway Infrastructure" is a national, non-statutory code of practice which sets out a series of general principles for highway maintenance. It is endorsed and recommended by the Department for Transport and its production has been overseen by the UK Roads Liaison Group (UKRLG) and its Roads, Bridges and Lighting Boards.</p> <p>In order to demonstrate that the County Council complies with the principles of "Well-managed Highway Infrastructure" a robust decision-making process, an understanding of the consequences of those decisions, and how the associated risks are managed to ensure highway safety must be demonstrated. As part of that process, a new Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan needs to be produced, which clearly lays out the levels of service customers may expect, and which integrates with a revised "Safety Plus" inspection manual. "Safety Plus" is a formalised system of highway inspections which ensures highway inspections are carried out and any safety defects identified and repaired within prescribed timescales.</p> <p>A new Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan (attached as an Appendix) is proposed to meet this objective.</p>	
<p>West Sussex Plan: Policy Impact and Context</p> <p>The proposal supports the prosperous place priority in the West Sussex Plan. The provision of a Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan, with clearly defined customer service levels, will help manage customer expectations. A well-managed highway network will help to support local businesses and communities by ensuring safe, reliable, and consistent journey times.</p>	
<p>Financial Impact</p> <p>Any revision to service levels will be designed with sufficient flexibility to contain expenditure within projected budgets when the new highways contract(s) commence. The estimated annual value of the revenue works services affected by this decision is £8.707m.</p>	

Recommendations

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure approves a new Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan (see Appendix) including a review of service levels currently delivered and which details the revised service level for revenue works.

PROPOSAL

1. Background and Context

- 1.1. The County Council, in its capacity as Highway Authority, has a duty to maintain the highway under Section 41(1) of the Highways Act 1980. However, the Act does not specify the levels of service required, in order to meet that duty.
- 1.2. A document named "Well-managed Highway Infrastructure" was published in October 2016, replacing "Well-maintained Highways", "Management of Highway Structures" and "Well-lit Highways". Like its predecessors, "Well-managed Highway Infrastructure" is a national, non-statutory code of practice which sets out a series of general principles for highway maintenance.
- 1.3. There are no prescriptive or minimum standards in the Code. Adoption of a risk based approach, taking account of the advice in the Code, will enable this authority to establish and implement levels of service appropriate to local circumstances. The Code of Practice is endorsed and recommended by the Department for Transport and its production has been overseen by the UK Roads Liaison Group (UKRLG) and its Roads, Bridges and Lighting Boards.
- 1.4. In order to demonstrate that the County Council complies with the principles of "Well-managed Highway Infrastructure" a robust decision-making process, an understanding of the consequences of those decisions, and how the associated risks are managed to ensure highway safety must be demonstrated. As part of that process, a new Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan needs to be produced, which clearly lays out the levels of service customers may expect, and which integrates with a revised "Safety Plus" inspection manual. "Safety Plus" is a formalised system of highway inspections which ensures highway inspections are carried out and any safety defects identified and repaired within prescribed timescales.
- 1.5. Highway maintenance contributes in varying degrees to the core objectives of safety, customer service, sustainability and serviceability. Levels of service and delivery arrangements need to be established having regard to these objectives and be focussed on outcomes, rather than on inputs mainly related to maintenance type.
- 1.6. Delivery of a safe and well maintained highway network relies on good evidence and sound engineering judgement. The new Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan demonstrates how the Highways, Transport and Planning Service in West Sussex will develop levels of service in accordance with local needs, priorities and affordability.

2. Proposal Details

- 2.1. A new Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan (Appendix 1) has been produced, which clearly lays out the levels of service customers may expect,

integrates with a revised "Safety Plus" inspection manual, and explains how the County Council meets its statutory duty to maintain the highway.

- 2.2. The Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan demonstrates that the County Council complies with the principles of the Code of Practice, sets out the service levels that can be expected by customers, and explains the risk based rationale behind the setting of those service levels.
- 2.3. The Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan has a key role to play in determining affordable service levels and in ensuring that the service continues to be delivered to the required quality at an affordable cost. The overriding principle behind the plan is to ensure the safety of the highway, and any proposed changes to service levels have been risk assessed, with safety being the first factor evaluated.
- 2.4. Proposed changes to service levels are summarised in the table below.

Analysis Topic	Service Level Variation	Change to Service Standard
Safety Plus	No change in service levels	
Highway Condition Surveys	No change in service levels	
Drainage Management	No change in service levels	Better use of data to empty gullies only when required. Efficiency Saving.
Highway Trees	More safety driven	Risk based approach to tree investigations and prolonging the cyclical pollarding frequency
Pedestrian Guardrail	More safety driven	Reactive repairs only in approximately 40 locations each year.
Highway Structures	More risk based approach	Cyclic programmes of general and preventative maintenance reduced.
Traffic Systems	No change in service levels	
Winter Maintenance	Revised risk based policy aligned with neighbouring authorities	Reduction of Precautionary Salting network from 1804kms (41% of the network) to 1232kms (28% of the network) to only include: Major Road Network (P1) and other Primary routes and County distributors (P2).
Vegetation Management	Reduced Service Levels to redirect resources to safety based maintenance, take account of the council's recently agreed Pollinator Action Plan, and seek to reduce the	Reduction of urban grass cuts from 7 to 5. Reduction of rural grass cutting from two 1m swath cuts and one full cut to one 1m swath cut and one full cut. Reduction of weed spraying to selected targeted areas. Annual hedge cutting

	use of Glyphosate products	programme reduced to two year cycle.
Graffiti	No change in service levels	As levels of graffiti have decreased there will be minor reductions in contributions to third parties
Signs, Bollards & Road Markings	Reduced Service Levels to redirect resources to safety and regulatory based maintenance	Prioritise replacement of regulatory signs (e.g. give way signs). Prioritise replacement of safety orientated markings and regulatory lining in CPZs.

FACTORS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

3. Consultation

- 3.1 The Executive Director of Place Services, the Director of Finance and Support Services and the Director of Law and Assurance have been consulted. The Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee considered the proposals at its meeting on 20 June 2019 and noted that the strategies outlined in the Highway Maintenance Infrastructure Plan should help inform future financial planning.
- 3.2 The Committee also recommended a robust communication plan publicising changing service levels, explaining riparian responsibilities to landowners, and seeking to enhance partnership working with District, Town and Parish Councils. A communications strategy will be developed to support deployment of the Highway Maintenance Infrastructure Plan.

4. Financial and Resource Implications

The Highways Maintenance Revenue Budget for 2019/20 approved by Full Council in February 2019 is £8.707m. Any revision to service levels will be designed with sufficient flexibility to contain expenditure within budget.

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Revenue Works Budget	8.707	8.707	8.707	8.707	34.828
Change From Proposal	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Remaining Budget	8.707	8.707	8.707	8.707	34.828

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1. Highway authorities have certain legal obligations with which they need to comply, and which may be the subject of claims for loss or personal injury, or of legal action by those seeking to establish poor or non-compliant activities by highway authorities. In such cases the principles of the "Well-managed Highway Infrastructure" Code of Practice may be a relevant consideration.
- 5.2. Where this authority elects, in the light of local circumstances to adopt policies or approaches different from those suggested by the Code of Practice, it is essential that they are identified, together with the reasoning for such differences, approved by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

and published. This proposal adopts the risk based approach recommended by the Code of Practice and does not recommend policies or approaches different to those suggested by the Code of Practice.

6. Risk Assessment Implications and Mitigations

The risk of not reviewing and implementing revised service levels using an affordable risk based approach, and publishing a Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan laying out those service levels, is that the County Council's statutory duty to maintain the highway under Section 41(1) of the Highways Act 1980 will not be met.

7. Other Options Considered

Service level analyses have been completed, which considered a number of alternative levels of service for different work types, against the available budget. The findings of these service level analyses are laid out in the appendices to the Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan.

8. Equality and Human Rights Assessment

The public sector equality duty will apply to the delivery of the services which fall within the service area review. The potential to disadvantage accessibility for disabled or other vulnerable road users with protected characteristics has been assessed against each service level option as one of the four key factors considered when evaluating risk. This will ensure that the County Council is able to fulfil its obligations, through the delivery of the services, and provide sufficient assurance that the duty will be complied with. The proposal has no implications under the Human Rights Act 1998.

9. Social Value and Sustainability Assessment

The proposal has no implications to the Council's duty under the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012.

10. Crime and Disorder Reduction Assessment

There are no foreseeable crime and disorder implications to this proposal.

Lee Harris
Executive Director Place Services

Matt Davey
Director
Highways, Transport and Planning

Contact Officer:

Chris Barrett, Contract Lead Professional, 03302226707

Appendix

Appendix – [Draft Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan](#)

Background papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank

Chanctonbury County Local Committee

Ref: CBY03(19/20)

Community Initiative Funding

Key Decision:

19 November 2019

No

Part I

Report by Director of Law and Assurance

Electoral Divisions:

All in CBY CLC area

Recommendation

That the Committee considers the pitches and applications submitted for Community Initiative Funding as set out in Appendix A and award funding accordingly.

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.

1.4 Effective from 8 February 2019, the County Council’s Community Initiative Fund budget was reduced from £280,000 per year to £140,000 per year, following a decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities (decision reference SSC8 18/19). It was approved that this proposal be included in the Governance Committee review of County Local Committees with implementation of savings to be delayed until the review has been completed. Therefore, it was agreed that the 2019/20 CIF budget is provisionally reduced to £140,000, subject to the outcome of the Governance Committee review of CLCs on 25 November 2019.

- 1.5 Effective from 12 June 2019, the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities took a decision to introduce a Micro Fund following feedback received from groups relating to small projects (decision reference SSC02 19/20). Applications to the Micro Fund are intended for projects with a total cost of up to £750 as an alternative to crowdfunding and pitching to CIF via West Sussex Crowd. As with crowdfunding pitches, Micro Fund applications are considered the CLC meetings for a decision. CLCs were advised to allocate up to 30% of their budget to Micro Fund applications, although this is discretionary.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 That the Committee considers the pitches and/or applications for 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 2019/20 financial year, Chanctonbury CLC had a total of £8,000.00 available for allocation, of this £6,046.00 is still available for allocation. Details of awards made in the current program and previous financial year are included in Appendix B.
- 3.2 There is one crowdfunding pitch and three Micro Fund applications for consideration by the Committee, with a total project value of £6,001.00.

Pitches are outlined in Appendix A and can also be viewed at:
www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk

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 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: Jenna Barnard, Democratic Services Officer – 033 022 24525

Appendices

Appendix A – Current pitches for consideration by the Committee

Appendix B – Summary of awards made in 2019/20 and 2018/19

Background Papers:

West Sussex Crowd pitches – www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk

Micro Fund applications –

<http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/ds/clc/cby/cby191119microfundback.pdf>

Decision SSC8 18/19 -

<https://westsussex.moderngov.co.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=494>

Decision SSC02 19/20 -

<https://westsussex.moderngov.co.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=611>

Current pitches for consideration by the Committee

West Sussex Crowd

The following project has pitched to the Community Initiative Fund since the last meeting:

Actively Fundraising –

- **419/CBY – Henfield Youth Club, 'Light up running costs down', £4,974.00 – towards installing a cost-effective LED lighting system throughout the building.**
<https://www.spacehive.com/light-up-running-costs-down>

Micro Fund

The following projects have applied to the Micro Fund since the last meeting:

- **423/CBY – Henfield Computer Club, 'Purchase of TV monitor for use at workshops', £300.00 – towards purchasing a new smart LED TV to aid presenting at club workshops.**
- **444/CBY – Ashington Festival Committee, 'Ashington Festival', £607.00 – towards the cost of printing 1,200 festival programmes.**
- **449/CBY – The Bramber Society, 'Christmas tree lights', £120.00 – towards purchasing replacement Christmas tree lights for the annual village carol concert.**

This page is intentionally left blank

Summary of awards made in 2019/20 and 2018/19

The following pitches and applications have received funding during the 2019/19 financial year to date:

Applicant	Summary	Member	Awarded	Evaluation
MICRO FUND				
385/CBY - Thakeham Village Hall	Towards purchasing 20 new chairs with arms and a trolley for transportation	Pat Arculus	£750.00	No feedback received – refer to Member
386/CBY - Storrington Community Partnership	Towards publicity and marketing materials costs plus event venue hire	Paul Marshall	£464.00	No feedback received - refer to Member
390/CBY - Pulborough Lunch Club	Towards providing cooked meals for more than 50 members in 2019/20	Pat Arculus	£740.00	No feedback received – refer to Member
			TOTAL: £1,954.00	

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

Applicant	Summary	Member	Awarded	Evaluation
WEST SUSSEX CROWD				
227/CBY - Cowfold Country Mice Nursery Technology	Towards purchasing an Early Years interactive learning resource	Lionel Barnard	£1,500.00	No feedback received
228/CBY - Ashurst Village Hall Stage Extension	Towards purchasing a new portable stage pack	David Barling	£981.00	Feedback received (view using Google Chrome web browser)
267/CBY - Install a public toilet	Towards installing a unisex wheelchair-accessible toilet in the village centre	Paul Marshall	£2,500.00	No feedback received
319/CBY - To upgrade and refurbish our net	Towards resurfacing and repairing the net	Pat Arculus	£1,000.00	Feedback received (view using Google Chrome web browser)
320/CBY - Sandgate Park bridge	Towards a new footbridge	Paul Marshall	£2,500.00	Feedback received (view using Google Chrome web browser)
324/CBY - Tables and benches for camping	Towards replacing outdated tables and benches	Lionel Barnard	£1,000.00	No feedback received
330/CBY - Stunning Town Entrance	To purchase the main signpost, planters and installation costs for Steyning-in-Bloom project	David Barling	£2,500.00	No feedback received
			TOTAL: £11,981.00	

To note: The following pitch received a pledge of £500.00 but subsequently failed to successfully reach their fundraising target.

239/CBY – Thakeham Village Football Club, 'Raising £2019 for 2019 – Part 1', a pool for cancer patients, £1,413.00 – towards purchasing new mini football goals and bench seating for parents.

Chanctonbury County Local Committee**20 November 2019****Nominations for Local Authority Governors to Maintained Schools and Academy Governing Bodies****Report by Director of Education and Skills**

Ref: CBY05(19/20)
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 Re-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 Director since it is usually advantageous to bring in experienced governors from other areas
 - iv) 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 Director since it is usually advantageous to bring in experienced governors from other areas
 - v) 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**

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

6. **Resources**

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

Factors taken into account

7. **Consultation**

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**

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**

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. In such a case the Governing Body cannot make an appointment.

10. **Equality Duty.**

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**

None

12. **Crime and Disorder Act Implications**

None

13. **Human Rights Implications**

None

Paul Wagstaff

Director of Education and Skills

Contact: Governor Services Administrator
0330 222 8887

Appendix A: Local Authority Governors - Appointments, Reappointments or Nominations

Appendix B: Current Vacancy List

Background Papers: None.

Local Authority Governors - Nominations Under the 2012 Regulations

Maintained Schools

Nominations for Reappointment:

Thakeham Primary School

Judith James for a four-year term

Nominations for Appointment:

Academies:

Nominations for Reappointment:

Nominations for Appointment:

Temporary Governing Bodies

Nominations for Reappointment:

Nominations for Appointment:

Authority Governor Vacancies for Chanctonbury County Local Committee Area

School	Division	Division Member	Vacant From	Current Status	Chairman	Head
Ashurst C.E. Primary School	Bramber Castle	David Barling	Aug-18	Resigning at end of term	Alison Woods	Janet Williams
Amberley C.E. Primary School	Storrington	Paul Marshall	Sep-18	Resigning at end of term	Ray Jackson	John Gilbert
West Chiltington Community Primary School	Pulborough	Pat Arculus	Sep-18	Resigning at end of term	Julian Hoad/Julia Handley	Julian Rose