

# Public Document Pack

## West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

**15 July 2022**

At the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 am on Friday, 15 July 2022, at County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RQ, the members present being:

Cllr Bradbury (Chairman)

Cllr Wickremaratchi (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Albury

Cllr Ali

Cllr Atkins, RD

Cllr Baldwin

Cllr Baxter

Cllr Bence

Cllr Bennett

Cllr Boram

Cllr Britton

Cllr Burgess

Cllr Burrett

Cllr Cherry

Cllr Chowdhury

Cllr Condie

Cllr Cooper

Cllr Cornell

Cllr Crow

Cllr J Dennis

Cllr N Dennis

Cllr Duncton

Cllr Elkins

Cllr Evans

Cllr Forbes

Cllr Gibson

Cllr Greenway

Cllr Hall

Cllr Hillier

Cllr Hunt

Cllr Johnson

Cllr Joy

Cllr A Jupp

Cllr Kerry-Bedell

Cllr Lanzer

Cllr Linehan

Cllr Lord

Cllr Markwell

Cllr Marshall

Cllr McDonald

Cllr McGregor

Cllr McKnight

Cllr Milne

Cllr Mitchell

Cllr Montyn

Cllr Oakley

Cllr O'Kelly

Cllr Oxlade

Cllr Patel

Cllr Payne

Cllr Pudaloff

Cllr Quinn

Cllr Russell

Cllr Sharp

Cllr Smith

Cllr Sparkes

Cllr Turley

Cllr Urquhart

Cllr Waight

Cllr Wall

Cllr Walsh, KStJ, RD

### **100 Death of Cllr John Charles and two former members**

100.1 The Chairman reported the death of Cllr John Charles, the member for the Felpham division. Members expressed their sincere condolences to Cllr Charles's family.

100.2 He also reported the deaths of two former members of the Council – Mr Ian Elliott, DL and Mr Donald Lissenburg. Mr Lissenburg had represented the Gaisford division in Worthing from 2001 to 2009. Mr Elliott had been the member for Shoreham from 1973 until 2001. He had held a number of senior positions and became

Chairman of the County Council from 1997 to 2001. Mr Elliott also served as a Deputy Lieutenant for West Sussex for many years, representing Her Majesty's Lord-Lieutenant of West Sussex.

100.3 Members held a minute's silence.

## **101 Her Majesty The Queen's Platinum Jubilee**

101.1 The Chairman reported that a response had been received from Her Majesty the Queen in response to the Council's loyal address on the occasion of Her Majesty's Platinum Jubilee.

## **102 Lord Lieutenant of West Sussex**

102.1 The Chairman reported that he had written to Her Majesty's Lord-Lieutenant of West Sussex, Dame Susan Pyper, to offer the County Council's thanks for her 14 years of dedicated service, from which she will retire at the end of July. He had also written to congratulate Lady Emma Barnard DL, who has been confirmed as the new Lord-Lieutenant and will take office on 1 August 2022.

## **103 Director of Finance and Support Services**

103.1 The Chairman informed members that it was the last meeting of the County Council that Katharine Eberhart, the Director of Finance and Support Services, would attend before she leaves the County Council at the end of August. Members expressed their thanks to Ms Eberhart for her help and support to all members and sent their best wishes for the future.

103.2 The Chairman reported that steps are being taken to appoint a successor to Ms Eberhart as Section 151 Officer. As it is for the Council to confirm the designation of the officer fulfilling that role, he said he would keep members informed of the process.

## **104 Attendance and Apologies for Absence**

104.1 The following members attended the meeting virtually and therefore did not take part in or vote on items requiring a decision.

Cllr Bennett, Cllr Evans, Cllr Hall, Cllr Hillier, Cllr A Jupp, Cllr Mitchell, Cllr Oxlade, Cllr Sparkes and Cllr Wall.

104.2 Apologies were received from Cllr Dunn, Cllr N Jupp, Cllr Kenyon, Cllr Mercer, Cllr Nagel, Cllr Oppler, Cllr Pendleton and Cllr Richardson.

104.3 Apologies for the morning session were received from Cllr Chowdhury. Apologies for the afternoon session were received from Cllr Bennett, Cllr Britton, Cllr Evans, Cllr Urquhart and Cllr Wall. Cllr Oakley gave his apologies and arrived at 12.35 pm. Apologies for the remainder of the morning session were given by

the following: Cllr Wall at 10.55 am, Cllr Evans at 11.00 am, Cllr Bennett at 12.15 pm and Cllr Hall at 12.40 pm.

104.4 Cllr A Jupp left at 3.47 pm and Cllr Turley at 4.00 pm.

## **105 Members' Interests**

105.1 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

## **106 Minutes**

106.1 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 27 May 2022 (pages 5 to 26) be approved as a correct record.

## **107 Result of By-election**

107.1 The Council received the County Returning Officer's return of the by-election on 7 July 2022 for the county councillor for the Worthing West electoral division (supplement page 3).

## **108 Review of Proportionality**

108.1 The County Council noted its 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 had been circulated (supplement pages 5 and 6).

108.2 Resolved –

That the proportionality be recalculated after a Felpham division by-election and that the impact of the recent by-election on committee vacancies, as set out in paragraph 5 of the report, be approved.

## **109 Committee Appointments**

109.1 The Council approved appointments as set out below.

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Change</b>
Governance Committee	Cllr Lord in place of Cllr Walsh
Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee	Cllr McKnight to fill vacancy
Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee	Cllr McKnight to fill vacancy

109.2 The following appointments were approved subject to the agreement of the Council to recommendation (3) of item 8, Review of the Constitution.

<b>Committee</b>	<b>New</b>
Governance Committee	Cllr Cornell Cllr Hunt Cllr Urquhart Cllr Walsh
Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Nagel
Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Cooper
Fire & Rescue Service Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Duncton
Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Baldwin
Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Bence Cllr Johnson

## **110 Appointment of Co-opted Member**

110.1 The Council was asked to approve the appointment of Mrs Julie Oldroyd, the current Deputy Director of the Education Service for the Catholic Diocese of Arundel & Brighton, as a voting co-opted member of the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee. The appointment will take effect from 1 September 2022 when Mrs Oldroyd takes up her new post of Director of the Education Service for the Diocese.

110.2 Resolved –

That the appointment be approved.

## **111 Address by a Cabinet Member**

111.1 Members received an address by the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People on the inspection of the Youth Justice Service.

111.2 In response to a question from Cllr Cornell about the number of BAME staff working on youth justice, where they were based and whether anything could be done to increase their number, the Cabinet Member said she would find out and respond to her.

## **112 Governance Committee: Constitution Review**

112.1 The Council reviewed the changes made to Standing Orders to provide for virtual meetings and proposals for meeting cancellation,

substitutes and treatment of notices of motion at Council in the light of a report from the Governance Committee (pages 27 to 34).

112.2 Recommendation (4) was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 3.35.

(a) For recommendation (4) – 38

Cllr Albury, Cllr Ali, Cllr Atkins, Cllr Baldwin, Cllr Baxter, Cllr Bence, Cllr Boram, Cllr Bradbury, Cllr Britton, Cllr Burgess, Cllr Burrett, Cllr Cooper, Cllr Cornell, Cllr Crow, Cllr J Dennis, Cllr Duncton, Cllr Elkins, Cllr Forbes, Cllr Greenway, Cllr Hunt, Cllr Lanzer, Cllr Linehan, Cllr Markwell, Cllr Marshall, Cllr McDonald, Cllr McGregor, Cllr McKnight, Cllr Montyn, Cllr Patel, Cllr Payne, Cllr Pudaloff, Cllr Quinn, Cllr Russell, Cllr Smith, Cllr Turley, Cllr Urquhart, Cllr Waight and Cllr Wickremaratchi.

(b) Against recommendation (4) – 12

Cllr Cherry, Cllr Condie, Cllr N Dennis, Cllr Gibson, Cllr Johnson, Cllr Joy, Cllr Kerry-Bedell, Cllr Lord, Cllr Milne, Cllr O’Kelly, Cllr Sharp and Cllr Walsh.

(c) Abstentions – 0

112.3 Recommendation (4) was approved.

112.4 Recommendation (5) was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 35.5.

(a) For recommendation (5) – 31

Cllr Albury, Cllr Ali, Cllr Atkins, Cllr Baldwin, Cllr Bence, Cllr Boram, Cllr Bradbury, Cllr Britton, Cllr Burgess, Cllr Burrett, Cllr Cooper, Cllr Crow, Cllr J Dennis, Cllr Duncton, Cllr Elkins, Cllr Forbes, Cllr Greenway, Cllr Hunt, Cllr Lanzer, Cllr Linehan, Cllr Markwell, Cllr Marshall, Cllr McDonald, Cllr McGregor, Cllr Montyn, Cllr Patel, Cllr Payne, Cllr Russell, Cllr Urquhart, Cllr Waight and Cllr Wickremaratchi.

(b) Against recommendation (5) – 19

Cllr Baxter, Cllr Cherry, Cllr Condie, Cllr Cornell, Cllr N Dennis, Cllr Gibson, Cllr Johnson, Cllr Joy, Cllr Kerry-Bedell, Cllr Lord, Cllr McKnight, Cllr Milne, Cllr O’Kelly, Cllr Pudaloff, Cllr Quinn, Cllr Sharp, Cllr Smith, Cllr Turley and Cllr Walsh.

(c) Abstentions – 0

112.5 Recommendation (5) was approved.

112.6 Resolved –

That the following changes, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be approved:

- (1) Changes to virtual attendance at meetings (paragraphs 5 to 8 of the report and Standing Order 3.09 (e));
- (2) New Standing Order on meeting cancellation (paragraph 9 of the report and Standing Order 3.09 (f));
- (3) Arrangements for substitutes (paragraph 10 of the report and Standing Orders 6.03, 6.04 and 7.03) and confirmation of the provisional appointments set out in minute 109.2 above;
- (4) Treatment of motions not reached due to lack of time (paragraphs 11 and 12 of the report and Standing Order 2.23 (k)); and
- (5) Time of for motion subjects returning for consideration (paragraphs 13 and 14 of the report and Standing Order 2.55).

### **113 Report of the Corporate Parenting Panel**

113.1 The Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Panel moved the report of the recent work of the Panel (pages 35 to 68).

113.2 Resolved -

That the Corporate Parenting Report for Children we Care for, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be noted.

### **114 Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee: Scrutiny Annual Report 2021/22**

114.1 The Chairman of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee moved the Scrutiny Annual Report which summarises the main outcomes of scrutiny, best practice, lessons learnt, and any development issues identified during 2021/22 (pages 69 to 78).

114.2 Resolved -

That the Scrutiny Annual Report 2021/22, as attached at Appendix 1 to the report, be noted.

### **115 Standards Committee: Annual Report 2021/22**

115.1 The Council noted a report from the Standards Committee on its activities for the period from April 2021 to March 2022 (pages 79 and 80).

115.2 Resolved -

That the report be noted.

## **116 Question Time**

116.1 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 81 to 86) and a supplementary report (supplement page 1) and written questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 2.38 (set out at Appendix 2).

116.2 The Chairman informed the Council that as the Cabinet Member for Learning and Skills was not in attendance, any questions on that portfolio would be covered by the Leader or the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People.

## **117 Motion on Integrated Care System**

117.1 The following motion was moved by Cllr Ali and seconded by Cllr McDonald.

‘This Council:

- (1) Welcomes the formation of the Integrated Care System (ICS) for Sussex from 1 July in accordance with the provisions of the Health and Care Act 2022.
- (2) Welcomes the opportunity afforded by the ICS to develop deeper collaboration between the NHS, local government and other partners to deliver improved outcomes in population health, address inequalities, improve productivity and value for money, and support social and economic development.
- (3) Notes that the Integrated Care Strategy, to be approved by the Sussex Health and Care Assembly, aims to improve health and care for the Sussex population and that the three Health and Care partnerships have responsibility for delivering improved and joined-up health and care across West Sussex, Brighton and Hove, and East Sussex.
- (4) Notes that the three Health and Wellbeing Boards have responsibility for agreeing Health and Wellbeing Strategies and Joint Strategic Needs Assessments for the three local authority areas, and so identify priorities for each place within the ICS.
- (5) Notes that while some health and care priorities will be pan-Sussex in nature, others will be more localised and place-based.
- (6) Calls upon the Cabinet Member for Public Health and Wellbeing, as Chairman of the West Sussex Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB), to ensure that the HWB exerts its

influence so that the Integrated Care Strategy reflects local place-based needs and priorities, and that the same inform the development and delivery of services via the three Health and Care Partnerships, noting that the Sussex Integrated Care Board and the Sussex Health and Care Assembly both have duties to consider HWB plans.'

117.2 The motion was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 35.5.

(a) For the motion – 30

Cllr Albury, Cllr Ali, Cllr Atkins, Cllr Baldwin, Cllr Bence, Cllr Boram, Cllr Bradbury, Cllr Burgess, Cllr Burrett, Cllr Cooper, Cllr Crow, Cllr J Dennis, Cllr Duncton, Cllr Elkins, Cllr Forbes, Cllr Gibson, Cllr Greenway, Cllr Hunt, Cllr Lanzer, Cllr Linehan, Cllr Marshall, Cllr McDonald, Cllr McGregor, Cllr Montyn, Cllr Oakley, Cllr Patel, Cllr Payne, Cllr Russell, Cllr Waight and Cllr Wickremaratchi.

(b) Against the motion – 0

(c) Abstentions – 18

Cllr Baxter, Cllr Cherry, Cllr Chowdhury, Cllr Condie, Cllr Cornell, Cllr N Dennis, Cllr Johnson, Cllr Joy, Cllr Kerry-Bedell, Cllr Lord, Cllr McKnight, Cllr Milne, Cllr O'Kelly, Cllr Pudaloff, Cllr Quinn, Cllr Sharp, Cllr Smith and Cllr Walsh.

117.3 The motion was carried.

## **118 Motion on Support for Carers**

118.1 Due to lack of time the motion on Support for Carers was deferred for consideration for selection for debate at the next meeting.

Chairman

The Council rose at 4.17 pm



## Interests

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

<b>Item</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
12 – Question Time	Cllr Boram	Member of Adur District Council
12 – Question Time	Cllr Burgess	Member of Crawley Borough Council
12 – Question Time (Net Zero)	Cllr Hillier	Cabinet Member at Mid Sussex District Council
12 – Question Time	Cllr Oakley	Member of Water Resources South East Customer Challenge Group
13(a) – Motion on Integrated Care System	Cllr Boram	Member of Adur District Council
13(b) – Motion on Carers	Cllr Boram	Member of Adur District Council
13(b) – Motion on Carers	Cllr Smith	Registered West Sussex Carer and Member of West Sussex Carer's Support

This page is intentionally left blank

---

**Written Questions: 15 July 2022****1. Written question from Cllr Condie for reply by Cabinet Member for Adults Services****Question**

It would appear that the provision of goods and services at discounted rates to carers has been altered, for example, the withdrawal of reduced swimming charges at the Triangle, Burgess Hill, which is popular with carers.

Could the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, therefore, please advise:

- (a) To what degree has the provision of goods and services to carers under West Sussex County Council discount schemes been devalued?
- (b) What savings have been made by these new discount arrangements and (separately) by bringing the carers' register inhouse?
- (c) What steps are being taken to address the shortfalls from question (a)?
- (d) What budgetary provision is there for these discount arrangements and to what degree are budgets being met?
- (e) Would the Council consider a small budgetary provision to make good any shortfall and/or improve the attractiveness of the discount schemes to our invaluable carers.

**Answer**

The Triangle in Burgess Hill is in the Carer Discount Card Scheme, launched in February 2020. The scheme was launched in order to:

- Increase carer wellbeing
- Reduce carer isolation
- Reduce the financial Impact of caring
- Increase the physical activity of carers.

- (a) There has been no devaluing of the scheme as a whole. Despite the challenges of the past two years, the number of local businesses on the scheme has grown considerably.

Overall there has been a rise in the number of discounts and 'one off' offers available to carers and young carers.

Currently 149 businesses are registered with our contracted partner Carers Support West Sussex who promote the scheme as well as issue carer discount cards.

In terms of carers accessing the discount card, over 3,100 discount cards were issued in 2021/22.

- (b) No savings have been made in respect of the Carer Discount Card scheme as businesses offer a level of discount at their own discretion which varies from business to business.

(c) There have been no shortfalls.

(d) & (e)

There is no budget/payment from the Council to enable discounts but nevertheless local businesses are joining the scheme as it can create new footfall through their door and it is good PR.

Contact will be made with the Triangle directly in the next week or two to check if/why they have changed their offer and we will inform the Councillor of the outcome of that contact.

**2. Written question from Cllr Milne for reply by Cabinet Member for Community Support, Fire and Rescue**

**Question**

The Government's White Paper: [Reforming our fire & rescue service](#) is out to consultation. In West Sussex, the effect would be to transfer accountability for the Fire & Rescue Service to the PCC (Police & Crime Commissioner). This would represent a reduction in democratic control because PCC elections traditionally attract low interest. This Council has long believed that West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service (WSFRS) is best positioned to serve residents as part of the County Council.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm that:

- (a) The White Paper does not currently make provision for the PCC to take over WSFRS due to its status as a combined service;
- (b) He is making representations to our MPs and central government to ensure that current scrutiny arrangements are retained; and
- (c) If any bill comes to Parliament where there is a threat of control of WSFRS being removed from this Council, that he would strongly oppose such a move.

**Answer**

- (a) The White Paper highlights that "In order to transfer fire governance to an elected official, the boundaries of the fire and rescue service and the police force/combined authority/county council must align.". It also highlights that "in areas where there is more than one fire and rescue service within a police force area (for example, Sussex Police covers the area of both East Sussex and West Sussex fire and rescue services) a transfer of functions is still possible as the PCC can take responsibility for each fire and rescue service that falls within their area. We would not seek to combine services unless there was local appetite to do so.". This makes clear the potential for the PCC to transfer governance from the County Council remains, subject to 'local appetite'. The last time the PCC made a business case regarding transfer of FRS governance was in July 2017 when ultimately the PCC withdrew this case stating that "a case for change had been made, but that it was not compelling in the context of the complexity of the change and the potential disruption.". Since then, West Sussex Fire & Rescue has strengthened its position within the County Council with additional investment, scrutiny and governance which has been recognised through independent inspection.

- (b) Yes, the appropriate MP engagement and briefings will include strong representation of the benefits of our current governance arrangements which include current scrutiny.
- (c) Yes, and as the Cabinet Member, I will be advocating for the status quo in our consultation response including aforementioned benefits.

**3. Written question from Cllr O’Kelly for reply by Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change**

**Question**

Can the Cabinet Member advise what proportion of the County Council’s estate uses:

- (a) Electricity generated by its own solar farms;
- (b) Electricity through a green/renewable energy tariff;
- (c) Gas through a green/renewable energy tariff; and
- (d) Furthermore, can she outline the timetable for a more sustainable energy supply for the corporate estate?

**Answer**

The County Council’s corporate estate (excluding schools and streetlighting) consumes around 8,600 MWh per year of electricity and generates circa 12,300 MWh per year through its solar farms. There are no direct private wires connecting the major solar assets and corporate buildings. Electricity from the Council’s solar farms is supplied to the grid at a higher price than is paid for the supply. For example, electricity from the Council’s solar farms in March 2022 was sold at £233.68/MWh whereas, in contrast, [LASER Energy Buying Group](#) secured the Council’s wholesale electricity needs at a price of £97.10/MWh.

The Council could ‘sleeve’ the electricity from its solar farms to serve its own demand but the opportunity cost to do this in the financial year 2021/22 would have been £630,000.

It should be noted that everyone who does not have a direct supply of renewable energy is using the UK average carbon intensity regardless of the tariff procured. Given this, the County Council does not currently procure renewable energy tariffs. Electricity is procured on a standard tariff using hedging strategies and the carbon intensity of the Council’s electricity consumption is represented using the UK average carbon intensity (40.3% renewable), less consumption directly supplied through renewable energy.

The option to change procurement approach will, along with measures to encourage further investment in local renewable generation, form part of a wider consideration over the next few months about how the Council will achieve its Net Zero commitment by 2030. This will complement a range of measures including smarter working, heat decarbonisation of its buildings, offsetting of its residual emissions as well as the use of locally generated, renewable energy. This ambition is outlined in the County Council’s recently adopted [Energy Strategy](#) (PDF, 3.1MB).

**4. Written question from Cllr Cherry for reply by Cabinet Member for Finance and Property**

**Question**

The UK has the worst inflation rate in the G7, now nearing 11%. The County Council's 2022/23 budget was based on:

- Price inflation 3.7%
- Pay increases 3%

So, how is the County Council suffering in the cost-of-living crisis? The specific components of this question are as follows:

- (a) How much of the 2022/23 £2.9m contingency has now been spent or allocated?
- (b) What other contingencies are there, where are they and are they being used?
- (c) In terms of real-term value, are spending cuts now being made or planned?

**Answer**

- (a) Allocations against the contingency have not been formally made as the impacts of inflation continue to be monitored and updated as the position becomes clearer. Pay inflation is subject to national pay award agreements which have not yet concluded. As an indication, every 1% increase in pay above the budgeted 3% equates to roughly £2.5m additional cost for the County Council. For price inflation, budgets are closely monitored to identify inflation pressures and the budget includes additional contingency to manage in-year unforeseen pressures.
- (b) In 2022/23, the Council has a total of £9.2m set aside as a revenue contingency budget. Within this sum, £2.9m has specifically been set aside to deal with inflationary pressures. In addition, a further contingency reserve of £4.969m has been set aside as part of the underspend identified in the 2021/22 end of year financial position. Therefore, a total of £7.869m is available to deal with inflationary pressure in 2022/23. There has been no allocation from the contingency budgets to date.
- (c) The budgets are monitored closely and any inflationary pressure will be supported by the inflationary contingency budgets. If costs cannot be managed within the contingency then other options may be considered.

**5. Written question from Cllr Gibson for reply by Cabinet Member for Finance and Property**

**Question**

In June 2021 the Council signed a Statement of Common Ground for a potential land swap with a developer promoting a development of 550 new homes in East Grinstead. The potential land swap would provide the developer with an important access into the site, while the Council would gain land and facilities for school sports provision and the opportunity to take forward a project to bring together the Upper and Lower schools of Imberhorne Secondary School together on one site.

- 
- (a) How does the Council intend to value the land that it would be releasing to the developer?
  - (b) When and how will the Capital Assets Board (CAB) feasibility Study into the potential land swap be published?
  - (c) Will the CAB feasibility Study include a Business Case and costed plan for bringing together the Upper and Lower schools of Imberhorne Secondary School together on one site and what impact would the project have on Capital Strategy 2022/23 to 2026/27?

### Answer

- (a) The County Council land area to be released to the developer will be valued having regard to its proposed use as an access for the new development and all relevant factors related to the terms of the proposed land exchange, taking account of the value of the larger area of agricultural land to be transferred to the County Council for educational playing field use, subject to planning permission, and the costs to be incurred by the developer in undertaking significant works to make the agricultural land fit for playing field use. This will include drainage, fencing, pavilion facilities, etc. Independent surveyors and valuers, Lambert Smith Hampton, have been commissioned to undertake the required valuation work and once obtained, their report will provide the basis for a Cabinet Member key decision report seeking to approval for the land exchange transaction. The key decision report is likely to be forthcoming later this year.
- (b) The outcome from the viability study undertaken in 2019 has formed the basis of the land swap in relation to the additional land required to bring the school together onto one site with scope for expansion. Aspects of the study will be provided as an appendix to the decision report. A full feasibility study has not yet been commissioned and this would need to be agreed by CAB. It is anticipated that a full feasibility study, including detailed surveys, would be commissioned once the capital required to relocate the school onto one site has been agreed. In the meantime, the land swap can be taken forward independently.
- (c) It remains the Education Services' intention to explore the opportunities that would allow the school to be brought together on the Imberhorne Lane site and to this end a viability study was undertaken in 2019 indicating the land area requirement and potential capital required to enable this. The proposed land exchange will provide the necessary site area required to bring the school together on the Imberhorne Lane site and the Education Service will continue to explore funding opportunities as part of the annual capital programme cycle to fund the significant capital investment in the buildings. The service will bring forward a request for full feasibility in due course and once there is capital funding earmarked to bring the school onto one site.

### 6. Written question from **Cllr Sharp** for reply by **Cabinet Member for Finance and Property**

#### Question

What social and environmental practices does the Council follow in its procurement

practices? Do we require a reduction in carbon emissions and do we encourage local jobs to build more resilient communities?

Does the Council support the adoption of the Real Living Wage in its procurement contracts? Would the Cabinet Member agree to work with local Chambers of Commerce to promote the importance of the Real Living Wage in order to support our residents who work in local businesses?

This would mean that residents are better able to face the recent, considerable cost of living increases.

### **Answer**

The [WSCC Social Value Framework](#) outlines our framework on embedding and realising Social Value through Procurement & Contract. The County Council's Procurement Team works with Directorate Commissioners, Service Leads and Contract Managers across the Council to secure social value by adding outcomes into our contracts that benefit our community, environment and economy. Social value objectives and measures include a full range of options such as climate and carbon reducing targets, social/community action, volunteering, training, apprenticeships, job creation – all supporting outcomes to benefit our local community.

A recent example of the success of social value being generated through applying our Social Value Framework when working with our partners, was that more than [750 computers were allocated to organisations](#) across the county, including residential care homes, day care providers, carer support groups, the library service, youth groups and those which support victims of domestic violence.

Social value benefits are in addition to the service design, specification and requirements that directorates and services define – and are ways that our suppliers can bring even greater value in the way that they fulfil those contracts, not only for local businesses but also for local people by encouraging apprenticeships and local employment in West Sussex. This combines the blend of what is specified as a need, with the additional value that we can secure in how our suppliers fulfil the delivery of our contracts.

To drive specific and greater outcomes for the County Council's Climate Strategy targets in respect of our supply chain, we are working with the sustainability team to consider how climate change considerations can be built into service requirements as a core need. A draft comprehensive plan will be developed for wider consideration later this year.

The Council secures its contracts through full and fair competition with the aim of providing best value for the Council, balancing outcomes and costs. The Council does not have a blanket policy to require Real Living Wage in its contracts but allows specific consideration on a case-by-case basis to meet the service needs. However, in all our procurement Supplier Contracts there is a standard requirement to comply with UK Laws and of course compliance to paying staff the National Living Wage will be covered within that requirement.

The County Council is a member of the Sussex Chamber of Commerce (CoC), and our Economy Team works collaboratively with the CoC on a range of topics to support businesses. The Team is not currently involved in any discussions or work with the CoC in regard to the real living wage.



I am always happy to consider proposals from members but must always balance those requests with my responsibility to try to ensure that, at all times, we get the best value return for the money we spend. Therefore, I always need to balance the ongoing cost implications of any policies we might consider, with the overall impact they will have on providing best value for all of our residents.

**7. Written question from Cllr Cherry for reply by Cabinet Member for Learning and Skills**

**Question**

Though not quite as bad as at the time of the Black Death, the UK is facing one of its largest skills shortages in history.

So, given that West Sussex County Council has budgeted for an expenditure reduction in 2022/23 of £43,000 (-4.9%), how committed is the County Council in addressing this important issue?

Specifically:

- (a) Are robust contracts with training providers in place and, if so, with whom?
- (b) How does training course take-up compare with pre-pandemic levels?
- (c) What is the County Council doing to promote adults' skills training?
- (d) What are the County Council adults' skills investment plans going forward?

**Answer**

- (a) Adult Community Education (ACE) is delivered by three main providers at present: Aspire, Albion in the Community and Asphaleia. Each provider receives a percentage of the full £3.2m available via the Education Skills and Funding Agency (ESFA).

Multiply is a three-year funded programme directed at improving adult numeracy, to the value of £3,689,038, which is due to commence in the autumn following conclusion of the [process to award grants to organisations for delivery](#).

All providers go through robust allocation and procurement process. All provision is subject to Ofsted inspections.

- (b) Learner numbers have been in a steady decline since prior to the pandemic. Participation trends in England have seen a 25% decline from 2014 to 2018. The pandemic saw a steeper than average decline in learners enrolled with our core provider, Aspire, down almost 40%. This year's figures will be available in the autumn 2022.
- (c) ACE promotion is the responsibility of our providers, and they have targeted marketing. The Council provides substantial advice and support through our networks and to target key priority areas and learners.
- (d) A full review of ACE provision is being conducted. Future models are being explored to mitigate risk and ensure targeted support for adult learners across

the county, in collaboration with multiple stakeholders from across the Local Authority.

**8. Written question from Cllr Cornell for reply by Cabinet Member for Learning and Skills**

**Question**

The Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee has just this year expressed concern at our inability to access detailed performance data relating to academy schools in the county.

Given the Government's plans, set out in the White Paper 2022: [Opportunity for all: strong schools with great teachers for your child](#), to ensure all schools are part of a multi-agency academy trust (MAT) by 2030, how will this authority (and others) be able to monitor the educational performance of children in West Sussex after 2030?

**Answer**

The White Paper does indicate a change in current requirements for data transfer which will allow local authorities access to data held by academies that currently local authorities are not automatically entitled to access. This change and the process through which academies will be required to provide such information will be detailed in due course by the Department for Education. This is intended to help local authorities fulfil their statutory responsibilities.

**9. Written question from Cllr Smith for reply by Cabinet Member for Learning and Skills**

**Question**

How can the County Council support local school staff with their Career Professional Development? This is an area so often cut from very tight school budgets, and even if the identified training is agreed staff attendance on training courses is often difficult. A school can plan to free up staff, but with sickness absence cover needs ever increasing, especially with many new Covid infections/re-infections this can prove very difficult, and agency staff are often not available, so the training may be missed. A recent Worthing school Ofsted inspection found that teaching of SEND was inadequate as staff were not effectively supporting children with additional needs in class due to a lack of training.

How can we as an authority help to support our school staff to access all necessary training to support all of our children, especially those who are most vulnerable, reach their potential?

**Answer**

Education and Skills provides funded support to those maintained schools with the highest need. Allocated support from our advisory team, and specialists as required, can be to the value of between three and nine days of support. Schools understand this is allocated against categorisation criteria. All schools agreed to their categorisation in autumn 2021.

Our advisers and specialists can be bought in to provide bespoke support which is flexible to the needs of school and demands on staff.

With declining central grants and funding our training and events programme remains chargeable, but offers a low-cost alternative, and confidence of quality assurance and bespoke to the needs of our West Sussex schools. This provision can be online, face-to-face and in school.

Our advisers and specialists also provide forums, briefings, downloadable guidance, and support tools to our maintained schools that are all funded by the County Council.

Our Inclusion Framework and Ordinarily Available Practice publications were launched through funded events, and easily accessible training opportunities for governors, leaders, and practitioners. These drive our work on inclusive practice in schools. We continue to provide support for identified children with SEND, from our specialist advisory teaching teams, which includes strategies and interventions for class teachers to deploy in planning and delivering learning.

This [catalogue](#) shows what the Council has available to schools above that which is funded through the Department for Education and falls into our statutory responsibilities.

**10. Written question from Cllr Smith for reply by Cabinet Member for Learning and Skills**

**Question**

In a recent Worthing school Ofsted report the school was, sadly, deemed to be an inadequate school. The report cited part of the school's failing was attributed to weaknesses in the governing body holding the school leadership to account.

How can we as the responsible education authority help support the governors we have in our schools to carry out their roles most effectively, to make sure we retain those governors we do have working so hard for the school community, and how can we attract more people to this essential community voluntary role?

**Answer**

In the report referred to, the local authority has worked closely with the governing body and the report recognises that the governors have also displayed 'a drive for improvement'. This is because they have strengthened as a group of governors and have become more strategic. They have done this in part through their own resolve as well as taking on new, experienced governors but also because local authority officers have provided effective guidance and challenge.

In addition – and this is available to all schools – the Council has a governance team that provides high quality information, resources, guidance and training. This can be found on the [West Sussex Services For Schools website](#).

The Council values and appreciates the work of our governors in West Sussex and takes their recruitment, retention and development very seriously. Through the work of the Senior Education Adviser and the leader of the Governance team, the Council keeps in close contact with governing bodies.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Question Time: 15 July 2022**

Members asked questions of members of the Cabinet. In instances where a Cabinet Member or the Leader undertook to take follow-up action, this is noted.

**Leader**

The Leader answered questions on the following matters:

Coastal West Sussex Partnership, from Cllr Boram.

LGA Conference 2022, from Cllr Albury, Cllr Hunt and Cllr Oakley.

Transatlantic Ties Symposium, from Cllr Greenway, Cllr Lord and Cllr Patel.

**Cabinet Member for Adults Services**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters:

Extra care housing development in West Sussex, from Cllr Cooper.

Carers Support Week, from Cllr Duncton and Cllr Lord.

In relation to Carers Week and a question from Cllr Duncton, the Cabinet Member agreed to send details to all members of how people can contact carers support.

The Leader and the Cabinet Member answered questions on the Shaw homes contract, from Cllr Johnson, Cllr O'Kelly and Cllr Pudaloff.

**Cabinet Member for Children and Young People**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on kinship carers, from Cllr Lord.

In response from a question from Cllr Lord about how many kinship carers have not yet been through a foster care assessment, the Cabinet Member said she would find out and respond to her.

**Cabinet Member for Learning and Skills**

The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People and Leader, on behalf of the Cabinet Member, answered questions on the following matters:

Site for a possible new primary school in Broadbridge Heath, from Cllr Milne and Cllr Oakley.

In response to a question from Cllr Milne about the Department for Education's decision not to provide a new primary school for Broadbridge Heath and the fact that the land the school was due to be built on would not now be made use of for this purpose, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People said she would ask the Cabinet Member for Learning and Skills to provide a full response to Cllr Milne.

Holiday Activities and Food programme, from Cllr Quinn.

**Cabinet Member for Community Support, Fire and Rescue**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters:

Bell barrow west of Ifield, from Cllr Cornell.

In response to a question from Cllr Cornell about the presence of an ancient bell barrow on land owned by Homes England proposed for development, and whether it has protected status, the Cabinet Member agreed to find out and respond to her.

10 years of Community Volunteers, from Cllr Albury.

The Cabinet Member and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Property answered questions on support for schools taking on Ukrainian children, from Cllr Joy.

### **Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters:

Solar panels in schools, from Cllr Burgess, Cllr Greenway and Cllr Markwell.

Sussex-Air, from Cllr Baxter, Cllr Burrett, Cllr Cornell and Cllr O'Kelly.

In relation to the partnership with Sussex-Air, Cllr Baxter asked for details of where the particulate monitors and the network of sensors will be located and the Cabinet Member agreed to let her have details.

The Cabinet Member also agreed to let Cllr Baxter know whether it is Sussex-Air or Highways England which would need to bid for assistance around the A27 between Lancing and Worthing.

The Cabinet Member agreed to let Cllr Cornell have more detail of the trial into the needs of taxi operators in the transition to electric vehicles including the need for fast charge points and where they should be located.

### **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters:

Bus Services Improvement Plan, from Cllr Gibson, Cllr N Dennis, Cllr Kerry-Bedell, Cllr O'Kelly, Cllr Payne and Cllr Sharp.

In response to a question from Cllr N Dennis about whether, in relation to the Bus Services Improvement Plan, the County Council would look at a network of hubs to facilitate connections between journeys or across borders, the Cabinet Member said she would look into it again as part of the pilot.

Highways depot visit, from Cllr Condie, Cllr Cooper and Cllr Greenway.

Following a recent visit to the Drayton Highways Depot and a demonstration of the Jetpatcher road repair system, in response to questions from Cllr Gibson and Cllr Cooper about whether it could be used to repair pavements in towns, the Cabinet Member said she had asked officers to investigate and would respond in due course.

### **Cabinet Member for Public Health and Wellbeing**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following matters:

Smokefree fund, from Cllr Baxter and Cllr McDonald.

In relation to the Smokefree fund and a request from Cllr Baxter, the Cabinet Member agreed to look at whether an underspend in the public health grant due to the impact of the pandemic could be used to fund further smoking cessation clinics.

Rising Covid cases, from Cllr Ali, Cllr Baxter, Cllr Cornell and Cllr Pudaloff.

In response to a question from Cllr Baxter about rising Covid cases and the need for non-online methods of messaging, the Cabinet Member said he would look at what usefully can be done.

The Cabinet Member also agreed to let Cllr Ali have statistics on the uptake of the vaccination programme in West Sussex and more detail of the proposed autumn booster campaign when available.

### **Cabinet Member for Support Services and Economic Development**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on businesses and Net Zero, from Cllr Atkins, Cllr Gibson, Cllr Kerry-Bedell, Cllr Hillier and Cllr Sharp.

In response to a request from Cllr Kerry-Bedell for there to be incentives, grants and funding to help small and medium-sized businesses to move towards Net Zero, the Cabinet Member said he would be happy to look at it.

This page is intentionally left blank