

# Public Document Pack

**Tony Kershaw**  
Director of Law and Assurance

If calling, please ask for

Adam Chisnall 033 022 28314

Email: [adam.chisnall@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:adam.chisnall@westsussex.gov.uk)

[www.westsussex.gov.uk](http://www.westsussex.gov.uk)

 [@DemService](https://twitter.com/DemService)

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



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



17 June 2019

**A meeting of the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee will be held at 7.00 pm on Tuesday, 25 June 2019 at Bramble Hall, Bramble Hill, Balcombe, West Sussex, RH17 6HR**

**Tony Kershaw**  
Director of Law and Assurance

## Your local County Councillors



**Andrew  
Lea**  
Lindfield &  
High Weald



**Bill  
Acraman**  
Worth  
Forest



**Heidi  
Brunsdon**  
Imberdown



**Elizabeth  
Bennett**  
East Grinstead  
Meridian



**Jacquie  
Russell**  
East Grinstead South  
& Ashurst Wood

## Invite you to come along to the North Mid Sussex 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. **Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman**

The Committee is asked to elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman for the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee for the 2019/20 municipal year.

7.03 pm 2. **Welcome and introductions**

Members of North Mid Sussex County Local Committee are Bill Acraman, Liz Bennett, Heidi Brunsdon, Andrew Lea and Jacquie Russell.

- 7.05 pm 3. **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.
- 7.07 pm 4. **Minutes** (Pages 5 - 10)
- To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 5 February 2019 (cream paper).
- 7.09 pm 5. **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.
- 7.10 pm 6. **Progress Statement** (To Follow)
- The document contains brief updates on statements of progress made on issues raised at previous meetings. The Committee is asked to note the report.
- 7.20 pm 7. **Proposed Traffic Regulation Order - Calluna Drive, Copthorne (NMS01(19/20))** (Pages 11 - 26)
- Report by the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning and Head of Highway Operation.
- At the last meeting of the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee, the Committee resolved to defer a decision on this Proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to ensure that the local member's views could be taken into consideration.
- The North Mid Sussex County Local Committee are asked to consider the objections raised and authorise the Director of Law and Assurance to make the Order as detailed in the revised scheme at Appendix C.
- 7.40 pm 8. **A22 Lewes Road, East Grinstead Pedestrian Crossing - (NMS02(19/20))** (To Follow)
- Report by the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning
- The North Mid Sussex County Local Committee are asked to consider that the resulting benefits to the community outweigh the objections raised, and authorise the Director of Law and Assurance to make the order as advertised and install the pedestrian crossing and associated new cycleway.

- 8.00 pm 9. **Allocation of the Community Initiative Fund** (Pages 27 - 32)  
Report by the Director of Law and Assurance.  
  
The Committee is asked to note the report which outlines the decision to introduce a 'micro fund' as part of the Community Initiative Fund for smaller scale projects.
- 8.10 pm 10. **North Mid Sussex Community Initiative Funding (NMS03(19/20))** (Pages 33 - 40)  
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 received application and pledge funding if appropriate.
- 8.25 pm 11. **Nominations for Local Authority Governors to Maintained Schools and Academy Governing Bodies (NMS04(19/20))** (Pages 41 - 48)  
Report by Director of Education and Skills.  
  
The Committee are asked to approve the nomination of Authority School Governor as set out in the report.
- 8.35 pm 12. **Talk With Us Open Forum**  
  
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.
- 8.50 pm 13. **CLC Review Discussion**  
  
The Committee are asked to have a collective discussion about their views on the purpose and format of CLCs.  
  
The views will be passed on and considered at the next CLC Review meeting on 11 July.
- 9.00 pm 14. **Date of Next Meeting**  
  
The next meeting of the Committee will take place at 7.00 pm on Monday 21 October 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 Mid Sussex 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.

## **North Mid Sussex County Local Committee**

5 February 2019 – At a meeting of the Committee at 7.00 pm held at East Grinstead Library, 32-40 West Street, East Grinstead, RH19 4SR.

Present:

Mrs Brunsdon (Chairman) (Imberdown;), Mrs Bennett (East Grinstead Meridian;) and Mrs Russell (East Grinstead South & Ashurst Wood;)

Apologies were received from Mr Acraman (Worth Forest;) and Mr Lea (Lindfield & High Weald;)

Officers in attendance: Gulu Sibanda (Principal Community Officer), Monique Smart (Democratic Services Officer) and Richard Speller (Area Highways Manager)

### **23. Welcome and introductions**

23.1 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

23.2 The Chairman highlighted some information for residents including a Health and Wellbeing market place event taking place in Horsham on 14 March, a leaflet about health checks and leaflets asking for feedback about County Local Committees.

23.2 Apologies were noted from Mr Andrew Lea and Mr Bill Acraman.

### **24. Declarations of Interest**

24.1 None declared.

### **25. Minutes**

25.1 RESOLVED – that the minutes of the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee meeting held on 13 November 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **26. Urgent Matters**

26.1 None

### **27. Progress Statement**

27.1 Members considered the statements on matters arising from previous meetings (copy appended to the signed minutes) and made the following comments.

- The Area Highways Manager confirmed he would be meeting colleagues from Mid Sussex District Council in early March and issues regarding missing signage would be discussed then.

- The Area Highways Manager confirmed that the Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) prioritised at the last meeting had now been scored. Ship Street scored 19 points and Lingfield Road and Lowdells Lane had scored 15 points. He therefore recommended that Ship Street be progressed as the first TRO (2017/18 priority) and Lingfield Road/Lowdells Lane as the second TRO (2018/19 priority). The Committee agreed this approach.
- With regard to roads surrounding Queen Victoria Hospital the Area Highways Manager and local member confirmed that they were working on a travel plan.
- It was confirmed that East Grinstead Parish Council also have aspirations to improve Railway Approach so the Area Highways manager will liaise with them on any scheme. It was hoped that some S106 funds could be used.
- The Area Highways Manager confirmed that the replacement Speed Indicator Device (SID) had been ordered.
- The Chairman read out the following statement: The County Council are currently working jointly with Surrey County Council, Mid Sussex District Council and Tandridge District Council on an appraisal of options for the A22/A264 Felbridge junction. The exercise is underway and WSP are the transport consultants. The aim of the exercise is to appraise a range of options for improving the junction, taking account of the cumulative impacts of development in Tandridge and Mid Sussex. The range of options will include minor improvements to the current signals but also more substantial options that may require land outside the highway. The appraisal will inform decisions about the scope of future improvements to the junction. The study is expected to complete by the end of March and arrangements for briefing local members will be made in the summer.
- Worth Parish Council asked about Kilnwood Road. The Area Highways Manager suggested any scheme to change the cross roads would likely not score very highly but if they wished to submit an application they could.
- Mrs Jacquie Russell asked about the trees and street lighting in Clays Close. The Area Highways Manager agreed to check with the street lighting contractor (SSE) to see what was happening. He would report back to Mrs Jacquie Russell.

**28. Proposed Traffic Regulation Order - Calluna Drive, Copthorne (NMS09(18/19))**

28.1 The Committee consideration a report by the Director of Highways and Transport that detailed proposals for traffic restrictions in Calluna Drive, Copthorne.

28.2 The Chairman confirmed that the decision made on this Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) at the last meeting had been withdrawn to allow for further informal consultation.

28.3 The Area Highways Manager introduced the revised report and confirmed that the initial formal consultation had resulted in nine comments of support and six objections for the originally advertised

scheme. The further informal consultation had resulted in an additional six comments of support for the originally advertised scheme.

28.4 The Area Highways Manager went on to confirm that even with those additional comments of support for the originally advertised scheme, the officer recommendation remained as per the last report to implement a reduced scheme as detailed in the report and on the map attached as Appendix C. He explained that this recommendation would address the safety concerns initially raised in relation to junction protection but would have minimal displacement into Calluna Drive.

28.5 The Chairman allowed a resident and a local Parish Council representative to speak on this item. They both spoke in support of the originally advertised larger scheme. They stated that extended double yellow lines around the corner are necessary as at present large vehicles are often parked on the corner and vehicles wanting to go round do not have a clear line of sight of oncoming traffic.

28.6 The Chairman confirmed that the local member had given apologies for this meeting and but he had suggested previously that he supported the originally advertised scheme. However without an official statement from him to confirm this, the other Committee Members were reluctant to make a decision that went against the officer recommendation. Members suggested deferring the decision until the next meeting to allow the local Members view to be accurately recorded.

28.7 RESOLVED that the Committee defer a decision until the next meeting to ensure that the local member's views were taken into consideration.

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

29.1 The Chairman confirmed that there were no nominations for Authority School Governors. She highlighted the vacancy at Fairway Infant School and encouraged anyone with an interest to contact Governor Services or their local County Councillor.

30. **Talk With Us Open Forum**

30.1 The Chairman invited questions from those in attendance. The following matters were discussed:

- A resident of Windmill Lane asked if the Council could inspect the ditch on the north side of the Lane and clear it. The Area Highways Manager stated that he would have to first establish the ownership of the ditch as it would be the landowners duty under 'riparian ownership' to clear the ditch. If it is privately owned there is a possibility of apply for funds under 'Operation Watershed'. The Area Highways Manager agreed to look into the ownership and liaise with the local resident and the local Member, Mrs Liz Bennett.
- The Chairman of West Hoathly Parish Council asked for advice on what type of Speed Indicator Device (SID) the Parish Council should

purchase. The Area Highway Manager confirmed he would forward details onto the Parish Council clerk.

- Dr Ian Gibson asked about the removal of trees on the A264. He understood the land was owned by West Sussex County Council but following an FOI request, the County Council had confirmed they had not removed the trees. He stated that both Highways England and developers are undertaking works in the area and they had both confirmed they did not remove the trees. Dr Gibson stated that as the landowner, the County Council should investigate this and also arrange for supplementary screening whilst development is undertaken. The Committee asked if it could be investigated via the planning process at Mid Sussex District Council. The Area Highways Manager agreed to look into this and report back to the Committee.
- A resident asked about the item on the Progress Statement in relation to missing or inaccurate signage and said it included speed limit signs. The Area Highways Manager stated he was meeting with colleagues at Mid Sussex District Council in early March and would follow up with the local Member, Mrs Jacquie Russell, and the local resident after that meeting.
- A resident asked about the proposed public consultation for the East Grinstead Road Space Audit and asked how it will be advertised. The Chairman asked Mrs Jacquie Russell, in her role as the Deputy to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, to ensure this was widely advertised.
- A representative from East Grinstead Town Council raised concern about any solution for Railway Approach considering the CLC could only have 1 TRO a year. The Area Highways Manager explained that there are other options for progressing TROs if they are linked to developments or can be privately funded. He explained that Railway Approach could well attract Capital or S106 funding so could be progressed outside of the CLC TRO quota.
- Sarah Howland from Stone Quarry Crew raised concern that the CLC had no funding applications to consider for this meeting and suggested that CIF and Spacehive are not promoted enough. The Chairman stated that both Members and the County Councils Community Team do their best to promote it to local groups and organisation and the voluntary sector. The Locality Lead for Mid Sussex, Gulu Sibanda, did also add that they also arrange workshops and drop in events to help people with the Spacehive process. The Chairman added that the Spacehive process was being reviewed by a Select Committee after the first full year of implementation.

### **31. Date of Next Meeting**

31.1 The Chairman confirmed that the next meeting of the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee would take place on Tuesday 25 June 2019 at a venue to be confirmed.

31.2 The Chairman encouraged the public to complete the feedback sheets on the seats and suggest items for future meetings.



Chairman

The meeting closed at 8.22 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>North Mid Sussex County Local Committee</b>	<b>Ref No: NMS01(19/20)</b>
<b>25 June 2019</b>	<b>Key Decision: No</b>
<b>Worth – Copthorne – Calluna Drive Proposed Traffic Regulation Order</b>	<b>Part I</b>
<b>Report by Director of Highways, Transport and Planning and Head of Highway Operation</b>	<b>Electoral Division: Worth Forest</b>

### Summary

Calluna Drive has experienced a growing parking trend from commuter and car sharing individuals who park in the road and then car share to gain access to the nearby A23. Situated close to Gatwick Airport, there is an attraction for some drivers to park and travel avoiding the airport car parking fees. Concerns have been raised by local residents about cars parking on Calluna Drive, restricting visibility for passing traffic and causing congestion. Resolving this issue has been prioritised by the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee. A new Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is therefore proposed to avoid danger to persons or traffic using the affected length of road and to facilitate the safe passage of traffic.

The three week statutory consultation for the TRO ran between 22 March and 12 April 2018. Nine comments of support were received. Six objections were received which have been summarised in Appendix B to this Report.

At the North Mid Sussex CLC dated 13 November 2018 members agreed and supported the introduction of a reduced version of the original TRO proposal. Keeping the extended double yellow lines on the junction affecting Calluna Drive off Brookhill Road, further reinforcing rule 243 of The Highway Code.

Following the CLC some residents voiced concern to the local Member suggesting there was wider support for the original advertised scheme. The residents wanted the full scheme implemented, rather than the agreed limited version of extending the junction protection. It was suggested those who supported the advertised scheme did not respond as they understood only objectors needed to respond.

As a result the proposed decision was withdrawn under Standing Order 5.12 of the County Council's Constitution. This allowed the CLC to notify the Director or Law and Assurance of its intention to reconsider the proposal.

Local Member(s) then allowed views to be expressed outside of the usual TRO consultation parameters. West Sussex County Council Highways Officers had no knowledge of which roads were included within this informal engagement and therefore had no evidence if this was a fair reflection to the statutory consultation or if it formed any basis to alter the original CLC decision.

The result of this informal consultation was an additional six comments of support.

## **Recommendation**

That North Mid Sussex CLC, having considered the resulting benefits to the community outweigh the objections raised, authorise the Director of Law and Assurance to make the Order as detailed in the revised scheme at Appendix C.

### **Proposal**

#### **1. Background and Context**

- 1.1 Obstructive and inconsiderate parking close to junctions is negatively affecting driver and pedestrian visibility.
- 1.2 The purpose of the proposed restrictions are to improve visibility for residents and visitors. There is concern that access for emergency vehicles could be impeded due to current parking practice in the road.
- 1.3 On 7th December 2016, the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee resolved to progress a new traffic regulation order in Calluna Drive, for an extension of double yellow lines.
- 1.4 The results of the public consultation were that 9 comments of support and 6 objections were received.
- 1.5 After acknowledgement of the objections received, further discussions were carried out with residents directly affected by the proposals. Despite efforts to reconfigure the proposals, their objections still stood. On that basis it was presented to the Local Member to make a final decision.
- 1.6 The Area Highway Manager for the Mid Sussex area met with the Local Member on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2018 to consider the situation. The Local Member made to final decision to remove the majority of the original proposals but decided to retain an extension of parking restriction near the Brookhill Road junction.

#### **2. Proposal**

- 2.1 The original proposal was to alleviate congestion and access difficulties with new lengths of double yellow line. It was proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions, on sections of Calluna Drive and Kitsmead.
- 2.2 The original restrictions advertised included lengths of road that were the subject of the proposed Order, are shown on plans TQ3139SWS.

The original advertised plans are in Appendix A.

- 2.3 The Order is proposed to avoid danger to persons or traffic using the road or for preventing such danger from arising, to facilitate the safe passage of traffic and improve the amenity of the area through which the road runs.
- 2.4 Based on the decision made by the Local Member on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2018, the scheme has been redrawn to reflect the decision, as shown in Appendix C.

### 3. Resources

- 3.1 The cost to the Council for the installation of the TRO should be in the region of £500.00 to be met from the Community Traffic Order Regulation budget.

#### Factors taken into account

### 4. Consultation

- 4.1 **Members** - At the design stage, the local member for Worth Forest was consulted and supported the proposals.
- 4.2 **External** – Copthorne Parish Council supported the design of the proposed restrictions. Sussex Police were consulted at design stage and raised no objection.
- 4.3 **Public** - The three week statutory consultation for the TRO ran between 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2018 and 12<sup>th</sup> April 2018. Notification of this was sent directly to a range of stakeholders including the Police and emergency services, District and Parish Councils and motoring organisations. During this consultation period, notices were erected on site, a copy of plans and a statement of reasons were placed at the local library, and the advertisement placed in the local press and on the County Council's website.
- 4.4 During the consultation period, nine comments of support were submitted. Six comments of objection were received about the proposals. They have been summarised in Appendix B to this report together with comments from the Director of Highways and Transport.
- 4.5 The local County Councillor has confirmed their support for the revised proposals based on the objections received.
- 4.6 Following the CLC some residents were not content with this outcome and voiced their opinions and claiming wider support for the original advertised scheme. The residents wanted the full scheme implemented, rather than the agreed limited version of extending the junction protection. As a result the proposed decision was withdrawn under Standing Order 5.12 of the County Council's Constitution. This allowed the CLC to notify the Director or Law and Assurance of its intention to reconsider the proposal.
- 4.7 Local Member(s) wanted further engagement with the residents, therefore allowed these views to be expressed outside of the usual TRO consultation parameters. WSCC had no knowledge of which roads were included within the engagement, so WSCC had no evidence if this was a fair reflection to the statutory consultation or if it formed any basis to alter the original CLC decision.
- 4.8 The results of the informal consultation received 7 comments of which 1 had already expressed views during the statutory public consultation, so only 6 were additional to the statutory advert phase.

## **5. Risk Management Implications**

- 5.1 Due to obstructive parking at junctions, should the proposed TRO not be made the risk to the County Council is that parked vehicles will continue to obstruct access for residents, refuse vehicles and emergency services.
- 5.2 Should the TRO be made, the risk to the County Council is that car drivers will need to find alternative parking provision and may migrate further into the residential area and into neighbouring roads.
- 5.3 Making a decision based on comments outside of the statutory public consultation does compromise the core value of the statutory consultation itself which gave all stakeholders an opportunity to voice their feedback regardless if it was positive or negative. There is a potential risk that it exposes the TRO process to further public challenge and risks diluting the impartiality and consistent approach TRO's are conducted within the agreed process.
- 5.4 There is no evidence to the extent of roads or area the informal consultation encompassed, nor did it demonstrate engagement with key stakeholders, therefore it risks lack of integrity that the statutory consultation emulates. Those residents who may be negatively affected by the full scheme proposal, could now attempt to challenge the rationale of the events which led to a change of decision and encourage a second informal consultation or even the scheme be re-advertised to ensure all residents have their voice shared fairly.
- 5.5 Implementing the scheme as per original CLC decision, only risks a future re-visit if there is evidence that the scheme had not adequately address the facts discovered during the original investigations, thus possibly incorporate a more strategic assessment of the area to aid any future improvement.

## **6. Other Options Considered**

- 6.1 The proposed restrictions are considered the best option to ensure that the road junction is kept clear of obstruction and to discourage parking where it is not safe to do so.
- 6.2 To reduce the original scheme and to retain a section of junction protection near Brookhill Road, as discussed on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2018 and which the Local Member fully supported.

## **7. Equality Duty**

- 7.1 The protected characteristics as defined in the Equality Act were duly considered in the course of the development and design of this TRO proposal
- 7.2 The comments and objections received about the proposals did not raise Equality Act issues but were assessed in relation to the protected characteristics and no relevant impact emerged.

## **8. Social Value**

- 8.1 The proposals to deter obstructive parking at junctions, on pavements and verges, align with the County Council's policy on Social Value insofar as they aim to improve the local road environment for existing and future users.
- 8.2 It is acknowledged that loss of parking may be regarded as having an adverse impact on residential amenity but the primary concern of the Council must be to discharge its statutory duty to manage the highway network and ensure the safety of all road users.

## **9. Crime and Disorder Act Implications**

- 9.1 The County Council does not consider there to be any foreseeable Crime and Disorder Act implications associated with this proposal. The view of Sussex Police has been sought, who confirm they believe there are no issues in relation to the Crime and Disorder Act.

## **10. Human Rights Implications**

- 10.1 It is unlawful for a public authority to act in a way that is incompatible with a convention right. The policy objective to avoid danger to all road users and reduce congestion should then be set against these rights. Taking these points into consideration it is believed that the introduction of this Traffic Regulation Order is still justified.

**Matt Davey**  
Director of Highways,  
Transport and Planning

**Michele Hulme**  
Assistant Head of Highway  
Operations

**Contact:** Richard Speller, Area Highways Manager, 033 022 26394

### **Appendices**

Appendix A – plans of existing restrictions and advertised proposals  
Appendix B – summary of objections  
Appendix C – revised final proposal

### **Background Papers**

None

This page is intentionally left blank





Appendix A(a)  
existing restrictions



West Sussex County Council  
Communities & Infrastructure  
The Grange  
Tower Street  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1RH

Reproduced from or based upon 2010 Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of HMSO (c) Crown Copyright reserved.  
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings West Sussex County Council Licence No. 100023447

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT: WORTH  
WAITING RESTRICTIONS

TILE REF NO:  
TQ3139SWS

SHEET ISSUE NO 1  
SHEET ACTIVE FROM 10/09/2012

Appendix A  
SCA  
1:1250  
at A3 size

Agenda Item 7



Consultation Response Summary

<b>Objection/Comments</b>	<b>Comments from Director of Highways &amp; Transport</b>
<p><u>Resident of Brookhill Road</u></p> <p>I would be grateful if someone could contact me with reference to the above TRO proposal. I live on the corner of Calluna Drive and Brookhill road which would see my driveway which is the first on the right on Calluna Drive covered by double yellow lines. This poses a big problem to us as a family as we help to care for elderly disabled parents who are unable to walk more than a few steps. Currently the car can pull up in front of the drive and we can assist them to get into the house, however if you put the double yellow lines there this won't be possible. The parking area on your plan located further down the road will not be any help as this is too far for them to walk and also will be full up with the cars parked with Gatwick customers which is a big problem here. Please can someone discuss some options with us, something also to note, our house has single storey living and sleeping arrangements for disabled/elderly people so taking away appropriate parking for ease of care is very concerning.</p> <p>I have filled in the comment form but feel an e-mail is more appropriate to raise our concerns.</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed.</p> <p>Vehicles parking on Calluna Drive obstruct visibility and affect the free flow of traffic on a bend. The introduction of lengths of double yellow lines here will mean cars are not forced to overtake parked vehicles on a bend and drive on the wrong side of the road where it is unsafe to do so.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p> <p>Disabled persons displaying a Blue Badge have dispensation to park their vehicles on double yellow lines for up to 3 hours.</p> <p>Meeting with resident on site 24.05.18</p>
<p><u>Resident of Brookhill Road</u></p> <p>My concerns and reasons for opposing the implementation of planned parking restrictions are as follows:</p> <p>The proposal is based on incorrect information. In the years I have lived nearly opposite the end of Calluna Drive, I have never seen the parking on both sides of the road. Therefore the risk and danger described does not exist. Having a dog, I walk along the road at least twice a day every day, Parking occurs on the north side regularly, but I have never observed parking on the south side. On average there are between 2-4 cars parked on the stretch under consideration. In addition two larger vehicles are</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed. The local Parish Council requested restrictions on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Vehicles parking on a considerable length of Calluna Drive obstruct visibility and affect the free flow of traffic on a bend. The introduction of lengths of double yellow lines here will mean cars are not forced to overtake parked vehicles on a bend and drive on the wrong side of the road where it is unsafe to do so.</p>

Consultation Response Summary

<p>parked near the junction with Kitsmead, by the resident who lives opposite the junction. Cars will park up to the start of double yellow lines at the junction of Brookhill Road. This means cars can be quite close to the junction. If this is deemed dangerous, this could be addressed simply by extending the double yellow lines by a couple of metres.</p> <p>The proposal removes a local and amenity for those in Brookhill Road and creates a risk greater than it addresses. Brookhill Road, has in recent years become increasingly dangerous due to the volume and speed of vehicles, generally using it as a cut through to avoid the delays caused by traffic controls on the B2036 at Forge Wood. In addition, the use of heavy vehicles ignoring the nearby weight restriction has increased. In both cases, no enforcement takes place. As a result, the road is hazardous for pedestrians and for residents emerging from the drives. Of relevance to this consultation, it would be dangerous to park on Brookhill Road, so Calluna Drive offers a safer place for on street parking. The removal of this amenity will necessitate parking on Brookhill Road, despite the danger or parking further along Calluna Drive. Parking further down Calluna Drive will annoy local residents and result in parking opposite driveways and on a bend.</p> <p>Finally, if funds are available to address local traffic issues, this proposal does not address those of most local concern. This are the speed, size and volume of vehicles using Brookhill Road and Copthorne Bank. Failure to address this and spend money on an ill conceived proposal for Calluna Drive is a waste of public money and will only increase the dangers to and frustrations of local residents.</p>	<p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p> <p>Enforcement of existing speed and weight restrictions lies outside the scope of this proposed TRO.</p>
---	--

Consultation Response Summary

<p><u>Resident of Calluna Drive</u></p> <p>I am one of 2 houses that are affected by yellow lines 1 putting lines down will only push airport parking deeper into the estate 2 I also will have nowhere to park my van 3 I have a disabled grandson so how will he visit me 4 the people that want these lines don't even live at the end of the road that is affected so if the lines went ahead the cars will still park but on their door step and they will be complaining again for more lines</p> <p>I do agree there is a problem that needs to be addressed so why not permit parking for residents only then this I think will work.</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed.</p> <p>Vehicles parking on Calluna Drive obstruct visibility and affect the free flow of traffic on a bend. The introduction of lengths of double yellow lines here will mean cars are not forced to overtake parked vehicles on a bend and drive on the wrong side of the road where it is unsafe to do so.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p> <p>New permit parking schemes for local residents, are no longer available because of reduction of local authority funding and limited budgets for the administration required to run such schemes.</p> <p>Meeting with resident on site 30.05.18</p>
---	--

Consultation Response Summary

	<p><u>Resident of Calluna Drive</u></p> <p>We live at the entrance to Calluna Drive and totally object as we have two work vans that are parked outside our house and they will get broken into if moved elsewhere. We need that parking space airport parking does not interfere with this section. Listen to the people please who live in this part not the people who don't!</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed.</p> <p>Vehicles parking on Calluna Drive obstruct visibility and affect the free flow of traffic on a bend. The introduction of lengths of double yellow lines here will mean cars are not forced to overtake parked vehicles on a bend and drive on the wrong side of the road where it is unsafe to do so.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p>
--	--	--

Consultation Response Summary

	<p><u>Resident of Calluna Drive</u></p> <p>It is noticed the proposed lengths of double lines on both sides of Calluna Drive still leave a section for vehicles to park on the north side of Calluna Drive.</p> <p>Should high vehicles such as large SUV's or commercial van's continue to park in that section, as they do today, they will continue to present a danger to persons or traffic using the affected length of road and to facilitate the passage of traffic.</p> <p>Accordingly, I request the TRO be amended in order to prohibit any vehicles waiting at any time on the full lengths of both sides of Calluna Drive, between its junctions with Brookhill Road and Kitsmead.</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p> <p>Some accommodation for resident &amp; visitor parking is necessary. The presence of parking in suitable locations also provides a form of traffic calming and reduces speed in residential areas. The proposal will provide gaps in parking to help avoid conflict for two way traffic.</p>
--	---	--

Consultation Response Summary

	<p><u>Resident of Calluna Drive</u></p> <p>I support the proposal, however on the drawing it shows a white area. What does this mean, is parking still to be allowed in this area. If so then this negates any safety gain as the problem is caused by vehicles waiting to exit with cars entering. If any parking is allowed this risk will remain. I suggest the order covers the entire stretch of road from Brookhill Road to Kitsmead.</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p> <p>Some accommodation for resident &amp; visitor parking is necessary. The presence of parking in suitable locations also provides a form of traffic calming and reduces speed in residential areas. The proposal will provide gaps in parking to help avoid conflict for two way traffic.</p>
--	---	--





Appendix - C  
revised final  
proposal



West Sussex County Council  
 Highways & Transport  
 The Grange  
 Tower Street  
 Chichester  
 West Sussex  
 PO19 1RH

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT: WORTH  
 PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS (09.08.2018)

TILE REF NO:  
 TQ3139SWS

SHEET ISSUE NO 2\_NMS1701  
 SHEET ACTIVE FROM - DD/MM/YYYY

Reproduced from or based upon 2018 Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of HMSO (c) Crown Copyright reserved. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings West Sussex County Council Licence No. 100018485

Agenda Item:  
 Appendix  
 SCALE 1:1000  
 at A3 size

This page is intentionally left blank

## North Mid Sussex County Local Committee

25 June 2019

### Allocation of the Community Initiative Fund

#### Report by Director of Law and Assurance

#### Summary

In response to comments and feedback from Members, partners, and the public, the Cabinet Member for Safer Stronger Communities has to agreed a mechanism for smaller grants to be made by CLCs as part of the Community Initiative Fund (CIF). This would be for smaller-scale projects seeking funding of no more than £750 for total costs of their project.

An organisation seeking funding for £750 or less are able to apply direct for a grant as an alternative to using the crowdfunding platform. This would be aimed at smaller groups with low project costs.

#### West Sussex Plan: Policy Impact and Context

CIF grant funding makes a significant contribution to the aims of the Council in unlocking the power of communities by supporting them with contributions to projects in their local area that support the aims of the West Sussex Plan.

This new approach will improve the support for small projects not suitable for the crowdfunding approach but whose aims match the aspirations of the West Sussex Plan.

#### Financial Impact

There is no financial impact as this decision does not change the CIF grant fund size.

#### Recommendations

The County Local Committee is asked to note:

- 1) changes to the operation and processes for the allocation of Community Initiative Fund money to both a crowdfunding model and a smaller 'micro fund' as outlined in the report, in line with the Decision Made by the Cabinet Member for Stronger, Safer Communities; and
- 2) that the change takes effect from June 2019

## **1. Proposal**

### **Background and Context**

- 1.1 A decision was taken in April 2018 (Ref SSC11 17-18) that all grants funds available to County Council Members to allocate would be pooled into the Community Initiative Fund. In order to be eligible for funding, the applicant would need to submit their proposal through the West Sussex Crowd, a crowd funding platform that sought to encourage funds from other sources, including businesses and the voluntary sector.
- 1.2 A year after the implementation of a crowdfunding platform has allowed for a greater understanding of the benefits and limitations of using such a system. To date the West Sussex Crowd has managed to attract additional funding of over £470,000 from over 2000 backers donating to projects and seeing 77 successfully funded projects.
- 1.3 During the application process project managers are asked to provide details of their organisation including information regarding charitable status, financial position and organisational structure etc. This information is then verified by a third party to ensure legitimacy and transparency.
- 1.4 Feedback received from partners, members of the public and project managers has suggested that this process, for projects asking for smaller amounts of money may be counter-productive and less cost effective.
- 1.5 A proposal has therefore been put forward for small scale applications to apply directly to the County Council for funding, without using a crowdfunding platform.
- 1.6 The introduction of a 'micro fund' would effectively seek to reintroduce the previously established Small Grants Fund, which was administered by the County Council Communities Team. This fund was set at £80,000 per year and the average application was between £500 and £800. The proposed limits to be applied to CIF are in-line with this previous arrangement.

## **2. Proposal Details**

- 2.1 It is proposed to change the arrangements for the allocation of CIF so that projects which have a total cost of £750 or less will only need to complete a short, paper-based application form. Paper based application forms will be considered in the same way as those submitted through the West Sussex Crowd at CLC meetings.
- 2.2 Projects with a total project cost of more than £750 will need to complete their application through the West Sussex Crowd in the normal way.
- 2.3 Each County Local Committee allocating their funds will be able to initially allocate up to 30% of their total annual CIF budget to projects applying through the paper-based application. Should any CLC wish to increase the proportion of available CIF for small grants they should only do so after, the exhaustion of the 30% initial allocation and after consideration of a report setting out the amounts generated by crowdfund driven grants in the

previous period and an evaluation of the comparative benefits of small grants for their area by reference to the West Sussex Plan criteria.

- 2.4 CIF reports submitted to each CLC will feature a running total of how much has been spent on projects submitted through the West Sussex Crowd and also those that have been submitted for projects under £750.
- 2.5 It is proposed that Members continue to play a key role in the following ways by:
  - Setting the principles and objectives that will help determine how funds are allocated
  - Agreeing funding pledges to be made to projects in their CLC areas
  - Exploring and understanding the needs and community expectations in their areas
  - Championing, encouraging and supporting local groups to develop ideas to meet local needs and use the platform to raise funds
  - Monitoring the use of public funds and the effectiveness of the collaborative approach
- 2.6 Allocating 30% of the CIF fund to the micro fund reflects the previous small grants total (£84,000) and having a maximum funding limit of £750 also reflects the average of applications under the former small grants fund.

## **Factors taken into account**

### **3. Consultation**

- 3.1 Officers met Voluntary Sector Organisations in April 2019 to receive feedback on the crowdfunding model. Feedback received from these sessions supported the implementation of a 'micro fund' and responses were universally positive.
- 3.2 All members received a communication from the Cabinet Members for Safer Stronger Communities on 15 April 2019 regarding the proposed changes. Feedback and comments on the proposal were encouraged.
- 3.3 Formal consultation on the proposed change will be incorporated in the scheduled CLC review to be undertaken by the Governance Committee to commence in May 2019.

### **4. Financial (Revenue and Capital) and Resource Implications**

#### **Revenue consequences of proposal**

- 4.1 There are no revenue considerations to consider as this decision is not changing the CIF grant fund size.

## **Resource Implications**

- 4.2 Officer time will be required to assess each application and determine whether it is appropriate to be considered at CLC meetings. This will be monitored regularly to ensure the process is neither overly consuming or counterproductive.
- 4.3 The County Council seeks to maintain the crowdfunding model alongside a paper-based system, as the use of a crowdfunding approach brings, on average, 3.5 times leverage on grants. This provides the prospect of the County Council being able to facilitate an arrangement which will help a greater number of community groups to benefit to a greater extent than is currently achievable. This will assist all Members in contributing to the core ambitions of the Council's West Sussex Plan and the targets which the Council has approved for those ambitions.

## **5. Risk Assessment Implications and Mitigations**

- 5.1 The County Council anticipated that the numbers of groups using the new platform would be lower in the first year of the change than expected for the previously established system. Efforts were made to promote and encourage awareness and take up and members will be invited to take part in such promotion.
- 5.2 The proposed change seeks to mitigate the lower level of applications submitted through the crowdfunding platform by allowing project manager seeking smaller funds a more streamlined application process.
- 5.3 The County Council will continue to deploy support for communities from front line Communities Directorate staff to help community groups to understand and engage with the model.
- 5.4 When the initial decision to utilise a crowdfunding model was taken, research from [West Sussex Life](#) suggested that 88% of adults have used the internet in the last 6 months.

## **6. Other Options Considered**

- 6.1 To continue only using the crowdfunding model for all applications for CIF. This would not address the concerns expressed on behalf of community groups applying for low level funding.
- 6.2 Further amendments to processes could be made in an attempt to streamline approaches and minimise confusion and duplication. However, at a time of diminishing resources, this would not address the issues driving the proposals.
- 6.3 Grant funding could cease altogether, but this would diminish support to local groups at a time when the Council is committed to unlocking the power of communities.

## **7. Equality and Human Rights Assessment**

- 7.1 Under the Equality Act, the Council has a 'public sector equality duty'. It must have and show how it has given due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. The need for an Equality Impact Report has been assessed. Whilst CIF may be used to benefit people with protected characteristics, it is a universal grant that any group can apply for and is used to support a range of community-based projects and initiatives.
- 7.2 Allowing smaller groups with less capacity to apply using a paper-based application will help to be more inclusive of all community groups and project managers, particularly those who aren't as IT literate or have significant time restraints.
- 7.3 There are no known Human Rights implications associated with these recommendations

## **8. Social Value and Sustainability Assessment**

- 8.1 Grant funding helps voluntary and community groups to contribute to the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of their communities.

## **9 Crime and Disorder Reduction Assessment**

- 9.1 There are no Crime and Disorder Act implications associated with these recommendations although the Council's duties in relation to crime reduction and prevention and the community safety partnership work may well inform individual funding decisions and the principles members choose to adopt.

### **Director of Law and Assurance**

Tony Kershaw, Tel: 0330 022 22662

**Contact:** Nick Burrell, Senior Advisor, 033 022 23881

**Background Papers:** [Decision made by the Cabinet Member for Stronger Safer Communities, Ref No: SSC01 19/20](#)

This page is intentionally left blank



**North Mid Sussex County Local Committee**

**Community Initiative Funding**

**25 June 2019**

**Report by Director of Law and Assurance**

<b>Ref: NMS03 (19/20)</b>
<b>Key Decision: No</b>
<b>Part I</b>
<b>Electoral Divisions: All in NMS CLC Area</b>

**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**

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](#).

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](http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/your_council/meetings_and_decision-making/county_local_committees/community_initiative_funding.aspx)

For projects to be considered for funding they must upload their project idea to the West Sussex Crowd ([www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk](http://www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk)) funding platform and pitch to the Community Initiative fund.

**2. Proposal**

That the Committee considers the pitches to the Community Initiative Funding as set out in Appendix A.

The North Mid Sussex CLC will only consider projects that are actively fundraising.

### **3. Resources**

For the 2019/20 financial year, North Mid Sussex CLC has a total of £16,800.00\* available for allocation. Details of awards made in the current program and previous financial year are included in Appendix B.

There is one new pitch for consideration by the Committee.

The pitch is in fundraising stage with a total project cost of £7,158.00.

This is outlined in Appendix A and can also be viewed at:

[www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk](http://www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk)

CIF is intended for applications up to £5,000. However, the North Mid Sussex CLC will only consider pledges over £2,500 in exceptional circumstances. The size of the pledge will depend on the size of the project, how it delivers against fund criteria, the impact it will have, and the buy in from the community.

\* [Following the Cabinet Member decision in January](#), the Community Initiative Fund has been reduced subject to the outcome of the governance CLC review reporting in late September 2019.

### **Factors taken into account**

### **4. Consultation**

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.

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**

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.

Projects that do not reach 95% of their funding target on The West Sussex Crowd within the 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

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

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

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

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

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, Democratic Services Officer – 033 022 28314

### **Appendices**

Appendix A – Current pitch for consideration by the Committee

Appendix B - Awards made in 2018/19 and 2017/18

**Background Papers:** Pitches are available to view on [www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk](http://www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Current pitches**

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

Actively Fundraising -

- **352/NMS – Imberlink, Imberhorne: at the heart of our community, £7,158.00 - Towards installing four defibrillators at Imberhorne School and provide students with first aid training.**  
<https://www.spacehive.com/imberhorne-life-saving>

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:

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Awarded</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
<b>212/NMS</b> - Quarry Café Counter	Towards a new, portable café counter	£2,500.00	Liz Bennett	Feedback received
<b>203/NMS</b> - Streetmate - a mobile youth space	Towards a vehicle and equipment for the programme	£3,000.00	Andrew Lea	No feedback received
<b>277/NMS</b> - Off Platform	The Committee agreed to set aside up to £4,000.00 of their allocation to purchase a replacement SID	£4,000.00	CLC General	No feedback received

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

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Awarded</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
69/NMS Warninglid Residents Society	Towards a Speed indicator device	£2,500.00	Bill Acraman	
132/NMS Sussex Clubs for Young People	Towards setting up the Duke of Cornwall Award	£830.00	Heidi Brunsdon	Feedback received
142/NMS Crawley Down Memorial Association	War remembrance	£3,000.00	Heidi Brunsdon	
149/NMS East Grinstead Armed Forces Day	RAF 100	£1,000.00	Liz Bennett	
163/ NMS Weir Wood Sailing Club	Open the Gates	£2,500.00	Heidi Brunsdon	
166/NMS Ashurst Wood Village Council	Ashstock Festival	£1,000.00	Jacque Russell	
167/NMS Imberlink	Cricket in the Community	£4,766.00	Heidi Brunsdon	
173/NMS Pericles Theatre Company	Towards the promise of everlasting youth	£2,500.00	Andrew Lea	Feedback received
181/NMS East Grinstead Athletics Club	Towards a Hammer Cage	£3,500.00	Jacque Russell	



**North Mid Sussex County Local Committee****25 June 2019****Nominations for Local Authority Governors to Maintained Schools and Academy Governing Bodies****Report by Director of Education & Skills****Ref:  
NMS04 (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 reappointment of the 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 - Nominations Under the 2012 Regulations**

### **Maintained Schools**

Nomination for Reappointment:

#### **St Peter's Catholic Primary School, East Grinstead**

Nick Hodges for a further four year term

This page is intentionally left blank

Authority Governor Vacancies for North Mid Sussex County Local Committee Area

School	Division	Division Member	Vacant From	Current Status	Chairman	Head
Fairway Infant School	Worth Forest	Bill Acraman	Jul-17	Outstanding	Ashleigh Hamilton-Gillings	Bridget Davison

This page is intentionally left blank