West Sussex County Council - Ordinary Meeting

18 September 2020

At the virtual Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 am on Friday, 18 September 2020, the members present being:

Cllr Duncton (Chairman)

Cllr Acraman Cllr Lanzer Cllr Arculus Cllr Lea Cllr Atkins Cllr Lord Cllr Baldwin Cllr Magill Cllr Barling Cllr Markwell Cllr Barnard Cllr Marshall Cllr Barrett-Miles Cllr McDonald Cllr Bennett Cllr Millson Cllr Boram Cllr Mitchell Cllr Bradbury Cllr Montyn Cllr Bradford Cllr R Oakley Cllr Brunsdon Cllr S Oakley Cllr Buckland Cllr O'Kelly Cllr Burgess Cllr Oppler Cllr Burrett Cllr Oxlade Cllr Catchpole Cllr Patel Cllr Cloake Cllr Pendleton Cllr Purchese Cllr Crow Cllr J Dennis Cllr Purnell Cllr N Dennis Cllr Quinn Cllr Edwards Cllr Russell Cllr Elkins Cllr Simmons Cllr Goldsmith Cllr Smith

Cllr Hall Cllr Smytherman Cllr High Cllr Sparkes Cllr Hillier Cllr Turner Cllr Hunt Cllr Urguhart Cllr M Jones Cllr Waight Cllr Walsh Cllr A Jupp Cllr N Jupp Cllr Whittington Cllr Kennard Cllr Wickremaratchi

Cllr Kitchen

16 Armed Forces Covenant Gold Award

16.1 The Chairman reported that the County Council had received the Gold Award for its work on fulfilling the Armed Forces Covenant. She offered congratulations to everyone involved, particularly Cllr Bradbury, the County Council's Armed Forces Champion.

17 Apologies for Absence

- 17.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Barton, Cllr Bridges, Cllr Fitzjohn, Cllr A Jones, and Cllr Sudan.
- 17.2 Apologies for part of the afternoon session were received from Cllr Arculus who left at 2.40 pm and re-joined the meeting at 3.40 pm and then left at 4.25 pm. Cllr Elkins gave his apologies and left at 4.00 pm. Cllr Barling left at 2.35 pm, Cllr Cloake at 3.00 pm, Cllr Smith at 3.05 pm, Cllr Purchese at 3.10 pm, Cllr Hillier at 3.25 pm, Cllr R J Oakley at 3.35 pm, Cllr Oppler at 3.55 pm, Cllr McDonald at 4.00 pm and Cllr Goldsmith at 4.15 pm.

18 Members' Interests

18.1 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

19 Minutes

19.1 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 17 July 2020 (pages 7 to 28) be approved as a correct record.

20 Review of Proportionality

- 20.1 Following a recent change in group affiliation, the Council has a statutory duty to review the proportionality on its committees following the by-election. A paper on the application of the proportionality rules and how they were applied, together with a table showing the number of seats on committees, was set out on pages 29 and 30.
- 20.2 Resolved -

That the proportionality be agreed.

21 Appointments

21.1 The Council approved appointments as set out below.

Committee	Change
Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Pendleton in place of Cllr Barling*
	Cllr Hillier as Chairman*
	Cllr Brunsdon in place of Cllr Lea
	Cllr Lea in place of Cllr Brunsdon as substitute
	Cllr Oxlade to fill vacancy
	* with effect from

	25 September
Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Montyn in place of Cllr Barton
Fire and Rescue Service Scrutiny Committee	Cllr David Barling in place of Cllr M Jones
Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee	Cllr M Jones in place of Cllr Oxlade Cllr Oxlade in place of Cllr M Jones as substitute
Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Hillier in place of Cllr Barling Cllr Quinn in place of Cllr Oxlade as substitute
Planning Committee	Cllr Baldwin in place of Cllr Barton Cllr Sudan to fill vacancy
Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee	Cllr Lea in place of Cllr M Jones
Rights of Way Committee	Cllr Sudan in place of Cllr Brunsdon
Standards Committee	Cllr Lea in place of Cllr Brunsdon
Staff Appeals Panel	Cllr Sudan to fill vacancy

22 Address by a Cabinet Member

- 22.1 Members received addresses by the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People on the Council's Children First Improvement Plan and by the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health on the public health emergency.
- 22.2 In response to questions the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health agreed to provide members with responses as set out below.
 - Cllr O'Kelly: the current waiting time results for tests and how many staff members were self-isolating.
 - Cllr Brunsdon: the percentage of patients in the dataset used that had needed to be hospitalised.
 - Cllr M Jones: the levels of cases by district/borough areas (information to be sent to all members).

23 Motion on Support and Recognition for Veterans with Post-

Traumatic Stress Disorder

- 23.1 At the County Council meeting on 13 December 2019 a motion had been moved by Cllr Edwards, seconded by Cllr Atkins, and referred to the Leader and Cabinet Member for Adults and Health for consideration.
- 23.2 A revised version of the motion was circulated as set out below (change shown in bold, italic text). Due to technical issues experienced by Cllr Atkins, Cllr Walsh acted as seconder for the revised motion.
- 23.3 Members noted that the word 'not' had been omitted in error from the final line of paragraph 3 which should read 'not recognised'. A report by the Leader and Cabinet Member was included with the agenda (pages 37 and 38).

'This Council advocates better treatment of veterans who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and better recognition for those who have died as a result of this disorder. The County Council takes the wellbeing of all those who have served extremely seriously and is continually considering how it can better understand the needs of ex-services persons who are suffering from PTSD and provide the best possible support.

In this country there is a National Memorial Arboretum to commemorate those who have given their lives in the service of our country. Families are able to spend time there remembering their loved ones. Every name, in one place, a calm, respectful space, where people can reflect and honour these heroes. However, those veterans who have taken their own lives, succumbing to Post Traumatic Stress Disorder caused by combat, are not remembered at the National Memorial Arboretum.

This Council believes that this must change. These service personnel have given their all in their service for our country and in many cases have been medically discharged from service because of the trauma they have seen and taken part in. Subsequently, as civilians, they take their own life and therefore are recognised as combat related casualties.

This Council calls upon the Leader of the Council and the Armed Forces Champion to:

- (1) Lobby the Ministry of Defence **and other appropriate bodies** to provide a fitting memorial to those who have served and ultimately succumbed to PTSD'
- (2) Continue to work with partners through the West Sussex Civilian Military Partnership Board to improve the lives of veterans and promote the services available to them with particular emphasis on mental health services, including use

- of the Forces Connect South East App to all staff as a signposting mechanism;
- (3) Encourage staff to undertake Armed Forces Mental Health First Aid training; and
- (4) Work with the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health to ensure that health and wellbeing matters affecting veterans, including PTSD, are recognised in health and wellbeing strategies including the forthcoming refresh of Suicide Prevention Strategy in 2020.'
- 23.4 The revised corrected motion was carried as set out below.

'This Council advocates better treatment of veterans who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and better recognition for those who have died as a result of this disorder. The County Council takes the wellbeing of all those who have served extremely seriously and is continually considering how it can better understand the needs of ex-services persons who are suffering from PTSD and provide the best possible support.

In this country there is a National Memorial Arboretum to commemorate those who have given their lives in the service of our country. Families are able to spend time there remembering their loved ones. Every name, in one place, a calm, respectful space, where people can reflect and honour these heroes. However, those veterans who have taken their own lives, succumbing to Post Traumatic Stress Disorder caused by combat, are not remembered at the National Memorial Arboretum.

This Council believes that this must change. These service personnel have given their all in their service for our country and in many cases have been medically discharged from service because of the trauma they have seen and taken part in. Subsequently, as civilians, they take their own life and therefore are not recognised as combat related casualties.

This Council calls upon the Leader of the Council and the Armed Forces Champion to:

- (1) Lobby the Ministry of Defence and other appropriate bodies to provide a fitting memorial to those who have served and ultimately succumbed to PTSD'
- (2) Continue to work with partners through the West Sussex Civilian Military Partnership Board to improve the lives of veterans and promote the services available to them with particular emphasis on mental health services, including use of the Forces Connect South East App to all staff as a signposting mechanism;

- (3) Encourage staff to undertake Armed Forces Mental Health First Aid training; and
- (4) Work with the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health to ensure that health and wellbeing matters affecting veterans, including PTSD, are recognised in health and wellbeing strategies including the forthcoming refresh of Suicide Prevention Strategy in 2020.'

24 Motion on Government Planning Consultation

24.1 The following motion was moved by Cllr Bradbury and seconded by Cllr Kitchen.

'This Council notes the Government's consultations on changes to the current planning system alongside the consultation on the 'Planning for the Future' White Paper, and welcomes the focus on building on brownfield sites, better energy efficiency standards and the requirement to enhance bio-diversity.

This Council also welcomes simplifying the planning process and the proposal to replace S106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy with a new Infrastructure Levy and to apply it to permitted development. However, it believes that planning should be kept local with public participation at its heart, with sufficient funding for local infrastructure that flows to the infrastructure provider. Therefore, the County Council must have a statutory role in the operation of the new levy and secure an appropriate share of the funds that are raised.

However, the Council calls for an urgent review of the housing allocation algorithm which concentrates housing numbers in the suburbs and rural areas, which already have an infrastructure deficit, and away from towns and cities, which post Covid-19, are crying out for regeneration of town centres and high streets. The Council registers its concern over the impact that this algorithm will have on West Sussex regarding:

- (1) The almost doubling of housing targets will impact the environment, loss of agricultural land, building on flood plains and the county's ability to combat climate change. The county already suffers from a lack of infrastructure such as roads, public transport, rail, and others and has just experienced water shortages in some areas;
- (2) Insufficient account is taken of the areas covered by national parks, AONBs and coastal flood plains, leading to mass development outside of these areas;
- (3) The need in rural areas is for affordable rented housing. The change to affordable housing thresholds would mean that in approximately 70% of small parishes no affordable housing contributions would be required on sites of fewer than 40-50

dwellings, this would mean that no affordable housing would be delivered in these communities which will be catastrophic for their sustainability.

Planning is not just about housing and it will be important to understand how the proposed changes to the operation of the planning system impact upon the County Council's statutory minerals, waste and other planning functions.

Council also supports the recommendation in the Glover Review to give AONBs statutory consultee status for planning applications in their area to strengthen their role in the planning system.

This Council therefore calls upon the Cabinet Member for Environment working with the Leader to liaise with the district and borough councils and members of Parliament in making these points in the response to the Consultation.'

24.2 An amendment was moved by Cllr O'Kelly and seconded by Cllr Walsh as set out below:

'This Council notes the Government's consultations on changes to the current planning system alongside the consultation on the 'Planning for the Future' White Paper, and welcomes the focus on building on brownfield sites, better energy efficiency standards and the requirement to enhance bio-diversity.

This Council also welcomes simplifying the planning process and the proposal to replace S106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy with a new Infrastructure Levy and to apply it to permitted development. However, it believes that planning should be kept local with public participation at its heart, with sufficient funding for local infrastructure that flows to the infrastructure provider. Therefore, the County Council must have a statutory role in the operation of the new levy and secure an appropriate share of the funds that are raised.

However, the Council calls for an urgent review of the housing allocation algorithm which concentrates housing numbers in the suburbs and rural areas, which already have an infrastructure deficit, and away from towns and cities, which post Covid-19, are crying out for regeneration of town centres and high streets. The Council registers its concern over the impact that this algorithm will have on West Sussex regarding:

(1) The almost doubling of housing targets will impact the environment, loss of agricultural land, building on flood plains and the county's ability to combat climate change. The county already suffers from a lack of infrastructure such as roads, public transport, rail, and others and has just experienced water shortages in some areas;

- (2) Insufficient account is taken of the areas covered by national parks, AONBs and coastal flood plains, leading to mass development outside of these areas;
- (3) The need in rural areas is for affordable rented housing. The change to affordable housing thresholds would mean that in approximately 70% of small parishes no affordable housing contributions would be required on sites of fewer than 40-50 dwellings, this would mean that no affordable housing would be delivered in these communities which will be catastrophic for their sustainability; and

(4) Its failure to address the building of social rent homes at the scale that is required.

Planning is not just about housing and it will be important to understand how the proposed changes to the operation of the planning system impact upon the County Council's statutory minerals, waste and other planning functions.

Council also supports the recommendation in the Glover Review to give AONBs statutory consultee status for planning applications in their area to strengthen their role in the planning system.

This Council therefore calls upon the Cabinet Member for Environment working with the Leader to liaise with the district and borough councils and members of Parliament in making these points in the response to the Consultation.'

- 24.3 The amendment was lost.
- 24.4 An amendment was moved by Cllr Lea and seconded by Cllr Brunsdon as set out below:

'This Council notes the Government's consultations on changes to the current planning system alongside the consultation on the 'Planning for the Future' White Paper, and welcomes the focus on building on brownfield sites, better energy efficiency standards and the requirement to enhance bio-diversity.

This Council also welcomes simplifying the planning process and the proposal to replace S106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy with a new Infrastructure Levy and to apply it to permitted development. However, it believes that planning should be kept local with public participation at its heart, with sufficient funding for local infrastructure that flows to the infrastructure provider. Therefore, the County Council must have a statutory role in the operation of the new levy and secure an appropriate share of the funds that are raised.

However, the Council calls for an urgent review of the housing allocation algorithm which concentrates housing numbers in the

suburbs and rural areas, which already have an infrastructure deficit, and away from towns and cities, which post Covid-19, are crying out for regeneration of town centres and high streets. The Council registers its concern over the impact that this algorithm will have on West Sussex regarding:

- (1) The almost doubling of housing targets will impact the environment, loss of agricultural land, building on flood plains and the county's ability to combat climate change. The county already suffers from a lack of infrastructure such as roads, public transport, rail, and others and has just experienced water shortages in some areas;
- (2) Insufficient account is taken of the areas covered by national parks, AONBs and coastal flood plains, leading to mass development outside of these areas;
- (3) The need in rural areas is for affordable rented housing. The change to affordable housing thresholds would mean that in approximately 70% of small parishes no affordable housing contributions would be required on sites of fewer than 40-50 dwellings, this would mean that no affordable housing would be delivered in these communities which will be catastrophic for their sustainability.

Planning is not just about housing and it will be important to understand how the proposed changes to the operation of the planning system impact upon the County Council's statutory minerals, waste and other planning functions.

Council also supports the recommendation in the Glover Review to give AONBs statutory consultee status for planning applications in their area to strengthen their role in the planning system.

This Council welcomes this review as the current planning regime imposes more development than many of our residents wish or than infrastructure can sustain, causing irreparable harm to the south-east. It fails to protect and restore the natural environment. The asymmetric planning process gives an illusion of listening to local views whilst in reality according them little weight.

This Council therefore calls upon the Cabinet Member for Environment working with the Leader to liaise with the district and borough councils and members of Parliament in making these points in the response to the Consultation.'

- 24.5 The amendment was lost.
- 24.6 The motion was carried.

25 Motion on unaccompanied Child Asylum Seekers

25.1 The following motion was moved by Cllr Lord and seconded by Cllr Barling.

'During summer 2020, the number of people arriving by boat to seek asylum in the UK has increased with an associated raised media profile for this issue. In August, Kent County Council announced that it is has now reached its capacity to accommodate unaccompanied asylum-seeking children. West Sussex County Council is signed up to the voluntary National Transfer Scheme and has taken six unaccompanied asylum-seeking children from Kent since June.

This Council:

- (1) Recognises the United Kingdom's proud tradition of welcoming people fleeing conflict and persecution;
- (2) Asks the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People to commit to continue to work with other local authorities through the National Transfer Scheme and to continue our dialogue with our near neighbours, particularly Kent and Portsmouth, to meet the needs of as many Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children as we are able;
- (3) Asks the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People to acknowledge the role of West Sussex County Council's Children's Services and the foster carers who provide a safe home for our Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children and expresses our gratitude for their ongoing work; and
- (4) Acknowledges that, notwithstanding differing personal views, anyone engaged in discourse on this issue, including elected members, has a responsibility to treat the people involved with dignity, compassion and respect.'
- 25.2 The motion was carried.

26 Motion on Post-16 Support Services

26.1 The following motion was moved by Cllr M Jones and seconded by Cllr Oxlade.

'This Council notes that the Covid 19 pandemic has impacted on the education of young people over the age of sixteen in this County over the last six months or so. Those who have recently taken A levels, GCSEs and BTec examinations have had a particularly stressful time due to changes in the way exams were graded which impacted on choices for onward study for some young people. For those who were planning on seeking employment or apprenticeships after completing their education, the situation is even worse due to the current state of the economy.

Now more than ever these students need support to ensure they do not find themselves Not in education, employment or training (NEETs). Moreover, given the likely long term impact of the effects of the pandemic on the economy, it will become even more important than ever for this Council to be able to provide support for future generations of school-leavers.

This Council therefore calls on the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills to reprioritise funding to enable the reversal of the decision taken at full Council in February to reduce the post-16 support service that provides interventions and careers guidance for young people Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETs) and instead to consider whether current staffing levels are adequate or should in fact be increased.'

26.2 The motion was referred to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills for consideration.

27 Allocation of Additional Funding to support response to Covid-19

- 27.1 The Cabinet Member for Finance moved the report on the allocation of additional funding to support the response to COVID-19.
- 27.2 The recommendations were put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 3.36.
 - (a) For the recommendations 59

Cllr Acraman, Cllr Arculus, Cllr Atkins, Cllr Baldwin, Cllr Barling, Cllr Barnard, Cllr Barrett-Miles, Cllr Bennett, Cllr Boram, Cllr Bradford, Cllr Brunsdon, Cllr Burgess, Cllr Burrett, Cllr Catchpole, Cllr Crow, Cllr J Dennis, Cllr N Dennis, Cllr Duncton, Cllr Edwards, Cllr Elkins, Cllr Goldsmith, Cllr Hall, Cllr High, Cllr Hillier, Cllr Hunt, Cllr M Jones, Cllr A Jupp, Cllr N Jupp, Cllr Kennard, Cllr Kitchen, Cllr Lanzer, Cllr Lea, Cllr Lord, Cllr Magill, Cllr Markwell, Cllr Marshall, Cllr McDonald, Cllr Millson, Cllr Mitchell, Cllr Montyn, Cllr O'Kelly, Cllr R J Oakley, Cllr S J Oakley, Cllr Oppler, Cllr Oxlade, Cllr Patel, Cllr Pendleton, Cllr Purnell, Cllr Quinn, Cllr Russell, Cllr Simmons, Cllr Smytherman, Cllr Sparkes, Cllr Turner, Cllr Urquhart, Cllr Waight, Cllr Walsh, Cllr Whittington and Cllr Wickremaratchi.

- (b) Against the recommendations 0
- (c) Abstentions 0
- 27.3 Resolved -
 - (1) That grant funding received in connection with the current pandemic and which is not ring fenced is allocated pro rata to the expenditure incurred in relation to each service area;

- (2) That ring-fenced grant funding is allocated according to the purposes and in accordance with any rules specified; and
- (3) That the Total Performance Monitor report will report on the use and allocation of this funding during the course of 2020/21.

28 Question Time

28.1 Members asked questions of members of the Cabinet on matters relevant to their portfolios and asked questions of chairmen, as set out at Appendix 3. This included questions on those matters contained within the Cabinet report (pages 43 to 48) and written questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 2.38 (set out at Appendix 2).

29 Governance Committee: Minor changes to the Constitution: Rights of Way Committee, Pension Advisory Board and Pensions Committee

29.1 The Council considered minor changes to the terms of reference of the Rights of Way Committee, the Pension Advisory Board and the Pensions Committee, in the light of a report from the Governance Committee (pages 49 to 54).

29.2 Resolved -

- (1) That the proposed changes to the Rights of Way Committee terms of reference and Delegation Code of Practice, as set out at Appendix 1, be approved;
- (2) That the amendment to the terms of reference of the Pension Advisory Board set out in paragraph 2 be approved; and
- (3) That the amendment to the membership of the Pensions Committee set out in paragraph 3 be approved.

30 Report of Urgent Action: Regulation 19

30.1 The report of urgent action taken under regulation 11 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 (pages 55 and 56) was noted.

Chairman

The Council rose at 4.30 pm

Interests

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

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 7(a) – Notice of Motion on Post Traumatic Stress Disorder	Cllr Atkins	As veteran of the Royal Navy Reserve, vice chair of Worthing's Royal Naval Association, As trustee of Building Heroes Trust and as director of Building Heroes Property Services
	Cllr Bradbury	Chairman of Building Heroes
	Cllr Goldsmith	Son serves in the Armed Forces
Item 7(b) – Notice of Motion on Government Planning Consultation	Cllr Atkins	Vice-Chair of Worthing Borough Council's Planning Committee
	Cllr Bennett	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
	Cllr Boram	Member of Adur District Council
	Cllr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
	Cllr Brunsdon	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
	Cllr Elkins	Member of Arun District Council
	Cllr Goldsmith	Chairman of Save Our South Coast Alliance
	Cllr High	Chairman of Worthing Borough Council Planning Committee
	Cllr Hunt	Chairman of Chichester Harbour Conservancy
	Cllr N Jupp	Member of Horsham District Council
	Cllr M Jones	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Cllr Kitchen	Chairman of Horsham District Council Planning Committee North
	Cllr Lea	Member of Mid Sussex District Council

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Item 7(b) – Notice of Motion on Government Planning Consultation	Cllr Montyn	Member of Chichester Harbour Conservancy and its Planning Committee
(cont)		Has Freedom of the Harbour
	Cllr S Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council and that Council's appointee to Portsmouth Water's Customer Challenge Group
		Member of Tangmere Parish Council
	Cllr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council
	Cllr Walsh	Leader of Arun District Council
Item 7(d) – Post 16 Support Services	Cllr Smytherman	Chairman of Governors of West Sussex Alternative Provision College
Item 9 – Question Time	Cllr Atkins	Former Royal Navy qualified Fire Fighter
	Cllr Brunsdon	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
		Employed by British Airways
	Cllr Burrett	Deferred member of the West Sussex Local Government Pension Scheme
	Cllr Lanzer	Deferred Member of the West Sussex Local Government Pension Scheme
		Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Cllr Lea	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
	Cllr O'Kelly	Member of Chichester District Council
	Cllr S Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council
Item 10 – Governance Committee: Minor Changes to the Constitution	Cllr Burrett	Deferred member of the West Sussex Local Government Pension Scheme

Written Questions: 18 September 2020

1 Written question from Cllr Noel Atkins for reply by the Cabinet Member for Economy and Corporate Resources

Question

I have a great interest and background in IT and built the IT Junction at Heene Community Centre with a grant from the County Council to provide the residents of Worthing with free hands-on advice and use of computer systems.

Can the Cabinet Member, therefore, please describe the kind of emerging technologies that are in the IT Strategy and how they might be effectively deployed in the future.

Answer

The IT Strategy references the following emerging technologies:

- Virtual assistants that can operate at the explicit or implicit direction of the user (for example, virtual personal assistants and chatbots). These can be used for the enable automation of routine tasks and then, as they grow in sophistication, more complex tasks can be added to their repertoire.
- Independent agents that operate in the background and are not invoked directly by the user. For example, an independent agent might monitor a place and make decisions that changes the actions and activity of control systems. This might range from intelligent street lights through to whole place management.

The application of machine learning and AI to analytical systems can transform how analytics content is developed, consumed and shared, for example:

- Augmented data preparation, which uses machine learning automation to augment data preparation activities such as data quality management, modelling, enrichment, and metadata development.
- Augmented business intelligence (BI), which enables business users and others to automatically find, visualize and narrate relevant findings without building models or writing algorithms.

Microsoft Power BI products have been selected as many of these capabilities are or will be included within this product set as they become more mainstream. This will enable response to the increase in data generated by the IoT as well as making the analytical capability more sophisticated.

Elsewhere in this strategy describes how IT services will be migrated to a cloud-based delivery model. One of the advantages of cloud-based solutions is that they have capacity in depth and can respond to high demand for processing and other technical requirements. At the same time the power and capabilities of 'end-point' devices (e.g. laptops, smartphones, IoT devices, consumer technologies) is also increasing. These devices collectively may be referred to as 'edge' computing. Edge computing will tend to keep the data traffic and processing local, with the goal being to reduce data transmissions and to speed up local responses. It is expected that intelligence will enhance a range of edge devices including edge input/output devices such as

speakers and screens, edge computing devices such as smartphones and laptops, and complex edge devices such as vehicles and power generators. This intelligence at the edge will provide opportunity to deliver services in new ways, or example using virtual reality (VR) or augmented reality (AR) technologies.

- VR provides a computer-generated 3D environment that surrounds a user and responds to an individual's actions in a natural way.
- AR is the real-time use of information in the form of text, graphics, video and other virtual enhancements integrated with real-world objects.

AR aims to enhance users' interaction with the real physical environment, rather than separating them from it. Both AR and VR will be enhanced by technology capabilities that will improve visual interaction and allow other sensory models, such as touch and sound. There are several examples of VR or AR in use in the UK public sector. While most of these are experimental, it is likely that use will become mainstream. The County Council's computing facilities will enable VR and AR solutions.

The sense of immersion within a virtual world or when interacting with digital entities is enhanced by the growth in capability of conversational platforms that provide an interface that is mainly in the user's spoken or written natural language. Conversational platforms are most recognisably implemented in:

- Virtual personal assistants, such as Amazon Alexa, Apple's Siri, Google Assistant and Microsoft's Cortana
- Virtual customer assistants, such as IPsoft's Amelia and Watson Virtual Agent
- Chatbot frameworks, such as Amazon Lex, Dialogflow from Google, IBM Watson Assistant and Microsoft Bot Framework

While interactions in conversational platforms are currently relatively simple (e.g. "What's the weather today") or via a highly structured interaction such as that required to book a hotel room, the technology will mature. This will enable extremely complex requests and activities, for example collecting oral testimony from crime witnesses and then creating an image of the suspect.

2 Written question from Cllr Kate O'Kelly for reply by the Cabinet Member for Economy and Corporate Resources

Question

Can the Cabinet Member please:

- (a) Confirm how much funding has been provided to the County Council by the European Union through the European Structural and Investment Fund (ESIF) since 1 April 2015?
- (b) Provide a break-down of funding from each of the strands of the ESIF (which includes the European Social Fund, European Regional Development Fund and the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development), for each of the last five years and in respect of each of those years confirm what any funding provided has been used for.

(c) In 2017, the UK government announced that it would replace EU Structural Funds with a successor arrangement called the UK Shared Prosperity Fund. Does the Cabinet member have any further information regarding the intention to replace the funds previously provided by the EU to ensure the residents of West Sussex do not miss out?

Answer

- (a) and
- (b) The main funds received by the County Council are in the areas of economy, education and energy. For economy in the last five years the County Council has received:
 - LEADER programme with £2.9m from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development providing grants to rural businesses and communities
 - SPARK Social Enterprise Project with £230,000 Interreg 2 Seas funding to support and enable innovation among social enterprises
 - Downs Link cycling and walking improvements to support the visitor economy – delivered by countryside services – with £557,000 from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development

The Council has committed match funding through the economy reserve for two further projects and awaits final decisions from the managing authority on the bids to the European Regional Development Fund. One concerns business innovation and the other the low carbon sector.

Other funds have been levered by providing match funding, mainly through the Strategic Investment Fund to the University of Chichester led Hot House business support, this received a £5.5m European Regional Development Fund allocation.

For Education in the last five years the Council has received the following ESIF funding in relation to the current NEETS programme which comes to an end in December 2020:

2018/19 - £140,000 2019/20 - £233,000

2020/21 - £58,000 to date with a further £123,000 (approx.) pending between now and the project end date

This is match funded by the local authority.

For Energy in the last five years the Council has received: BISEPS Project, based in Manor Royal Business Park, funded by the Interreg 2 Seas programme to explore, encourage and implement exchange of renewable energy in business parks with £231,099 received to date with a further £90,000 (approx.) pending between now project end date of April 2021.

An LECSEA Project is to be funded by the Interreg 2 Seas programme to explore the financial and legal structures for Local Energy Communities including capital works to install battery storage for the Local Energy Community. Over the life of the project (February 2020 to March 2023) the

County Council will receive EUR 800,000 of de minimis funding from the Interreg 2 Seas Programme. To date no funding for LECSEA has been received.

Both projects are match funded by the Council.

- (c) On the UK Shared Prosperity Fund there have been no further updates that the Council is aware of.
- 3 Written question from Cllr Heidi Brunsdon for reply by the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills

Question

It has been recently reported that nationally only around 8,173 Children Looked After (CLA) are enrolled in university this academic year. It paints a sad picture, during lockdown, of many disadvantaged students going through A Levels completely alone. It is well known that students from such backgrounds are, on average, two years of learning behind their more affluent or fortunate peers by the end of secondary school. They are twice as likely to be predicted an E at A Level than those from less disadvantaged backgrounds.

Could the Cabinet Member, please:

- (a) Confirm how many of our CLA took A levels this year;
- (b) Provide a breakdown of results, such as percentages of A-E grades obtained by those students;
- (c) Advise how these results compare with those generally across the county;
- (d) Advise how these results compare with results for CLA over the last three years in West Sussex; and
- (e) Advise how these results compare to our authority neighbours in East Sussex, Hampshire, Surrey and Kent, and nationally, over the last three years.

Answer

During the academic year 2019/20, we had 131 students registered with the virtual school. They undertook a range of qualifications at level 3 including A levels which can lead onto higher education should they chose to pursue this pathway.

As most students undertaking A levels or other level 3 qualifications are 18 years or over by the time, they complete their courses and they are therefore considered to be care leavers. The level of involvement with the virtual school is therefore limited once they are 18 years and any sharing of information requires the consent of the young person. The Virtual School requests that the young people share their results but this does not always give a full picture of outcomes as some young people choose not to engage with this process.

Due to the constantly evolving nature of the year 13 cohort and the changing needs to our young people every year, along with the incomplete data set, it is not possible to give year on year comparisons.

With specific reference to the 2019/20 examinations, the Department for Education announced on 8 April that school, college or multi-academy trust level performance data based on summer 2020 tests, assessments and exams at any phase would not be published and therefore there will be no data available to Virtual Schools.

The Department of Education does not publish any local authority level data for post-16 children looked after and therefore there is no local or national data available to demonstrate trends or comparisons over time.

4 Written question from Cllr Brian Quinn for reply by the Cabinet Member for Environment

Question

On Friday 17 July West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service (WSFRS) was called to the Household Waste Recycling Site in Crawley at 6.50 pm. I understand that firefighters then battled a huge blaze for around 12 hours affecting 40 tonnes of waste at the site with crews from Crawley, East Grinstead, Petworth, Haywards Heath, Horsham, Turners Hill, Burgess Hill and Reigate in Surrey in attendance. At the time of submitting this question the site remains closed to residents so that structural engineers can inspect the extent of the damage to the building and to allow for burnt and dampened waste to be removed. Local residents are being asked to store their waste rather than making longer journeys to dispose of it.

This is not the first fire at this site, neither is it the first fire this year resulting in the closure of a household waste site.

Can the Cabinet Member, therefore, please:

- (a) Provide me with the dates of other fires at or within the West Sussex household waste sites since 2005, confirming which sites were affected, the cause of the fires (if known), whether it resulted in the closure of the facility and what additional measures were installed to prevent further fires at each site;
- (b) Given that the sites are operated by an external provider, confirm the position regarding liability and who is responsible for the cost of insuring the facilities;
- (c) Confirm the estimated total cost to the County Council of the fires referred to in (a) above, including waste clearance, additional staffing arrangements, increases in insurance premiums and additional measures to prevent further fires; and
- (d) Confirm when she anticipates the Crawley site re-opening to residents and what additional fire prevention measures she is proposing to introduce to this site.

Answer

(a)

Date of fire	Time	Scale	Site	What was affected	Other information
28/04/20	Identified around 05:30	Major	Burgess Hill TS	Artic trailer of MDR, parked outside in yard	Smoke discovered by arriving drivers
17/07/20	Approx 18:30	Major	Crawley	Fire in CA waste	Smoke discovered by people in local area

2019/20

Date of fire	Time	Scale	Site	What was affected	Other information
02/04/19	approx 20:00	Major	Westhampnett	Transfer Station	Commenced in CA pile, whole shed destroyed
15/05/19	approx 19:30	Major	Westhampnett	RORO vehicle outside in yard	Electrical fault on the vehicle - whole vehicle destroyed
02/03/20	approx 18:00	Major	Westhampnett HWRS	Outside while shed was being rebuilt	Commenced in CA pile.

2018/19 - No records

2017/18 - No fires

Date of fire	Time	Scale	Site	What was affected	Other information
06/05/16	approx 15:30	Minor	Westhampnett	Transfer Station	CA pile, something smouldering, so removed from shed and extinguished.
04/08/16	approx 21:00hrs	Major	Burgess Hill TS	Transfer Station CA pile	Corner of shed and part of the roof needed to be rebuilt. Very short term diversion of WCAs, HWRS unaffected (as containerised)
26/08/16	Afternoon	Minor	Horsham HWRS	Container for metal	Believed to be from hot coals from a disposable BBQ
06/02/17	16:10	Minor	Worthing	WEEE container	Cause not conclusive, likely battery ignition

2015/16

Date of fire	Time	Scale	Site	What was affected	Other information
29/05/15	approx 16:15	Major	Crawley	In a loaded artic trailer, inside the shed	While artic was being loaded with WEEE, variety of fire appliances attended and site closed for approx for 2 days.
19/08/15	15:45	Minor	Burgess Hill TS	Small fire in MDR pile	
03/09/15	Afternoon	Minor	Burgess Hill TS	Small fire in MDR pile	
17/09/15	approx 11:00	Minor	Lancing TS	In a loaded artic trailer, inside the shed	

2014/15

Date of fire	Time	Scale	Site	What was affected	Other information
10/09/14	approx 15:00	Minor	Crawley	MDR after it had been tipped from RCV	Staff wet area with hoses, fire service called and hose down.
15/10/14	approx 14:30	Minor	Crawley	Mattress smouldering in CA pile	
03/02/15	approx 13:30	Minor	МВТ	Fire caused by maintenance in wet pre- treatment	
14/03/15	14:10	minor	Westhampnett HWRS	Fire in small WEEE skip in HWRS area	Site closed while Fire Service doused container with water. Once safe they left and site was re-opened.

2013/14 - No fires recorded

Date of fire	Time	Scale	Site	What was affected	Other information
03/07/12	approx 13:00	Major	Burgess Hill	MSDC refuse freighter fire in	Fire service called - site evacuated and closed for the rest of the day. Fire was behind the cab

Date of fire	Time	Scale	Site	What was affected	Other information
				Burgess Hill yard	which then caused the fuel tank to rupture.
01/08/12	approx 21:00	Major	Woodhorn Tangmere	Fire in wood pile	RCVs with green diverted the following day
02/10/12	04:00hrs	Major	Chi Depot	RCV caught fire overnight while in their workshop	

2011/12

Date of fire	Time	Scale	Site	What was affected	Other information
15/03/12	approx 08:30	Minor	Shoreham	Hot ashes placed in a bin by customer.	Site evacuated, while fire service in attendance

2010/11

Date of fire	Time	Scale	Site	What was affected	Other information
27/05/11	approx 12:30	Major	Ford MRF	Fire in plastics bunker	Site evacuated and fire service attended. Material diverted to Crayford (not sure how long out of service).

2009/10 - No fires recorded

2008/09

Date of	Time	Scale	Site	What was	Other information
fire				affected	
09/06/08	18:00hrs	Major	Crawley	Fire	Fire in destroyed
				commenced	shed, which
				in CA area	reopened 1 April
				and	2019 (It had only
				destroyed	been built and
				shed	operating since 7
					Aug 2006)

2007/08 - No data available

2006/07 - No fires recorded

Date of fire	Time	Scale	Site	What was affected	Other information
26/03/06	Unknown	Major	Burgess Hill	Fire in TS (unknown exactly where)	TS and HWS closed all day (this was before the site was constructed as it is now).

- (b) Viridor is liable and responsible for the insurance on the facilities.
- (c) No additional costs for the County Council as these costs sit with Viridor.
- (d) The Household Waste Recycling Site in Crawley remains closed following the fire on 17 July. Contractors have carried out work to clear and clean the internal and external areas of the building which were affected by the fire.

A full structural assessment to see what other work may be needed for the site has been undertaken. This showed that one major and approximately 20 minor beams need replacing. In addition, most of the shutters and the electric/lighting systems in the building will have to be repaired or replaced. Most damage is towards the back of the shed (where the public tip waste through the windows) hence the need to set up a temporary public area on the lower part of the site. Viridor has sent out tenders for this work and anticipate that the work will take a minimum of six weeks from award of contract. All potential contractors have suggested they can start the work quickly.

Additional fire prevention measures have not been discussed; these will form part of the discussions with the Environment Agency as part of a revised fire prevention plan. At this stage, there is no confirmed date for when the site will fully reopen. In the meantime, the nearby sites at Horsham and East Grinstead are open seven days per week.

Written question from Cllr Brenda Burgess for reply by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

Question

In the light of the many objections and concerns received from residents in Three Bridges and Pound Hill South division and more widely in the Borough of Crawley about the temporary pop-up cycle lane, have such concerns and objections been made from other areas of West Sussex and in the light of such objections and concerns how will these be addressed? Could the Cabinet Member advise if they will they be removed?'

Answer

There has been a great deal of publicity since May when the Secretary of State for Transport announced a £2bn package to 'create a new era for cycling and walking'. More than 250 suggestions for temporary schemes were received from residents, district and borough councils and cycling fora. Positive and negative comments have been received about the schemes.

Post-opening road safety reviews will be undertaken for each scheme which will involve experienced and independent road safety auditors, a representative from Sussex Police and the County Council's Cycling Development Officer.

In order to allow time for traffic patterns around each scheme to settle it will be beneficial to allow approximately six weeks from each scheme's opening which will result in a rolling review process. Each scheme will have a separate report that will present the data together with a commentary and recommendation. The recommendation will either be to:

- retain for a further period and future review,
- to amend and review in future, or
- to remove the scheme.

The Cabinet Member has set up an Executive Task and Finish Group (TFG) to act as a critical friend for officers and advise the Cabinet Member in respect of the County Council's response to the Emergency Active Travel Fund and the review of the Walking and Cycling Strategy. Each report will be presented to the Cabinet Member and the Executive TFG. The TFG will be asked for their consideration and to provide feedback to the Cabinet Member. On receipt of the TFG feedback, the Cabinet Member will be asked to consider the future of each scheme.

Question Time: 18 September 2020

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

Best Start in Life

Cabinet Member for Education and Skills

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters.

Reduction in school funding, from Cllr Walsh.

In response to concerns expressed by Cllr Walsh over the level of school funding affecting the more deprived areas of West Sussex, the Cabinet Member said he would respond with a fuller answer.

Woodlands Meed, Haywards Heath, from Cllr Barling, Cllr Barrett-Miles, Cllr M Jones, Cllr Lea and Cllr Lord.

In response to a question from Cllr Barrett-Miles, the Cabinet Member confirmed he would keep all members informed of progress.

Withdrawal of breaktime school milk funding for the over 5s, from Cllr M Jones.

A Prosperous Place

Leader

The Leader answered questions on Gatwick and the local economy, from Cllr Brunsdon.

In response to a question from Cllr Brunsdon about the environmental impact of Gatwick Airport the Leader said he would provide her with more information about help to support diversification and reskilling in the Crawley area. He also agreed to look at whether the County Council's seat on Gatcom should be held by the Cabinet Member for Environment.

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

The Cabinet Member answered questions on COVID-19 pop-up cycle lanes, from Cllr Burrett, Cllr N Dennis, Cllr M Jones and Cllr Lea.

In response to a question from Cllr Lea about the pop-up cycleways in East Grinstead and whether the replacement of temporary bollards with white lines meant the measures had been made permanent without the usual traffic regulation order process, the Cabinet Member agreed to respond to Cllr Lea.

A Strong, Safe and Sustainable Place

Cabinet Member for Fire & Rescue and Communities

The Cabinet Member answered a question on new fire appliance vehicles, from Cllr Wickremaratchi.

Cabinet Member for Environment

The Cabinet Member answered questions on countywide charging network for electric vehicles, from Cllr O'Kelly and Cllr Walsh.

A Council that works for the Community

Leader/Cabinet Member for Economy and Corporate Resources

The Leader and Cabinet Member answered questions on the impact of COVID-19 on the economy in Crawley, from Cllr Oxlade.

Cabinet Member for Economy and Corporate Resources

The Cabinet Member answered questions on a visit from the Secretary of State for the Department of Culture, Media and Sport from Cllr Burgess.

Cabinet Member for Finance

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the use of the apron at Tangmere airfield for emergency resilience purposes, from Cllr S Oakley.

In response to a question from Cllr Oakley the Cabinet Member agreed to keep him informed of any plans for the future of the airfield.