

# Public Document Pack

## West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

**19 October 2018**

At the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 am on Friday, 19 October 2018, at the County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mr Barnard (Chairman)

Mrs Arculus	Mrs Kitchen
Mr Acraman	Mr Lanzer
Lt Cdr Atkins, RD	Mr Lea
Mr Baldwin	Ms Lord
Mr Barling	Mr Markwell
Mr Barrett-Miles	Mr Marshall
Mr Boram	Mr McDonald
Mr Bradbury	Mrs Millson
Mr Bradford	Mr Mitchell
Mrs Bridges	Mr Montyn
Mr Buckland	Mr R J Oakley
Mr Burrett	Mr S J Oakley
Mr Catchpole	Dr O'Kelly
Mr Cloake	Mr Oppler
Mr Crow	Mr Oxlade
Mrs Dennis	Mr Parikh
Dr Dennis	Mrs Pendleton
Mrs Duncton	Mr Petts
Mr Edwards	Mr Purchase
Mr Elkins	Mrs Purnell
Mr Fitzjohn	Mr Quinn
Ms Flynn	Mrs Russell
Ms Goldsmith	Mr Simmons
Mrs Hall	Mr Smytherman
Mr High	Mrs Sparkes
Mr Hillier	Mr Turner
Mr Hunt	Mrs Urquhart
Mr Jones	Mr Waight
Mrs Jupp	Dr Walsh, KStJ, RD
Mr Jupp	Mr Wickremaratchi
Ms Kennard	

### **69 Apologies for Absence**

69.1 Apologies were received from Lt Col Barton, Mrs Bennett, Mrs Brunsdon, Mrs Jones, Mrs Mullins, Mr Patel, Mrs Smith and Mr Whittington.

69.2 Apologies for the afternoon session were received from Mr Simmons. Mrs Hall and Mr Markwell were absent for the afternoon session. Mr Oppler left at 3.15 p.m. Dr O'Kelly, Ms Lord and Mr Turner left at 4.00 p.m.

## **70 Members' Interests**

70.1 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

## **71 Minutes**

71.1 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 20 July 2018 (pages 11 to 38) be approved as a correct record.

## **72 Appointments to Committees**

72.1 The Council approved appointments to fill vacancies as set out below.

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Change</b>
Children and Young People's Services Select Committee	Mrs Bridges Ms Flynn
Performance and Finance Select Committee	Mr Catchpole (Vice-Chairman) Mr Edwards Mr Fitzjohn
Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committee	Mrs Pendleton

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

73.1 The Council approved the appointment of Mr Trevor Cristin, Director of Education, Church of England Diocese of Chichester, as a voting co-opted member of the Children and Young People's Services Select Committee to fill a vacancy.

## **74 Petition**

74.1 The Council debated the following petition. A briefing note from the Director of Law and Assurance and a statement from the petitioners and been circulated with the agenda (supplement pages 3 and 5).

Save Crawley Open House!

'This petition demands that West Sussex County Council rejects the proposed cuts to Housing Related Support, which will cause untold misery for the most vulnerable members of our society, and instead maintains this vital support for our local homeless.'

- 74.2 Mr Peter Lamb, on behalf of the petitioners, addressed the Council for five minutes in support of the petition.
- 74.3 The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health responded to the petition for five minutes on behalf of the County Council.
- 74.4 The Council debated the petition.
- 74.5 Mr Lamb, on behalf of the petitioners, and the Cabinet Member were each given three minutes to make a closing statement.
- 74.6 A proposition was moved by Mr Bradbury and seconded by Mrs Arculus as set out below:

'That this County Council supports the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health in engaging with the recently-formed consortium to ensure that future contracts meet the need for targeted support and mitigate any unintended consequences and in ensuring that the County Council's work with districts and boroughs achieves an integrated approach to tackling homelessness across the county.'

- 74.7 The proposition was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 35.5.

(a) For the proposition – **48**

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Lt Cdr Atkins, Mr Baldwin, Mr Barling, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Boram, Mr Bradbury, Mr Bradford, Mrs Bridges, Mr Catchpole, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Dennis, Mrs Duncton, Mr Edwards, Mr Elkins, Mr Fitzjohn, Ms Flynn, Ms Goldsmith, Mrs Hall, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jupp, Mr Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr Lea, Mr Markwell, Mr Marshall, Mr McDonald, Mr Mitchell, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Parikh, Mrs Pendleton, Mr Petts, Mrs Purnell, Mrs Russell, Mr Simmons, Mrs Sparkes, Mr Turner, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(b) Against the proposition - **12**

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr Jones, Ms Lord, Mrs Millson, Dr O'Kelly, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Purchese, Mr Quinn, Mr Smytherman and Dr Walsh.

(c) Abstentions – **1**

Mr Barnard

- 74.8 The proposition was carried.
- 74.9 A proposition was moved by Mr Jones and seconded by Mr Oxlade as set out below:

'That this Council supports the petition and calls on the Cabinet Member to agree to the request made in the petition and abandon the proposals to cut the home support fund in any way and confirm that the current contracts remain in place for a further year.'

74.10 The proposition was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 35.5.

(a) For the proposition – **13**

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr Jones, Ms Lord, Mr Markwell, Mrs Millson, Dr O'Kelly, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Purchase, Mr Quinn, Mr Smytherman and Dr Walsh.

(b) Against the proposition - **43**

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Lt Cdr Atkins, Mr Baldwin, Mr Barling, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Boram, Mr Bradbury, Mr Bradford, Mr Catchpole, Mr Cloake, Mrs Dennis, Mrs Duncton, Mr Edwards, Mr Elkins, Ms Flynn, Ms Goldsmith, Mrs Hall, Mr High, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jupp, Mr Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr Lea, Mr Marshall, Mr McDonald, Mr Mitchell, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Parikh, Mrs Pendleton, Mr Petts, Mrs Purnell, Mrs Russell, Mr Simmons, Mrs Sparkes, Mr Turner, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(c) Abstentions – **5**

Mr Barnard, Mrs Bridges, Mr Crow, Mr Fitzjohn and Mr Hillier.

74.11 The proposition was lost.

## **75 Motion on Tackling Homelessness and supporting those at Risk**

75.1 The following motion was moved by Mr Jones and seconded by Mr Oxlade.

'This Council is extremely concerned that 2018 has seen the number of people sleeping rough in West Sussex reach its highest level since modern records began. It supports the aims of the Government's Rough Sleeping Strategy to tackle rough sleeping and pledges to do it all it can to ensure the aims to eradicate rough sleeping become a reality in West Sussex, including targeted prevention activity. Furthermore, this Council values the work of voluntary sector organisations around the county who support some of the most vulnerable residents who are at risk of homelessness or who need support to prevent them from being homeless. The Council is concerned to note that:

(1) The current proposals being considered by the Cabinet Member which might cut the entire funding for housing support will bring significant impacts in the medium to longer term by adding to the demand for acute higher cost specialist

services and that implementation of these proposals would not only put this Council at odds with national government policy but crucially will deny local councils the opportunity to secure government funding in tackling this major social problem. In addition, the 'floating support' services at threat are a key tool for promoting social inclusion and stable communities through tenancy sustainment, community engagement and a reduction in anti-social behaviour, all key planks in meeting strategic objectives within the Council's own West Sussex Plan 2017-22;

- (2) Without this support this Council expects to see a rise in homelessness across all client groups, including families with associated social and health costs. These include direct costly impacts on social care services through family breakdown with increased child protection issues, foster and other care placements and temporary accommodation placements for intentionally homeless families. Poor educational attainment and increased truancy rates for children in unsettled and temporary accommodation will inevitably be added consequences;
- (3) The termination of housing support for young people over 18, through such initiatives as the foyers across the county, puts vulnerable young people who have either suffered a troubled family life, or are care leavers, in a position where they will be moved from a relatively stable and secure environment which can be used as a stepping stone into living independently, and either be immediately forced into shared temporary accommodation or sharing in the private rented sector, with people who will not be vetted or motivated to act in that young person's best interest. While this would be undesirable for all young people placed in that situation, it will be particularly inconsistent with the Council's duty as a corporate parent to care leavers, who form a significant proportion of the current service users; and
- (4) If funding is removed and refuge accommodation for women and their children subjected to domestic abuse is no longer available, this will put women's lives and children's lives directly at risk, as well as taking away support for women with their recovery and helping to rebuild their confidence and self-esteem, and losing specialist support workers for the children who accompany them.

This Council believes that the proposals clearly and directly fly in the face of three of the key areas of focus agreed by the Council – best start in life for children and young people, a strong, safe and sustainable place for communities and a council that works for communities. This Council further believes that a fourth key area of focus, independence in later life, is also significantly impacted by these proposals because the current preventative service model extra care housing schemes give vulnerable older people whose

disabilities, frailty or mental health make ordinary housing unsuitable the opportunity to live independent for longer.

Therefore this Council requests that the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health ensures that the existing funding through 18 contracts with housing related support services is maintained in full for 2019/20 and rejects the current proposals being considered to terminate them.'

75.2 An amendment was moved by Mr Barling and seconded by Mr Boram.

'This Council is extremely concerned that 2018 has seen the number of people sleeping rough in West Sussex reach its highest level since modern records began. It supports the aims of the Government's Rough Sleeping Strategy to tackle rough sleeping and pledges to do it all it can to ensure the aims to eradicate rough sleeping become a reality in West Sussex, including targeted prevention activity. Furthermore, this Council values the work of voluntary sector organisations around the county who support some of the most vulnerable residents who are at risk of homelessness or who need support to prevent them from being homeless. The Council is concerned to note that:

- (1) The current proposals being considered by the Cabinet Member which might cut the entire funding for housing support will bring significant impacts in the medium to longer term by adding to the demand for acute higher cost specialist services and that implementation of these proposals would not only put this Council at odds with national government policy but crucially will deny local councils the opportunity to secure government funding in tackling this major social problem. In addition, the 'floating support' services at threat are a key tool for promoting social inclusion and stable communities through tenancy sustainment, community engagement and a reduction in anti-social behaviour, all key planks in meeting strategic objectives within the Council's own West Sussex Plan 2017-22;
- (2) Without this support this Council expects to see a rise in homelessness across all client groups, including families with associated social and health costs. These include direct costly impacts on social care services through family breakdown with increased child protection issues, foster and other care placements and temporary accommodation placements for intentionally homeless families. Poor educational attainment and increased truancy rates for children in unsettled and temporary accommodation will inevitably be added consequences;
- (3) The termination of housing support for young people over 18, through such initiatives as the foyers across the county, puts vulnerable young people who have either suffered a troubled

family life, or are care leavers, in a position where they will be moved from a relatively stable and secure environment which can be used as a stepping stone into living independently, and either be immediately forced into shared temporary accommodation or sharing in the private rented sector, with people who will not be vetted or motivated to act in that young person's best interest. While this would be undesirable for all young people placed in that situation, it will be particularly inconsistent with the Council's duty as a corporate parent to care leavers, who form a significant proportion of the current service users; and

- (4) If funding is removed and refuge accommodation for women and their children subjected to domestic abuse is no longer available, this will put women's lives and children's lives directly at risk, as well as taking away support for women with their recovery and helping to rebuild their confidence and self-esteem, and losing specialist support workers for the children who accompany them.

This Council believes that the proposals clearly and directly fly in the face of three of the key areas of focus agreed by the Council – best start in life for children and young people, a strong, safe and sustainable place for communities and a council that works for communities. This Council further believes that a fourth key area of focus, independence in later life, is also significantly impacted by these proposals because the current preventative service model extra care housing schemes give vulnerable older people whose disabilities, frailty or mental health make ordinary housing unsuitable the opportunity to live independent for longer.

Therefore this Council requests that the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health ensures that ~~the existing funding through 18 contracts with housing related support services~~ **are** is maintained ***in a sustainable way and to continue to promote the Government's homelessness strategy (for rough sleepers) and continues constructive consultations with all district and borough councils and the service providers*** ~~in full for 2019/20 and rejects the current proposals being considered to terminate them.'~~

75.3 The amendment was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 35.3.

- (a) For the amendment – **48**

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Lt Cdr Atkins, Mr Baldwin, Mr Barling, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Boram, Mr Bradbury, Mr Bradford, Mrs Bridges, Mr Catchpole, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Dennis, Mrs Duncton, Mr Edwards, Mr Elkins, Mr Fitzjohn, Ms Flynn, Ms Goldsmith, Mrs Hall, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jupp, Mr Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr Lea, Mr Markwell, Mr Marshall, Mr McDonald, Mr Mitchell, Mr Montyn, Mr R J Oakley,

Mr S J Oakley, Mr Parikh, Mrs Pendleton, Mr Petts, Mrs Purnell, Mrs Russell, Mr Simmons, Mrs Sparkes, Mr Turner, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Waight and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(b) Against the amendment - **12**

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr Jones, Ms Lord, Mrs Millson, Dr O’Kelly, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Purchase, Mr Quinn, Mr Smytherman and Dr Walsh.

(c) Abstentions – **1**

Mr Barnard

75.4 The amendment was carried.

75.5 The motion as amended and set out below was agreed.

‘This Council is extremely concerned that 2018 has seen the number of people sleeping rough in West Sussex reach its highest level since modern records began. It supports the aims of the Government’s Rough Sleeping Strategy to tackle rough sleeping and pledges to do it all it can to ensure the aims to eradicate rough sleeping become a reality in West Sussex, including targeted prevention activity. Furthermore, this Council values the work of voluntary sector organisations around the county who support some of the most vulnerable residents who are at risk of homelessness or who need support to prevent them from being homeless. The Council is concerned to note that:

- (1) The current proposals being considered by the Cabinet Member which might cut the entire funding for housing support will bring significant impacts in the medium to longer term by adding to the demand for acute higher cost specialist services and that implementation of these proposals would not only put this Council at odds with national government policy but crucially will deny local councils the opportunity to secure government funding in tackling this major social problem. In addition, the ‘floating support’ services at threat are a key tool for promoting social inclusion and stable communities through tenancy sustainment, community engagement and a reduction in anti-social behaviour, all key planks in meeting strategic objectives within the Council’s own West Sussex Plan 2017-22;
- (2) Without this support this Council expects to see a rise in homelessness across all client groups, including families with associated social and health costs. These include direct costly impacts on social care services through family breakdown with increased child protection issues, foster and other care placements and temporary accommodation placements for intentionally homeless families. Poor educational attainment and increased truancy rates for



children in unsettled and temporary accommodation will inevitably be added consequences;

- (3) The termination of housing support for young people over 18, through such initiatives as the foyers across the county, puts vulnerable young people who have either suffered a troubled family life, or are care leavers, in a position where they will be moved from a relatively stable and secure environment which can be used as a stepping stone into living independently, and either be immediately forced into shared temporary accommodation or sharing in the private rented sector, with people who will not be vetted or motivated to act in that young person's best interest. While this would be undesirable for all young people placed in that situation, it will be particularly inconsistent with the Council's duty as a corporate parent to care leavers, who form a significant proportion of the current service users; and
- (4) If funding is removed and refuge accommodation for women and their children subjected to domestic abuse is no longer available, this will put women's lives and children's lives directly at risk, as well as taking away support for women with their recovery and helping to rebuild their confidence and self-esteem, and losing specialist support workers for the children who accompany them.

This Council believes that the proposals clearly and directly fly in the face of three of the key areas of focus agreed by the Council – best start in life for children and young people, a strong, safe and sustainable place for communities and a council that works for communities. This Council further believes that a fourth key area of focus, independence in later life, is also significantly impacted by these proposals because the current preventative service model extra care housing schemes give vulnerable older people whose disabilities, frailty or mental health make ordinary housing unsuitable the opportunity to live independent for longer.

Therefore this Council requests that the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health ensures that housing related support services are maintained in a sustainable way and to continue to promote the Government's homelessness strategy (for rough sleepers) and continues constructive consultations with all district and borough councils and the service providers.'

## **76 Motion on Cycling**

- 76.1 At the County Council meeting on 20 July 2018 the following motion had been moved by Dr O'Kelly, seconded by Ms Lord, and referred to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure for consideration. A report by the Cabinet Member was included with the agenda (pages 39 and 40).

'This Council recognises the significant work being done by the Cabinet to promote the benefits of increasing cycle journeys, in terms of improving fitness, reducing congestion and the need to provide additional parking spaces, and improving air quality, as well as opening up the countryside for both residents and visitors. Along with the undoubted benefits of making cycling easier, there are also a number of issues that need to be addressed for the benefit of all residents and visitors to West Sussex. There are also new developments, such as electric bikes and increasing numbers of motorised scooters, which should, ideally, be segregated from pedestrians as far as possible in town centres.

The Council therefore calls on the Cabinet to hold a county-wide Cycling Summit to explore all the issues more fully, involving the whole range of stakeholders to address at least the following issues:

- (1) The health benefits of increasing cycling miles and how this can be achieved;
- (2) The role of cycling in addressing congestion and air quality;
- (3) Increasing cycle commuting and the role of employers in encouraging this;
- (4) Cycling Safety;
- (5) Cycle tourism - opportunities and threats, including a presumption against road closures for large cycle events and damage to popular off-road routes;
- (6) Cycling education, and involving schools and other educational establishments in promoting cycling;
- (7) Involving businesses, and encouraging them to promote cycling through their travel plans;
- (8) Maximising grant funding and exploring other ways of funding new high quality infrastructure;
- (9) Design standards and increasing cycling infrastructure and capacity; and
- (10) Recognising the different challenges of promoting cycling in urban and rural environments and working with district, borough, parish and neighbourhood councils, and the South Downs National Park Authority.'

76.2 An amendment was moved by Mrs Russell and seconded by Mrs Urquhart.

'This Council recognises the significant work being done by the Cabinet to promote the benefits of increasing cycle journeys, in terms of improving **health and wellbeing** fitness, reducing

congestion and the need to provide additional parking spaces, and improving air quality, as well as opening up the countryside for both residents and visitors. Along with the undoubted benefits of making cycling easier, there are also a number of issues that need to be addressed for the benefit of all residents and visitors to West Sussex. There are also new developments, such as electric bikes and increasing numbers of motorised scooters, which should, ideally, be segregated from pedestrians as far as possible in town centres.

The Council therefore calls on the Cabinet **Members** to hold a ~~county-wide Cycling Summit~~ to explore all the issues more fully **including at the 2019 Cycling Summit**, involving the whole range of stakeholders to address ~~at least~~ the following issues:

- (1) The health **and wellbeing** benefits of increasing cycling miles and how this can be achieved;
- (2) The role of cycling in addressing congestion and air quality;
- (3) Increasing cycle commuting and the role of employers in encouraging this;
- (4) Cycling **and Pedestrian** Safety;
- (5) Cycle tourism - opportunities and threats, including a **detailed consideration of proposed** ~~presumption against~~ road closures for large cycle events and **potential consequences for** ~~damage to~~ popular off-road routes;
- (6) **The continuation of c**Cycling education **in schools through 'Bikability' courses, instructor advice and school travel plans**, ~~and involving schools and other educational establishments in promoting cycling;~~
- (7) Involving businesses, and encouraging them to promote cycling through their travel plans;
- (8) Maximising grant funding and exploring other ways of funding new high quality infrastructure;
- (9) **The success of the newly-implemented** Design standards and increasing cycling infrastructure and capacity; and
- (10) Recognising the different challenges of promoting cycling in urban and rural environments and working with district, borough, parish and neighbourhood councils, and the South Downs National Park Authority.'

76.3 The amendment was accepted.

76.4 The motion, as amended and set out below, was carried.

'This Council recognises the significant work being done by the Cabinet to promote the benefits of increasing cycle journeys, in terms of improving health and wellbeing, reducing congestion and the need to provide additional parking spaces, and improving air quality, as well as opening up the countryside for both residents and visitors. Along with the undoubted benefits of making cycling easier, there are also a number of issues that need to be addressed for the benefit of all residents and visitors to West Sussex. There are also new developments, such as electric bikes and increasing numbers of motorised scooters, which should, ideally, be segregated from pedestrians as far as possible in town centres.

The Council therefore calls on the Cabinet Members to explore issues more fully including at the 2019 Cycling Summit, involving the whole range of stakeholders to address the following issues:

- (1) The health and wellbeing benefits of increasing cycling miles and how this can be achieved;
- (2) The role of cycling in addressing congestion and air quality;
- (3) Increasing cycle commuting and the role of employers in encouraging this;
- (4) Cycling and Pedestrian Safety;
- (5) Cycle tourism - opportunities and threats, including a detailed consideration of proposed road closures for large cycle events and potential consequences for popular off-road routes;
- (6) The continuation of cycling education in schools through 'Bikability' courses, instructor advice and school travel plans;
- (7) Involving businesses, and encouraging them to promote cycling through their travel plans;
- (8) Maximising grant funding and exploring other ways of funding new high quality infrastructure;
- (9) The success of the newly-implemented Design standards and increasing cycling infrastructure and capacity; and
- (10) Recognising the different challenges of promoting cycling in urban and rural environments and working with district, borough, parish and neighbourhood councils, and the South Downs National Park Authority.'

## **77 Motion on consultation on Shale Gas and Other Oil and Gas Exploration and Production**

77.1 The following motion was moved by Ms Lord and seconded by Mrs Millson.

'This Council notes that, in May this year, Ministers outlined a proposal in a Written Ministerial Statement to redefine non-hydraulic fracturing shale gas exploration applications as permitted development and to redefine large scale shale gas production sites as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects which would mean central government would determine planning applications rather than local authorities.

This Council believes that the wishes of local communities should be considered in decisions on shale gas and other oil and gas exploration and production, and that these decisions are best determined by local Mineral Planning Authorities through the planning process.

This Council resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Environment respond to the Government's consultation that applications for shale gas exploration, and for other oil and gas exploration, should not become permitted development and that they, along with planning applications for shale gas production, should be determined by local planning authorities in accordance with planning law and guidance, and also to share this response with West Sussex MPs and relevant government ministers.'

- 77.2 An amendment was moved by Mrs Duncton and seconded by Dr Walsh.

'This Council notes that, in May this year, Ministers outlined a proposal in a Written Ministerial Statement to redefine non-hydraulic fracturing shale gas exploration applications as permitted development and to redefine large scale shale gas production sites as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects which would mean central government would determine planning applications rather than local authorities.

This Council believes that the wishes of local communities should be considered in decisions on shale gas and other oil and gas exploration and production, and that these decisions are best determined by local Mineral Planning Authorities through the planning process.

This Council resolves to **support the proposed draft responses, as published on 10 October 2018 in the Members' Information Service newsletter**, ask the Cabinet Member for Environment respond to the Government's consultation that applications for shale gas exploration, and for other oil and gas exploration, should not become permitted development and that they, along with planning applications for shale gas production, should be determined by local planning authorities in accordance with planning law and guidance, and **to** also to share this response with West Sussex MPs and relevant government ministers **making it clear that we will oppose attempts by the Government to dilute local democracy.**'

77.3 The amendment was accepted.

77.4 The motion, as amended and set out below, was carried.

'This Council notes that, in May this year, Ministers outlined a proposal in a Written Ministerial Statement to redefine non-hydraulic fracturing shale gas exploration applications as permitted development and to redefine large scale shale gas production sites as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects which would mean central government would determine planning applications rather than local authorities.

This Council believes that the wishes of local communities should be considered in decisions on shale gas and other oil and gas exploration and production, and that these decisions are best determined by local Mineral Planning Authorities through the planning process.

This Council resolves to support the proposed draft responses, as published on 10 October 2018 in the Members' Information Service newsletter, should not become permitted development and that they, along with planning applications for shale gas production, should be determined by local planning authorities in accordance with planning law and guidance, and to also share this response with West Sussex MPs and relevant government ministers making it clear that we will oppose attempts by the Government to dilute local democracy.'

## **78 Motion on Scrutiny of Strategic Budget Options**

78.1 With the agreement of the Council, Dr Walsh withdrew his motion on scrutiny of strategic budget options, having accepted assurances given in the briefing note on the arrangements for consultation for proposed savings decisions and budget preparation.

## **79 Motion on Fire and Rescue Service Funding**

79.1 The following motion was moved by Mr Jones and seconded by Mr Purchase.

'This Council notes the existing, and increasing, gap in the funding provided per person from the Government towards West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service (WSFRS), in comparison to the per person funding in all of those Fire and Rescue Services immediately surrounding it. Not only are many of these surrounding authorities receiving much higher sums to protect their communities, but with further government cuts in 2019/20, the gap is set to become far worse, and even more unfair, for West Sussex. Moreover, the local government Settlement Funding Assessment for fire authorities shows West Sussex having the biggest funding cut in England, between 2016/17 and 2019/20, of 45%. The English average is a 15% cut.

This Council also notes that despite assurances by the previous Chief Fire Officer that there would always be a minimum of 30 fire appliances and crews available, out of 35 across the county at any one time, that in practice, between 7 am and 7 pm, there are rarely more than 15 available, sometimes as few as 10, and that firefighters are having to work hard to keep such numbers and maintain the resilience of the Service.

This Council further notes that WSFRS has already had very deep cuts made to it in recent years, with £2.5 million and £1.6 million in 2012 and 2014 respectively, making it according to the FBU the second worst hit fire authority in the proportion of its overall number of firefighters lost in the whole of Great Britain, with a reduction of 37% of its firefighters, during that time.

The Council is aware that it was confirmed at the September meeting of the Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee, that the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities would be coming forward with proposals for further cuts to the Service in November, although as of the date this motion was submitted, this was still not indicated on the Council's Forward Plan of key decisions.

The Council is also aware the forthcoming HMI inspection of WSFRS is not due to begin until November, and aside from some preliminary feedback expected during the following month, is not due to formally publish its conclusions until its final report, expected in May 2019.

This Council believes in the context of the circumstances outlined above, and also because it is impossible to predict what issues or extra demands the HMI inspection may reveal which will require action, it would be inappropriate at this time to come forward with any measures which would reduce the amount of funding WSFRS receives.

The Council therefore resolves:

- (1) To request the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities abandons any plans to bring forward further proposals for cuts to WSFRS, as the service has taken as many cuts as it can bear without further compromising public and firefighter safety, and further threatening the availability of crews and appliances at the county's fire stations; and
- (2) To request the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities jointly write to the relevant Government Minister, questioning the inequalities in funding for WSFRS and calling for it to be raised so that it is in line with the funding that other neighbouring fire authorities receive, per person.'

79.2 The motion was referred to the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities for consideration.

## **80 Question Time**

80.1 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 45 to 58) and a supplementary report (supplement pages 1 to 3) and written questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 2.38 (set out at Appendix 2).

## **81 Performance and Finance Select Committee: Annual Scrutiny Performance 2017/18**

81.1 The Council considered the Annual Scrutiny Newsletter 2017/18 which summarised the work of the Select Committees and reported the performance measures to the end of the year, in the light of a report by the Performance and Finance Select Committee (pages 59 to 76).

81.2 Resolved –

That the Annual Scrutiny Newsletter 2017/18, as attached at Appendix 1 to the report, be approved.

## **82 Report of Urgent Action**

82.1 The report of urgent action taken under regulation 11 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 (pages 77 and 78) was noted.

Chairman

The Council rose at 4.15 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>
Item 6 - Petition on 'Save Crawley Open House'	Mr Boram	Member of Adur District Council
	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and Chairman of Building Heroes Education Foundation
	Mr Burrett	Prejudicial Interest as Trustee of Crawley Open House (Mr Burrett left the room for the discussion of the item)
	Mr Hillier	Close relative has a close association with Crawley Open House
	Mr Jones	Cabinet Member for Housing at Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Quinn	Member of Crawley Borough Council
Item 7(a) - Motion on Tackling Homelessness and supporting those at risk	Mr Boram	Member of Adur District Council
	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and Chairman of Building Heroes Education Foundation
	Mr Burrett	Prejudicial Interest as Trustee of Crawley Open House (Mr Burrett left the room for the discussion of the item)
	Mr Hillier	Close relative has a close association with Crawley Open House
	Mr Jones	Cabinet Member for Housing at Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Lanzer	Member of Crawley Borough Council

<b>Item</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Item 7(a) - Motion on Tackling Homelessness and supporting those at risk (cont)	Mr S J Oakley	Member of Chichester District Council
	Mr Quinn	Member of Crawley Borough Council
	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council and Trustee of Coastal West Sussex MIND
	Mr Turner	Member of Worthing Borough Council
Item 8 – Question Time All paragraphs	Mr Bradbury	Trustee of Sussex Learning Trust, member of Mid Sussex District Council and Chairman of Building Heroes Education Foundation
	Mr Smytherman	Member of Worthing Borough Council and Trustee of Coastal West Sussex MIND
Item 8 – Question Time Paragraph 9 (Rail timetable change inquiry)	Dr Dennis	Annual rail season ticket holder between Horsham and London
Item 8 – Question Time Paragraph 19 (Stoptober)	Mr Turner	Pharmacist
Item 8 – Question Time Paragraph 20 (Flu Campaign)	Mr Turner	Pharmacist
Item 8 – Question Time Paragraph 21 (Going Local)	Mr Turner	Pharmacist
Item 8 - Question Time Paragraph 24 (Local Government Pension Fund Awards)	Mr Burrett	Member of Local Government Pension Scheme
	Mr Lanzer	Deferred member of Local Government Pension Scheme
Item 8 - Question Time (Incineration of clinical waste)	Mr Parikh	Work for and have funding from the NHS

---

**Written Questions: 19 October 2018**

1. Written question from **Mrs Mullins** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Adults and Health**

**Question**

The Cabinet Member may recall that at the February County Council meeting this year, the budget papers referred to an announcement in the provisional local government finance settlement, allowing local authorities to increase council tax from 2% to 3%, before a referendum was needed. As a result a core rise in council tax of 2.95% was included in the 2018/19 revenue budget presented (alongside an additional 2% for adult social care). That budget report went on to describe a number of one off investments for 2018/19 totalling £2.5m, to be paid for out of additional money raised through council tax.

Among those one-off investments was an allocation of £0.6m, to work with district and borough councils, to develop options to provide increased temporary accommodation in the county and reduce the growing level of homelessness being experienced across West Sussex.

Can the Cabinet Member please provide:

- (a) A breakdown per district and borough, of how many additional places were delivered for homeless people, as a result of that £0.6m funding allocation, so far this year; and
- (b) Information on how many of those additional places might be impacted by the cuts in housing related support which she is proposing to make in next year's budget.

**Answer**

The County Council does not have a statutory role in addressing homelessness as this legal duty sits with the district tier of local government.

However, the authority recognises that there is a significant interdependence between support for vulnerable people and access to accommodation and is already playing an active part in supporting those residents affected by homelessness who are central to the County Council's statutory duties – including 16 and 17-year-olds, Care Leavers and households identified as Intentionally Homeless.

- (a) Current work to consult partners and providers on the future funding of the 'Housing Related Support contracts' includes remodelling future service provision to focus on the most vulnerable and to identify potential use of County Council assets to support additional units of accommodation. This one-off funding is thus supporting work to quantify demand pressures and consider opportunities for shared accommodation initiatives with the district and borough councils and has identified the following additional units of accommodation to date;

- Eight properties across the county that will be leased to the local district council on a peppercorn basis, which will manage them on the County Council's behalf, and the capacity shared by both authorities to accommodate homeless households to whom a statutory duty is owed.

The first two of these properties are expected to go live with Crawley Borough Council in December 2018 following completion of some refurbishment works.

- Seven units based in Chichester for young people, which will provide two emergency access bed spaces for homeless 16 and 17-year-olds and Care Leavers and will provide five units of longer-term supported accommodation for this client group.

This project is scheduled to come on line on 17 December 2018.

- Exploration of the transfer of a surplus County Council site within Adur District to the local council to support the development of additional units of accommodation in exchange for County Council nomination rights for those threatened with homelessness.

Further work to review additional asset opportunities is being developed alongside the work to remodel service provision with partners.

In addition, £50,000 has been utilised as a one-off uplift to increase the number of units and level of support provided to rough sleepers in the south of the county through additional funding to support the opening of the new 24/7 Bognor Hostel, run by StonePillow. The long-term provision of these services is part of the remodelling of the Housing Related Support contracts, as above.

- (b) As no decision has yet been made and the consultation with stakeholders is still ongoing, it is not possible to provide this information.

**2. Written question from Mr Oxlade for reply by the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People**

**Question**

I have a number of questions relating to Beechfield secure children's home in Copthorne, West Sussex which closed in 2016 following an inadequate Ofsted inspection. I understand the home required major building work which was subsequently undertaken and signed off at the end of 2017 but that the unit remains closed at present.

Can the Cabinet Member please tell me:

- (a) Whether the County Council is or has been paying for any West Sussex children being accommodated in similar facilities within other local authorities since the facility closed in 2016;

- (b) Whether any operating licences/registration has to be in place and if so, when any current licences are due to expire/have expired;
- (c) How much the refurbishment has cost and to what extent this has improved the facilities available previously (e.g. any additional beds or equipment for more therapeutic services);
- (d) For each of the three years prior to the closure of the facility confirm the extent to which the operating costs exceeded the income generated through other local authority placements;
- (e) How much the facility is costing on average per month whilst sitting empty (in terms of insurance/security/re-deploying staff in alternative roles); and finally
- (f) Summarise the nature of any discussions he or officers have had with the Department for Education and/or Ofsted regarding the future of this facility and confirm when he anticipates a decision will be taken as to whether to re-open it or not.

### Answer

- (a) A total of four children (five placements) have been placed in Secure Accommodation at a cost of £454,000 since the closure in October 2016.
- (b) Beechfield's license is due to expire on 31 March 2019.
- (c) There has been a total spend of £729,000 spent on the refurbishment of Beechfield, all of which has been Department for Education (DfE) Grant Funded.
- (d) Including corporate spend and overheads, the expenditure exceeded the income in the following years:

Year	Cost
2013/14	£49,000
2014/15	£167,000
2015/16	£386,000

- (e) The majority of staff have now been redeployed into other vacant posts already budgeted for in the directorate. For those staff that remain 'over establishment', the cost to the budget from 1 April to 30 September has been c£150,000. The cost for the remainder of the financial year is anticipated to be around £15,000 per month. However, this may reduce further still through Beechfield leavers or through other posts becoming vacant that these staff can then be redeployed into.

Rates	£17,500
Grounds maintenance	£8,013
Utilities	£19,554

Mechanical and electrical maintenance	£37,619
Facilities Management visits	£5,000
Security	£10,000
Total budget per annum	£97,686

- (f) Officers have been involved in ongoing discussions with the DfE and Ofsted about the future options for the facility. In September 2018 the DfE undertook a site visit. The Executive Director Children, Adults, Families, Health and Education is now leading on these discussions and we are hopeful that a final decision regarding the future of Beechfield will be confirmed in coming months.

**3. Written question from Dr Walsh for reply by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations**

**Question**

I understand that Performance Related Pay (PRP) is being introduced for Hay management grades across the County Council.

- (a) Who took this decision and when?
- (b) Was any consultation carried out with staff organisations, and if so, which?
- (c) Was a full analysis of the risks and benefits carried out and is it available?
- (d) What is the financial provision for the scheme?
- (e) How many employees are eligible for the scheme, and at what grades?
- (f) What percentage of basic pay do the PRP payments represent at each grade?
- (g) Is PRP a one off payment, or an addition to basic salary?
- (h) Why was this not presented to the Performance and Finance Select Committee for scrutiny?

**Answer**

(a), (b), (c) and (h):

The Council's Pay Policy was agreed by the County Council on 16 February 2018 and amended by the County Council on 20 July 2018. The following paragraphs are for particular note:

- '5.1 Staff on NJC and Hay grades are eligible for annual incremental increases to base pay until they reach the top of the grade for their role. There is no further base pay progression once the employee reaches the maximum of the grade, with the exception of a small

---

number of staff who retain an entitlement to an additional long service increment, in accordance with the rules of a scheme which is no longer current.

- 5.2 Incremental progression is subject to 'satisfactory' performance and this will be defined within the Council's Performance Management Policy/Procedure.
- 6.5 The pay awards for staff on Hay pay grades are determined locally and are approved by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Director of Human Resources and Organisational Change; and following consultation with the staff concerned and UNISON.
- 6.6 The total sum available for any pay increase for staff on SMG or Hay grading arrangements is decided annually by the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Director of Finance, Performance and Procurement (S151 Officer) and Director of Human Resources and Organisational Change. This is based on consideration of appropriate market and other relevant information, including the performance of the County Council and affordability.
- 6.7 In exceptional circumstances; and as approved by the Leader in the case of SMG Tier 1; and as approved by the Chief Executive in the case of SMG Tier 2 to 4 and Hay grades - an unconsolidated additional payment may be made to recognise exceptional performance.'
- (d) Please see paragraph 6.6 of the Pay Policy. The financial provision is agreed as part of the budget setting process.
- (e) There are 404 Hay graded staff – all paid according to the provisions of the Pay Policy.
- (f) Not applicable.
- (g) The only reference within the Pay Policy to an unconsolidated payment provision is in paragraph 6.7.

**4. Written question from Mr Jones for reply by the Cabinet Member for Environment**

**Question**

The Cabinet Member will no doubt be aware of the concerns raised by organisations like the British Lung Foundation, and campaigns such as #noidling and Doctors against Diesel, highlighting the impact of air pollution on children.

A recent report by Unicef UK and Queen Mary University of London has demonstrated that while youngsters only spend 40 per cent of their time on the school run and at school, they receive 60 per cent of their exposure to tiny particles of black carbon during that time. Moreover, research by Greenpeace in

2017 indicates that more than 2,000 schools and nurseries across the country are located close to roads with illegal levels of pollution, underlining the seriousness of the problem.

I am aware of the county-wide action plan for tackling air quality published earlier this year which makes reference to funding provided by the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) to deliver a targeted intervention with 13 schools within the air quality management areas (AQMAs) in West Sussex aimed at reducing idling during school drop-offs and pick-ups, increasing walking and cycling rates and to measures the changes.

Can the Cabinet Member please:

- (a) Confirm which schools will be involved in this intervention and when she anticipates the findings being available;
- (b) Outline what other action with schools is planned to highlight and address this issue; and
- (c) In light of the above question, will she encourage headteachers in schools across West Sussex to comply with the guidance, in as far as they are not doing this already, from the National Education Union (NEU) and the British Lung Foundation, key elements which include:
  - Encouraging schools to create action plans to protect pupils' health. This includes installing air pollution monitors to show when toxic air is worst, in order to help make decisions about outside PE lessons and monitor vulnerable pupils with underlying health conditions.
  - Recommending the introduction of travel plans to reduce the danger of air pollution around schools. This could include car sharing, safe walking routes away from main roads, making sure there is sufficient parking for scooters and bikes, discouraging car parking outside the school gates and asking parents arriving in cars to turn off their engines.
  - Reminding parents that children in buggies are at greater risk, due to their proximity to vehicle exhaust pipes; and
  - Linking air pollution and its impact to the national curriculum in Science, PHSE, English and Geography.

**Answer**

- (a) Following the award of £105,900 from Defra to target interventions, as described in the question above, with schools within or very close to air quality management areas across Sussex, Sustrans and Living Streets have been appointed as delivery partners.

26 schools have been approached to fill 13 spaces for West Sussex. A number have agreed to take part and a few have declined. Activities with the schools will be arranged to fit around their own particular timetables, so



final results will not be available until the end of the project next September. However, we will know how the messages around anti-idling etc. have been received from the regular reports from the delivery partners.

The schools approached are:

Adur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buckingham Park Primary</li> <li>• Eastbrook Primary</li> <li>• Glebe Primary Academy</li> <li>• St Nicholas &amp; St Mary Primary</li> <li>• St Peter's Primary</li> <li>• Swiss Gardens Primary</li> </ul>
Chichester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central School</li> <li>• Lancastrian</li> <li>• Parklands Community Primary School</li> <li>• Portfield Primary</li> <li>• St Richard's</li> </ul>
Crawley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazelwick School</li> <li>• Milton Mount Primary</li> <li>• Northgate Primary School</li> <li>• Pound Hill Infant Academy</li> <li>• Pound Hill Junior Academy</li> <li>• Three Bridges Primary School</li> </ul>
Horsham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St Peter's, Cowfold</li> <li>• Storrington Primary</li> <li>• Thakeham Primary</li> </ul>
Mid Sussex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hassocks</li> <li>• Windmills</li> </ul>
Worthing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bramber</li> <li>• Broadwater</li> <li>• Downsbrook Primary</li> <li>• Thomas A Becket Infant School</li> <li>• Thomas A Becket Junior School</li> </ul>

- (b) The lessons learnt from the Defra grant project will be shared with all schools including any who were not able to participate in the project initially. We also continue to work with the EYE Project (Eco Young Engaged) to bring environmental messages to schools and we arranged for an air quality stand at the Chichester event on 5 October 2018. Sustrans and Living Streets were also represented. This will be repeated at future events in other areas across the county.
- (c) I will work with the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills and the Director for Public Health to agree the best way to encourage more involvement in schools. Work with schools on School Travel Plans and safer routes to school will continue to be carried out by the Local Transport Improvement Officers.

**5. Written question from Mr Jones for reply by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources**

**Question**

The Adur Planning Committee recently approved a hybrid planning application that could see 600 new houses and an Ikea store built in Lancing.

I understand that the 2ha site that the County Council was seeking for a primary school has been included with the planning permission but that the £4.35m in Section 106 funding to meet the costs of primary, secondary and further education provision in the local area arising from the additional housing allocation, was not. Furthermore, that same development essentially depends upon a 'land swap' with the developer of land owned by the County Council, although the terms for the proposed land transfer are not, as yet, agreed.

Can the Cabinet Member(s) please:

- (a) Assure me, given the serious impact the entire New Monks Farm development will have on the surrounding towns and parishes, that although this Council has yet to directly seek the views of the residents of those surrounding towns and parishes, it will now engage fully with them in respect of whether to proceed, and that these views will be taken into account prior to a decision approving any such 'land swap' being made;
- (b) Advise me (in confidence outside this meeting if needs be) of the value of the existing land owned by the Council known as Withy Patch;
- (c) Confirm whether the 'land swap' of the land owned by the Council at Withy Patch would be a key decision, and when it is anticipated this might be taken;
- (d) With regard to the provision of developer contributions towards education as a result of additional housing on this development, can the Cabinet Member please confirm:
  - (i) How significant a problem is the failure of the County Council to secure the requested £4.35m;
  - (ii) What level of contribution in s106 funding towards education provision he anticipates the County Council will receive; and
  - (iii) Comment on the extent to which the taxpayer will end up having to fund additional school places as a result of this development.

**Answer**

- (a) As part of the planning application process, and in accordance with planning legislation, there has already been full consultation with the public and an opportunity for all those residents affected to make representations. The County Council does not propose to undertake an additional consultation

with residents. In the event that the County Council proposes to proceed with the relocation of the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) site, there will be full consultation with the individual residents at the site.

- (b) The value of the existing GRT site at Withy Patch remains dependent on a number of factors which are yet to be agreed. Discussions are ongoing with the developers and it would prejudice those discussions for any sum to be disclosed.
- (c) It is anticipated that any land transfer arrangements related to the relocation of the Withy Patch site would require a key decision. The preparation of a report is dependent on provisional agreement of terms.
- (d)
  - (i) The County Council still expects to receive some S106 contributions towards the new primary school project costs and will consider how best to deliver the new school from available funding;
  - (ii) At this stage the County Council cannot confirm the level of S106 contributions that will be received from developers; and
  - (iii) The County Council always seeks to ensure developers fully mitigate the impact of their development to minimise the costs to the County Council. However, if the full value of a new school cannot be secured by S106 contributions, the County Council would look to address any shortfall by the use of either Basic Need grant from central government or the possibility of a Department for Education-funded Free School.

**6. Written question from Mrs Mullins for reply by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources**

**Question**

In July 2011, the then Cabinet Member for Education and Schools, declared the former Court Meadow site surplus to operational requirements, from September 2012. At that time he stated the site would be sold, with the capital receipt used towards the cost of the Woodlands Meed project.

Since then the site was leased for a period of time to the Building Heroes Education Foundation, but I believe has largely remained vacant.

I understand that the former school site was marketed over the summer, with several offers having been received. However, Cuckfield Parish Council has submitted an application to declare the property an asset of community value, which the County Council has objected to. I believe a decision by Mid Sussex District Council on the outcome is awaited and presumably the Cabinet Member will either take a decision to formally declare the land surplus to requirements, or engage with the Parish Council regarding their proposals.

Can the Cabinet Member please tell me:

- (a) Given that the land ceased to be used for education purposes in September 2012, why it has taken more than six years to market the site for re-sale;
- (b) What has the former school site been used for since September 2012 and for how long;
- (c) Whether the land is being marketed with planning permission for housing;
- (d) What liaison has taken place with the adjacent travellers site and Orchard House Respite Care Home, regarding the proposed future use of the site;
- (e) Whether he will commit to ensuring the proceeds achieved from the sale be 'ring fenced' for Woodlands Meed, or special needs in general; and
- (f) How much it has cost to transport pupils, from the former Court Meadow school site, to alternative education facilities, including escort costs, over the past six years.

**Answer**

- (a) It was not considered prudent to market this site following the school closure in 2012. The potential proceeds from a sale at that time would have generated an insignificant capital sum. The subsequent housing allocation (for 10 dwellings) within the Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan, improved market conditions and certainty around the need to retain the adjoining property led to the more recent decision to offer the site for sale.
- (b) The Court Meadow buildings were occupied by Building Heroes from 2014 to July 2015. The property has remained vacant since that time, apart from a classroom on the site which is currently used by Orchard House on a temporary basis.
- (c) The site has not been marketed with the benefit of a planning permission for housing. Any proposed sale would be conditional upon the purchaser securing planning approval for a form of development acceptable to the County Council and sensitive to the location of Orchard House and the Lodge.
- (d) There has been full consultation with Children's Services and the management at Orchard House concerning the proposed disposal. There has been no direct engagement with the families occupying the nearby County Council-owned travellers site.
- (e) Current practice for the sale of assets is to put the capital receipts into the County Council's Capital Programme. Their use is then strategically considered against the corporate priorities of the West Sussex Plan which, of course, includes access to education that meets the needs of our community.
- (f) County Council records show that 39 pupils were provided with transport to Court Meadow school in the school year before closure (2011/12). In most cases pupils were transferred to Woodlands Meed school and provided with

---

transport to get to Woodlands Meed. In some cases there was a change of placement, either immediately or in subsequent years, that was not connected to the new school being built. The County Council does not have records for the costs in the ensuing years of each individual's transport to Woodlands Meed (or the new placements) who were previously at Court Meadow.

**7. Written question from Mrs Dennis for reply by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure**

**Question**

The Burgess Hill Northern Arc will deliver 3,500 new houses in the land to the north of Burgess Hill, most of which is in the parish ward of Ansty, together with a substantial upgrade of the A2300 - the east/west link from the A23 into Burgess Hill through the parish wards of Twineham and Hurstpierpoint. The project has yet to be subjected to planning examination, although this is imminent. The planning vision promises to deliver 'the best of town and country to offer vibrant local centres' and a development with a 'sense of place' but mentions nothing about protecting the surrounding villages from the impact of the 20,000 plus additional daily traffic movements this will generate.

What practical steps does the County Council propose to take to preserve and enhance the sense of place in the villages that will be most affected by this huge development?

**Answer**

The development of the Northern Arc is a priority for both the County Council and Mid Sussex District Council, identified in the Burgess Hill Growth Deal agreed by the Leaders and Chief Executives of both authorities. County Council officers worked with Homes England and Mid Sussex District Council in the development of the Masterplan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which were approved by the Mid Sussex District Council Cabinet in September 2018.

The Masterplan and IDP identify a clear phasing and investment strategy that will ensure the required infrastructure is provided to support growth including a new secondary school, two new primary schools, delivery of an east/west internal link road, full funding of the link road junction with the A2300 and sustainable transport links between Northern Arc and key destinations. Overall, the projects will deliver infrastructure with a value in excess of £162m.

The Masterplan and IDP set a number of key principles in terms of the form and phasing of development. However, it is important to recognise that a further level of detail will be required to support planning applications which will be subject to approval by Mid Sussex District Council in consultation with the County Council.

Transport Assessments and traffic modelling accompanying the planning applications will detail the precise extent and design of proposed highways and transport improvements.

The traffic modelling will include an assessment of impacts and mitigation on the local villages and the local road network, including the B2036. The requirement to identify the impacts and deliver appropriate mitigation is highlighted in both the Masterplan and the IDP and is emphasised in the County Council's consultation response to Mid Sussex District Council in relation to both documents.

County Council officers continue to work closely with Mid Sussex District Council and Homes England and will provide quarterly updates on progress in relation to this significant development opportunity being delivered in our county.

**8. Written question from Mr Quinn for reply by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure**

**Question**

The Cabinet Member may recall that at February Council this year the budget papers referred to an announcement in the provisional local government finance settlement allowing local authorities to increase council tax from 2% to 3% before a referendum was needed. As a result a core rise in council tax of 2.95% was included in the 2018/19 revenue budget presented (alongside an additional 2% for adult social care). That budget report went on to describe a number of one off investments for 2018/19 totalling £2.5m to be paid for out of additional money raised through council tax.

- (a) Among those one-off investments was an allocation of £0.5m for a programme of works relating to white lines and signage to improve the safety of the County's roads. As I drive around the county I still see roads without clearly marked white lines and signage obscured by overgrown vegetation. Can the Cabinet Member please let me have a breakdown per District and Borough of how much of this £0.5m funding was spent on: (i) white lines, and (ii) signage, and which roads were dealt with? Can he also advise what money remains available in this year's budget to tackle this issue.
- (b) Furthermore, on my travels I am noticing a considerable increase in kerbside vegetation growth which, if not addressed in a timely way, can lead to cracked pavements and road surfaces. Can the Cabinet Member please confirm in respect of each Borough and District how often spraying to tackle this issue is planned and at what intervals, and whether this commitment has or will be met this year.

**Answer**

- (a) Please find below details showing all sign/ line jobs either completed or due to be completed by end of this financial year.

We have identified over £440,000 worth of work with a further £60,000 work expected to be identified in the next month.

Town	Road	Work Type	Forecast Cost	Km of lines
Worthing	Broadwater Road	Lines	£15,000.00	1.6
Crawley	a264 SW bypass	signs	£13,129.00	
Crawley	a2220	signs	£2,978.00	
County	A286 Chi to Midhurst ( raised as	Lines	£35,000.00	16
County	A281 Lining	Lines	£19,500.00	12
Slaugham	Warninglid Lane Slaugham (2.9km)	Lines	£8,897.00	2.9
Burgess Hill	Leylands Road Burgess Hill (1.3km)	Lines	£6,803.00	1.3
Burgess Hill	London Road Burgess Hill (1.3km)	Lines	£7,002.00	1.3
New timber	Saddlescombe Road Newtimber (Priority	Lines	£5,022.09	3
Henfield	Henfield Road Poynings (Priority	Lines	£4,715.29	3.8
New timber	Muddleswood Road Newtimber (Priority	Lines	£1,954.16	1.5
New timber	Brighton Road Newtimber (Priority	Lines	£3,899.67	2.2
Albourne & Sayers Common	London Road Albourne & Sayers Common (Priority	Lines	£5,639.40	3.3
Crawley	Crawley Avenue A222	lines	£45,923	5
slinfold	a264	lines	£15,363.00	5
Crawley	A 264 SW bypass	studs	£7,396.00	11
Lyminster	Lyminster Road	lines	£3,187.00	1.3
Crawley	a264 SW bypass	lines	£10,048.00	4
County	A24	Signs	£85,000.00	
County	A24	Signs	£0.00	
County	A24	Signs	£0.00	
Worthing	Chapel Road	Signs	£6,000.00	
Haywards Heath	Boardhill lane	lines	£10,506.00	2
County	A272 Hampshire to	Lines	£70,000.00	32
Worthing	Longfurlong	lines	£2,063.00	0.5
Scaynes Hill	Lewes Road	Signs	£3,127.00	
Bolney	Cowfold Road	Signs	£4,295.00	
Bognor	A29	lines	£6,076.00	3
Stedham	A272	lines	£2,274.00	0.7
Pagham	Lower Bognor Road	lines	£7,892.00	2.2
Westbourne	Emsworth common	lines	£7,979.00	3
Broadbridge Heath	Farthings Hill	lines	£4,280.00	1
Henfield	A281	lines	£5,079.00	1
Hurstpierpoint	A281	lines	£2,587.00	1.7
Haywards Heath	Sussex Sq	lines	£4,217.00	1
Shoreham	A281 Lining	lines	£6,655.00	0.75
Crawley	Manor Royal	lines	£3,490.00	0.6
			<b>£442,976.61</b>	<b>125</b>

- (b) With regard to weed spraying highways carry out up to two complete sprays throughout the county each year. Depending on weed growth and available budget, some areas are treated a third time if budget allows. Weed Spraying is carried out during May to June and again August to September. The weed spraying programme is due to finish next week.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Question Time: 19 October 2018**

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**

Paragraph 5, Pupil Attainment at Key Stages 1 and 2 (Cabinet Member for Education and Skills), from Ms Flynn.

Alternative Provision College, (Cabinet Member for Education and Skills), from Mr Buckland and Dr Walsh.

In response to a question from Mr Buckland about the secondary unit of the Alternative Provision College in Chichester to his division, the Cabinet Member agreed to provide a written response to the following questions:

- Why was Mr Buckland, as local member, not informed about the change
- Why were other local organisations not consulted (i.e. the Town Council has youth services in the building)
- Did the Council consider the crime and anti-social behaviour implications – if so, could the risk assessment be provided
- Did the Council consider the implications for anti-social behaviour on the rail network – if so, could the risk assessment be provided
- Were the Police, Transport Police and other key agencies consulted – if so, could their responses be provided
- Is any review of the decision planned in terms of its effectiveness and any negative impact on the town centre?

**A Prosperous Place**

Paragraph 8, Horsham Enterprise Park (Leader/Economy), from Mr Jupp and Mrs Millson.

Paragraphs 10 and 28, A27 Improvements (Leader and Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Mr Jones, Mr Montyn and Dr Walsh.

In response to a request from Mr Montyn that the Leader urge the member of Parliament for Chichester to emphasise at Westminster and with Highways England the need for a long-term and comprehensive solution and adequate funding for a full scheme for the A27 at Chichester, the Leader agreed to write to Mrs Keegan.

Paragraph 30, Velo South Stakeholder Engagement (Leader and Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr S J Oakley and Dr O'Kelly.

In relation to the targeted parish meetings, in response to a request from Mr Oakley the Leader agreed include the parishes affected by the parking contingency plan in relation to the impact on the A27.

Second runway at Gatwick (Leader/Economy), from Mr Acraman, Mrs Kitchen and Mr Quinn.

Written Question 7, Burgess Hill Northern Arc (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Mr Bradbury and Mrs Dennis.

The Cabinet Member agreed to meet Mr Bradbury to discuss traffic management and the need to preserve a sense of place in the surrounding villages.

Cost of repairing speed indicator devices and insurance position (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Mr Acraman and Mr Baldwin.

In response to a question from Mr Baldwin about the insurance position in relation to speed indicator devices and, particularly in areas where there is no parish precept, options for funding, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources agreed to liaise with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure to clarify the position and respond to Mr Baldwin.

### **A Strong, Safe and Sustainable Place**

Paragraph 13, National Hate Awareness Week 13 to 20 October 2018 (Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Mr Jones.

In response to a question from Mr Jones about a recent incident in Barns Green and to what extent the record number of incidents point to an increase in activity and extremism in the far right movement and/or an increase in hate crime incidences in rural communities, the Cabinet Member said she would provide him with the figures.

Paragraph 14, Worthing Community Hub Pilot (Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Mr Smytherman.

Paragraph 16, Household Waste Recycling Sites Permit Scheme (Cabinet Member for Environment), from Mr Purchase, Mrs Purnell and Mr Quinn.

Paragraph 17, West Sussex Waste Partnership Food Waste Campaign (Cabinet Member for Environment), from Mr Barling and Mrs Millson.

Incineration of clinical waste (Cabinet Member for Environment), from Mr Parikh.

### **A Council that works for the Community**

Paragraph 23, Public Services Infrastructure: Gigabit (Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations), from Mrs Duncton and Mr S J Oakley.

In response to a question from Mrs Duncton, the Cabinet Member agreed to send all members information about the business voucher scheme for small and medium-sized businesses.

Paragraph 25, County Council Funding (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources), from Dr Dennis.

Member involvement in staff groups (Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations and Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Mr Oxlade.

Written Question 3, Performance-Related Pay (Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations), from Mr Jones and Mr Purchase.

This page is intentionally left blank