

Public Document Pack

West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

14 December 2018

At the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 am on Friday, 14 December 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 Barrett-Miles	Mr Markwell
Lt Col Barton, TD	Mr Marshall
Mrs Bennett	Mr McDonald
Mr Boram	Mrs Millson
Mr Bradbury	Mr Mitchell
Mr Bradford	Mr Montyn
Mrs Brunson	Mrs Mullins
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 Dunton	Mr Petts
Mr Edwards	Mr Purchase
Mr Elkins	Mrs Purnell
Mr Fitzjohn	Mr Quinn
Ms Flynn	Mrs Russell
Ms Goldsmith	Mr Simmons
Mr High	Mr Smytherman
Mr Hillier	Mrs Sparkes
Mr Hunt	Mr Turner
Mrs Jones, MBE	Mrs Urquhart
Mr Jones	Mr Waight
Mrs Jupp	Dr Walsh, KStJ, RD
Mr Jupp	Mr Whittington
Ms Kennard	Mr Wickremaratchi

83 Interim Director of Children and Family Services and Director of Education and Skills

83.1 The Chairman welcomed Andrew Fraser, Interim Director of Children and Family Services, and Paul Wagstaff, Director of Education and Skills, to their first meeting as Directors.

84 Deaths of Mr Robert Dunn and Mr David Whyberd

84.1 The Chairman reported the deaths of two former members of the Council – Mr Robert Dunn, who had represented the Southwick South division from 1981 to 1985 and the Saltings division from 2003 to 2013, and Mr David Whyberd, who had represented the West Tarring division from 1981 to 1993.

84.2 Members stood for a minute's silence.

85 100th Anniversary of Women's Suffrage

85.1 The Chairman reminded members that 14 December 2018 marked the 100th Anniversary of the day when women were first able to exercise their right to vote.

86 Apologies for Absence

86.1 Apologies were received from Mr Barling, Mrs Bridges, Mrs Hall, Mr Patel and Mrs Smith.

86.2 Apologies for the afternoon session were received from Mrs Bennett, Mr Waight and Mr Whittington. Dr Walsh gave his apologies and arrived for the afternoon session at 2.25 p.m. Mr Markwell and Mr Oppler were absent for the afternoon session. Mr Boram and Mrs Brunsdon left at 3.30 p.m., Mr Bradbury and Mr Wickremaratchi at 3.50 p.m. and Mrs Arculus, Lt Cdr Atkins, Mr Barrett-Miles and Mr Jones at 4.00 p.m.

87 Members' Interests

87.1 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

88 Minutes

88.1 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 19 October 2018 (pages 11 to 46) be approved as a correct record, subject to the revision of the seconder to the motion on Fire and Rescue Service Funding set out in minute 79.1 on page 24 to read Mr Purchase rather than Mr Oxlade.

89 Address by a Cabinet Member

89.1 Members received an address by the Leader on the Local Government Financial Settlement and Business Rates Pilot announcement.

90 Motion on Fire and Rescue Service Funding

90.1 At the County Council meeting on 19 October 2018 the following motion had been moved by Mr Jones, seconded by Mr Purchase, and referred to the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities for consideration. A report by the Cabinet Member was included with the agenda (pages 47 and 48).

Note: With the Chairman's agreement, Mr Jones revised the wording of his motion to reflect that the decision maker for possible service changes would be the Chief Fire Officer rather than the Cabinet Member as set out below.

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 the Chief Fire Officer is due to take decisions in December which will result in a reduction of preventative measures which have proved to be a vital tool in reducing risk and saving lives through initiatives such as the Safe Drive to Stay Alive safety awareness campaign and the Firebreak scheme. It is understood that cuts are also proposed which will reduce the availability of the technical response unit who deliver specialist rescue services, and reducing the staff complement for the Resilience and Emergencies Team (RET) in the region of 50%.

The Council is also aware the HMI inspection of WSFRS began in November with preliminary feedback expected to be provided in December but its final report is not due to be published until 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 result in a reduction in funding and the delivery of services by the West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service.

The Council therefore resolves:

- (1) To call on the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities to instruct the Chief Fire Officer not to take any decisions that will result in a reduction in staffing or services provided by WSFRS, as the service has taken as much as it can bear without further compromising public and firefighter safety, further threatening the availability of crews and appliances at the county's fire stations and increasing the likelihood of road traffic accidents; 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.'

90.2 Resolution (1) of the motion was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 3.35.

- (a) For resolution (1) of the motion – 13

Mr Buckland, Dr Dennis, Mr Elkins, Mr Jones, Ms Lord, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mullins, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Purchase, Mr Quinn, Mr Smytherman and Dr Walsh.

- (b) Against resolution (1) of the motion - 33

Mr Acraman, Lt Cdr Atkins, Lt Col Barton, Mrs Bennett, Mr Boram, Mr Bradbury, Mr Bradford, Mr Burrett, Mr Catchpole, Mr Cloake, Mr Crow, Mrs Duncton, Mr Edwards, Ms Flynn, Ms Goldsmith, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jupp, Mr Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mrs Kitchen, Mr Lanzer, Mr Marshall, Mr McDonald, Mr Mitchell, Mr Montyn, Mr Parikh, Mrs Pendleton, Mr Petts, Mr Simmons, Mrs Sparkes, Mr Turner and Mrs Urquhart.

- (c) Abstentions – 17

Mrs Arculus, Mr Baldwin, Mr Barnard, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Brunsdon, Mrs Dennis, Mr Fitzjohn, Mr High, Mrs Jones, Mr Lea, Mr Markwell, Mr R J Oakley, Mr S J Oakley, Mrs Purnell, Mrs Russell, Mr Waight and Mr Wickremaratchi.

90.3 Resolution (1) of the motion was lost.

90.4 Resolution (2) of the motion was put to a recorded vote under Standing Order 3.35.

- (a) For resolution (2) of the motion – 48

Mr Acraman, Mrs Arculus, Lt Cdr Atkins, Mr Baldwin, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Bennett, Mr Boram, Mrs Brunson, Mr Buckland, Mr Catchpole, Mr Cloake, Mrs Dennis, Dr Dennis, Mrs Dunton, Ms Flynn, Ms Goldsmith, Mr High, Mr Hillier, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jones, Mr Jones, Mrs Jupp, Mr Jupp, Mr Lanzer, Mr Lea, Ms Lord, Mr Markwell, Mr McDonald, Mrs Millson, Mr Mitchell, Mr Montyn, Mrs Mullins, Mr S J Oakley, Dr O'Kelly, Mr Oppler, Mr Oxlade, Mr Parikh, Mrs Pendleton, Mr Petts, Mr Purchase, Mr Quinn, Mr Simmons, Mr Smytherman, Mrs Sparkes, Mr Turner, Mr Waight, Dr Walsh and Mr Wickremaratchi.

(b) Against resolution (2) of the motion - 6

Mr Burrett, Mr Elkins, Ms Kennard, Mr Marshall, Mrs Russell and Mrs Urquhart.

(c) Abstentions – 10

Mr Barnard, Lt Col Barton, Mr Bradbury, Mr Bradford, Mr Crow, Mr Edwards, Mr Fitzjohn, Mrs Kitchen, Mr R J Oakley and Mrs Purnell.

90.5 Resolution (2) of the motion was carried as set out below.

'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.

The Council therefore resolves:

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.'

91 Motion on Gatwick Master Plan

91.1 The motion by Mr Acraman was withdrawn.

92 Motion on Gatwick Master Plan

92.1 With the agreement of the Chairman, the following revised motion was moved by Mrs Russell and seconded by Mr Barrett-Miles.

'This Council notes the aspirations in the Gatwick Master Plan for growth within the curtilage of the Airport in response to the ever increasing demand for air travel by residents and businesses, proposing various growth scenarios.

The County Council recognises the contribution made by Gatwick to the national economy and the economic benefits to the local economy of having a successful international airport in the county.

This Council also understands the concerns of residents in areas close by who could be affected adversely and the potential growth in housing across the larger geographic area linked to by growth at Gatwick.

The Council continues to make the case for greater infrastructure investment in the county and for any further growth at Gatwick this is paramount.

At this stage Gatwick Airport Limited has not done enough work to establish the impacts of its ambitions or the appropriate mitigation measures and it makes limited reference to how its proposals would work with or complement those of other organisations for growth or development within the wider area.

If there is to be a plan to safeguard land for a future additional runway it would be of benefit to our communities to have the certainty that this would not be developed at least during the period covered by the proposed Master Plan and a Memorandum of Understanding with the County and Borough Councils should be considered to achieve this guarantee.

If airport growth is to be sustainable and manageable it must be shown to be planned only as part of a compelling case which addresses:

- Noise footprint, air quality and environmental impact
- Airport surface access and associated infrastructure capacity for an optimum infrastructure solution
- The future employment and housing growth implications
- Economic, employment and community engagement strategies
- The timing of the indicative future investment projects

The Gatwick Master Plan is aspirational but lacks sufficient detail or evidence in specific areas to provide assurance that the above issues have been or are being fully considered.

This Council therefore acknowledges the Master Plan but, due to lack of evidence and clarity on important detail, the Council reserves its position on the plans for the existing standby runway and for the safeguarding of land for future expansion until that evidence and clarity is produced and requests the Leader and Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure to work with Gatwick and the LEP to ensure that further work is undertaken to provide sufficient information to inform the Master Plan in the future.

The Council invites the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure to ensure that these reservations are fully addressed

in the Council's response to the Gatwick Master Plan and that a Memorandum of Understanding is proposed to address the limits needed on the timing of any future additional runway on safeguarded land.'

92.2 The motion was agreed.

93 Motion on Women standing for Election

93.1 The following motion was moved by Ms Flynn and seconded by Mrs Duncton:

'It is 100 years since the Representation of the People Act 1918, allowing many more men to vote and some women to vote as well as stand for election. This Council celebrates the first two women councillors first elected, Ellen Chapman and the Hon Evelyn Gladys Cecil, who took their place in the Council in 1919 immediately after women were allowed to participate in local elections. Progress has been made for a diverse representation of councillors but there is still some way to go.

This Council believes that a Woman's place is in the Chamber – the Council Chamber – and supports all efforts between now and the County Council elections in 2021 to attract more women to put themselves forward to stand for election as a county councillor.'

93.2 An amendment was moved by Mrs Mullins and seconded by Mr Quinn as set out below:

'It is 100 years since the Representation of the People Act 1918, allowing many more men to vote and some women to vote as well as stand for election. This Council celebrates the first two women councillors first elected, Ellen Chapman and the Hon Evelyn Gladys Cecil, who took their place in the Council in 1919 immediately after women were allowed to participate in local elections. Progress has been made for a diverse representation of councillors but there is still some way to go.

~~This Council believes that a Woman's place is in the Chamber – the Council Chamber – and supports all efforts between now and the County Council elections in 2021 to attract more women to put themselves forward to stand for election as a county councillor.'~~

93.3 The amendment was carried.

93.4 The motion, as set out below, was agreed.

'It is 100 years since the Representation of the People Act 1918, allowing many more men to vote and some women to vote as well as stand for election. This Council celebrates the first two women councillors first elected, Ellen Chapman and the Hon Evelyn Gladys Cecil, who took their place in the Council in 1919 immediately after women were allowed to participate in local elections. Progress has

been made for a diverse representation of councillors but there is still some way to go.

This Council supports all efforts between now and the County Council elections in 2021 to attract more women to put themselves forward to stand for election as a county councillor.'

94 Motion on Bus Services

94.1 With the agreement of the Chairman, the following revised motion was moved by Dr O'Kelly and seconded by Ms Lord:

'In West Sussex, some 27 million passenger journeys are made each year, many of which are made on commercial services. This Council recognises the value of buses to the residents of West Sussex, not only in terms of transport for economic, leisure and education reasons, but also the social value they provide to our communities.

This Council recognises that the promotion of bus services and the Council's support for non-commercial services helps to improve the quality of life for many people and assists in delivering these priorities set out in the West Sussex Plan:

- (a) Independence for later life: services that support older people in later life to live independently. Availability of bus services enables older people to travel more without reliance on a car, avoiding the risks of social isolation that may come from a lack of ability to travel.
- (b) Best start in life: Good bus service provision provides access to early education and education settings for children and allows for greater choice. It also helps young people to access a wider choice of further education and employment.
- (c) Strong, safe and sustainable place: Environmental sustainability can be achieved through modal shift to more use of bus services, reducing the number of cars on the road, which improves road safety and air quality.
- (d) A prosperous place: Good bus service provision forms a key sustainable infrastructure to support the economy and encourage the visitor economy, particularly into rural areas. A good bus network helps to realise the aim that opportunities should be available to all and to help businesses to thrive through more sustainable transport and a reduction in traffic congestion.

Finally this Council recognises the hard work of the officers and the Executive Task and Finish Group during the recent bus review. It calls on the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure to retain all the services under review to allow more time for the team

to develop partnerships and to work with all tiers of local government in seeking additional funding.'

94.2 An amendment was moved by Mr Parikh and seconded by Mrs Dennis as set out below:

'In West Sussex, some 27 million passenger journeys are made each year, many of which are made on commercial services. This Council recognises the value of buses to the residents of West Sussex, not only in terms of transport for economic, leisure and education reasons, but also the social value they provide to our communities.

This Council recognises that the promotion of bus services and the Council's support for non-commercial services helps to improve the quality of life for many people and assists in delivering these priorities set out in the West Sussex Plan:

- (a) Independence for later life: services that support older people in later life to live independently. Availability of bus services enables older people to travel more without reliance on a car, avoiding the risks of social isolation that may come from a lack of ability to travel.
- (b) Best start in life: Good bus service provision provides access to early education and education settings for children and allows for greater choice. It also helps young people to access a wider choice of further education and employment.
- (c) Strong, safe and sustainable place: Environmental sustainability can be achieved through modal shift to more use of bus services, reducing the number of cars on the road, which improves road safety and air quality.
- (d) A prosperous place: Good bus service provision forms a key sustainable infrastructure to support the economy and encourage the visitor economy, particularly into rural areas. A good bus network helps to realise the aim that opportunities should be available to all and to help businesses to thrive through more sustainable transport and a reduction in traffic congestion.

Finally this Council recognises the hard work of the officers and the Executive Task and Finish Group during the recent bus review. It calls on the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure to **make every effort to retain all current coverage of the services under review by engaging with local members, communities and local businesses working through an Executive Task and Finish Group to develop a 'Community Transport' option for the county for current and future sustainability.** ~~to allow more time for the team to develop partnerships and to work with all tiers of local government in seeking additional funding.'~~

94.3 The amendment was carried.

94.4 The amended motion, as set out below, was agreed.

'In West Sussex, some 27 million passenger journeys are made each year, many of which are made on commercial services. This Council recognises the value of buses to the residents of West Sussex, not only in terms of transport for economic, leisure and education reasons, but also the social value they provide to our communities.

This Council recognises that the promotion of bus services and the Council's support for non-commercial services helps to improve the quality of life for many people and assists in delivering these priorities set out in the West Sussex Plan:

- (a) Independence for later life: services that support older people in later life to live independently. Availability of bus services enables older people to travel more without reliance on a car, avoiding the risks of social isolation that may come from a lack of ability to travel.
- (b) Best start in life: Good bus service provision provides access to early education and education settings for children and allows for greater choice. It also helps young people to access a wider choice of further education and employment.
- (c) Strong, safe and sustainable place: Environmental sustainability can be achieved through modal shift to more use of bus services, reducing the number of cars on the road, which improves road safety and air quality.
- (d) A prosperous place: Good bus service provision forms a key sustainable infrastructure to support the economy and encourage the visitor economy, particularly into rural areas. A good bus network helps to realise the aim that opportunities should be available to all and to help businesses to thrive through more sustainable transport and a reduction in traffic congestion.

Finally this Council recognises the hard work of the officers and the Executive Task and Finish Group during the recent bus review. It calls on the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure to make every effort to retain all current coverage of the services under review by engaging with local members, communities and local businesses working through an Executive Task and Finish Group to develop a 'Community Transport' option for the county for current and future sustainability.'

95 Motion on Post Offices

95.1 The following motion was moved by Mrs Mullins and seconded by Mr Jones:

(a) This Council notes with concern that:

On 11 October 2018 it was announced that 74 crown post offices across the UK, including those in Crawley and Worthing will be franchised to WH Smith. Taken together, successive franchise announcements mean the loss of 60% of the crown office network since 2013.

These privatisations are financed using millions of pounds of public money, despite the fact that the public has never endorsed the closures, indeed they have only ever protested against them. Indeed, despite considerable campaigning over recent years with huge local public support (frequently with tens of thousands of local residents' signing petitions) the crown post offices in Chichester, Bognor Regis, Littlehampton, Horsham, Shoreham-by-Sea and Haywards Heath were all closed despite the overwhelming will of the public that they remain open.

In 2014/15 alone, £13 million of public money was used to pay compensation to get rid of post office staff, and the Communication Workers Union (CWU) estimates the staff compensation cost of the latest privatisation will be at least £30 million, affecting as it does, 800 staff.

Reports by Consumer Focus (2012) and Citizens Advice (2016) have identified issues with the franchising of post offices to WH Smith including poor accessibility for people with mobility impairments, longer queuing times, and inferior service and advice on products.

Franchising means the loss of jobs with good terms and conditions at the Post Office. WH Smith replaces experienced post office staff with new employees in typically minimum wage part time roles. This is clearly bad for jobs in West Sussex and Post Office workers, many of whom are our local residents.

The closure of our Crown post offices and relocation to a WH Smith, also means the loss of prime high street stores and this contributes to the demise of our town centres. No explanation has been given as to why the profit-making Crown post offices such as those of Crawley and Worthing are being handed to WH Smith.

All Crown post offices are under threat of closure and/or franchising in future, if the latest round of privatisations are allowed to go ahead, it could prove the tipping point for the viability of the entire post office network.

(b) This Council notes that on 15 November 2018 the majority of members on Crawley County Local Committee agreed to call

on the Leader of this Council, in her role as the lead on Economy matters, to respond to the consultation on the relocation of Crawley Post Office on behalf of the County Council, opposing the relocation.

(c) This Council believes that:

Our post offices are a key asset for the community, and the expertise and experience of staff there is invaluable.

The relentless franchising and closure programme of the profit-making Crown post offices, points to a lack of vision rather than the plan for growth and innovation that is needed.

The Government should therefore halt these closures and bring together stakeholders, including the CWU, and industry experts to develop a new strategy that safeguards the future of the Post Office.

This Council resolves to:

- (1) Ask the Leader of the Council to write to the Government to raise concern about the apparent managed decline of the post office network and the impact on high streets across the UK as well as the service in the franchised premises, and the poor quality jobs that result;
- (2) Ask the Leader to respond to current consultations on the Post Office in Haywards Heath and Worthing to oppose the proposals; and
- (3) To join local campaigning to raise awareness of the value of our Post Office and the need for it to remain an asset of and for the people.'

95.2 An amendment was moved by Mrs Millson and seconded by Ms Lord as set out below:

(a) This Council notes with concern that:

On 11 October 2018 it was announced that 74 crown post offices across the UK, including those in Crawley and Worthing will be franchised to WH Smith. Taken together, successive franchise announcements mean the loss of 60% of the crown office network since 2013.

These privatisations are financed using millions of pounds of public money, despite the fact that the public has never endorsed the closures, indeed they have only ever protested against them. Indeed, despite considerable campaigning over recent years with huge local public support (~~frequently with tens of thousands of local residents' signing petitions~~)

the crown post offices in Chichester, Bognor Regis, Littlehampton, Horsham, Shoreham-by-Sea and Haywards Heath were all closed despite the overwhelming will **wish** of the public that they remain open.

~~In 2014/15 alone, £13 million of public money was used to pay compensation to get rid of post office staff, and the Communication Workers Union (CWU) estimates the staff compensation cost of the latest privatisation will be at least £30 million, affecting as it does, 800 staff.~~

Reports by Consumer Focus (2012) and Citizens Advice (2016) have identified issues with the franchising of post offices to WH Smith including poor accessibility for people with mobility impairments, longer queuing times, and inferior service and advice on products.

~~Franchising means the loss of jobs with good terms and conditions at the Post Office. WH Smith replaces experienced post office staff with new employees in typically minimum wage part time roles. This is clearly bad for jobs in West Sussex and Post Office workers, many of whom are our local residents.~~

~~The closure of our Crown post offices and relocation to a WH Smith, also means the loss of prime high street stores and this contributes to the demise of our town centres. No explanation has been given as to why the profit-making Crown post offices such as those of Crawley and Worthing are being handed to WH Smith.~~

~~All Crown post offices are under threat of closure and/or franchising in future, if the latest round of privatisations are allowed to go ahead, it could prove the tipping point for the viability of the entire post office network.~~

- (b) This Council notes that on 15 November 2018 the majority of members on Crawley County Local Committee agreed to call on the Leader of this Council, in her role as the lead on Economy matters, to respond to the consultation on the relocation of Crawley Post Office on behalf of the County Council, opposing the relocation.

- (c) This Council believes that:

Our post offices are a key asset for the community, and the expertise and experience of **the** staff there is invaluable.

The relentless franchising and closure programme of the profit-making Crown post offices, points to a lack of vision rather than the plan for growth and innovation that is needed.

~~The Government should therefore halt these closures and bring together stakeholders, including the CWU, and industry experts to develop a new strategy that safeguards the future of the Post Office.~~

This Council resolves to:

- (1) Ask the Leader of the Council to write to the Government to raise concern about the apparent managed decline of the post office network and the impact on high streets across the UK as well as the service in the franchised premises ~~and the poor quality jobs that result;~~
- (2) Ask the Leader to respond to current consultations on the Post Office in Haywards Heath and Worthing to **focus on the principles set out in this motion** ~~oppose the proposals;~~ and
- (3) To **work** ~~join local campaigning~~ to raise awareness of the value of our Post Office **local network**, and the need for it to remain **in our communities** ~~an asset of and for the people.'~~

95.3 The amendment was carried.

95.4 The motion, as amended and set out below, was agreed.

(a) This Council notes with concern that:

On 11 October 2018 it was announced that 74 crown post offices across the UK, including those in Crawley and Worthing will be franchised to WH Smith. Taken together, successive franchise announcements mean the loss of 60% of the crown office network since 2013.

These privatisations are financed using millions of pounds of public money, despite the fact that the public has never endorsed the closures, indeed they have only ever protested against them. Indeed, despite considerable campaigning over recent years with huge local public support the crown post offices in Chichester, Bognor Regis, Littlehampton, Horsham, Shoreham-by-Sea and Haywards Heath were all closed despite the wish of the public that they remain open.

Reports by Consumer Focus (2012) and Citizens Advice (2016) have identified issues with the franchising of post offices to WH Smith including poor accessibility for people with mobility impairments, longer queuing times, and inferior service and advice on products.

(b) This Council notes that on 15 November 2018 the majority of members on Crawley County Local Committee agreed to call on the Leader of this Council, in her role as the lead on Economy matters, to respond to the consultation on the

relocation of Crawley Post Office on behalf of the County Council, opposing the relocation.

(c) This Council believes that:

Our post offices are a key asset for the community, and the expertise and experience of the staff is invaluable.

The relentless franchising and closure programme of the profit-making Crown post offices, points to a lack of vision rather than the plan for growth and innovation that is needed.

This Council resolves to:

- (1) Ask the Leader of the Council to write to the Government to raise concern about the apparent managed decline of the post office network and the impact on high streets across the UK as well as the service in the franchised premises;
- (2) Ask the Leader to respond to current consultations on the Post Office in Haywards Heath and Worthing to focus on the principles set out in this motion; and
- (3) To work to raise awareness of the value of our Post Office local network, and the need for it to remain in our communities.'

96 Report of the Corporate Parenting Panel

96.1 The Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Panel moved the report of the recent work of the Panel (pages 49 to 52).

96.2 In response to a request from Mrs Arculus the Chairman of the Panel agreed to make sure all members were aware of the date of the EPIC award ceremony in 2019. The Chairman also agreed to circulate to all members a briefing note on corporate parenting which had been circulated to dual-hatted members following a request from Mrs Jones.

96.3 Resolved -

That the report be noted.

97 Governance Committee: Delegation to other Local Authorities

97.1 The Council considered a proposal that non-Executive committees should have the power to delegate functions to another local authority in the light of a report from the Governance Committee (page 53).

97.2 Resolved -

That the terms of reference of the Governance, Standards, Planning, Rights of Way and Regulation, Audit and Accounts Committees be amended to include the delegation set out in paragraph 3 of the report.

98 Question Time

- 98.1 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 55 to 66) and a supplementary report (supplement pages 1 and 2) and written questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 2.38 (set out at Appendix 2).

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.

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
Items 6(b) and 6(c) – Motions on Gatwick Airport	Mr Barrett-Miles	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
	Mrs Jones	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and Burgess Hill Town Council
	Mr Lanzer	Member of Crawley Borough Council
Item 6(e) – Motion on Bus Services	Mr Hillier	Member of Haywards Heath Town Council
	Mr Smytherman	Worthing Borough Council representative on Quality Bus Partnership
Item 9 - QT All paragraphs	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council, Chairman of Building Heroes Education Foundation and Trustee of Sussex Learning Trust
	Mrs Bridges	Member of Adur District Council and Lancing Parish Council. Runs a club on behalf of 4Sight West Sussex
	Mrs Jones	Member of Mid Sussex District Council and Burgess Hill Town Council
Item 9 - (QT) paragraph 6 (Network Rail Main Line Upgrade)	Dr Dennis	Annual rail season ticket holder between Horsham and London
Item 9 - QT paragraph 14 (West Sussex Crowd)	Mr Smytherman	Trustee of Coastal West Sussex MIND
Item 9 - QT paragraph 15 (Armed Forces and Veteran Breakfast Club)	Ms Goldsmith	Son in the military
Item 9 – QT question on air quality	Dr O’Kelly	Member of Chichester District Council

This page is intentionally left blank

Written Questions: 14 December 2018

1. Written question from **Mr Jones** for reply by the **Leader**

Question

Can the Leader please confirm how many Away Days have been held and attended by (a) the Cabinet and (b) the Executive Leadership Team during 2018/19, and let me have a breakdown of the costs associated for each, and the venues where they were held.

Answer

- (a) The Cabinet has had two away days during the year as follows; the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) were also in attendance.

Date	Cost	venue
9 October 2018	£290.83	Chichester yacht Club
6 November 2018	£247.00	Chichester Yacht Club
Total	£537.83	

- (b) ELT have held two away days (jointly with all Directors and with other senior officers):

Date	Cost	Venue
10/11 May 2018	£3,977.84	Roffey Park Institute
15/16 November 2018	£5,048.50	Roffey Park Institute
Total	£9,026.34	

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

Question

In the outturn 2016/17, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources agreed a one-off £1.0m reserve entitled, 'Counselling Services to Schools', for the 2017/18 academic year. I understand that £0.56m was drawn down from the reserve and allocated to schools, through an application process. Can the Cabinet Member confirm how much of that £1.0m reserve was not allocated to schools for counselling services, whether a counselling service for schools reserve still exists, and if not, what happened to the remaining funding?

Answer

During 2017/18, following an application process open to all maintained schools within the county, a total of £0.617m was drawn down from the £1.0m counselling reserve set aside following the full Council meeting in February 2017. As schools were expecting these monies to be one-off in 2017/18; no further application process has been carried out during 2018/19. As a result, to date, no

further funds have been drawn down this year and the remaining £0.383m is currently held in reserves.

3. Written question from Mr S J Oakley for reply by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

Question

Further to my written question for the 16 February 2018 full Council meeting regarding West Sussex County Council Pensions, from what resource were the annual £11.2m cash lump sums and the raised level (from 16.3% to 24.9%) of employer contributions funded?

Answer

Employer's pension contribution is revenue expenditure and treated as the same as any another expenditure category in the budget setting process. Any increase to employer's contribution is pressure on the budget. Likewise any reduction to employer's contribution is a savings to the revenue budget.

4. Written question from Mrs Mullins for reply by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

Question

Over five years ago a process was initiated to look at solutions to parking problems in our towns and villages. So far there has been one full audit, carried out in Chichester, with a full report out to consultation, but no actions as yet taken and one partial audit, carried out in Crawley, with a very brief interim report, available for comment.

- (a) What was the final cost of the Road Space Audit for Chichester and how was it funded?
- (b) What is the estimated cost of the Road Space Audit for Crawley and how will it be funded?
- (c) What is the estimated cost of other road space audits in the county and how will they be funded?
- (d) What pressure is there, both now and in the future, on the finances of the Parking Account and the ability to finance other parking initiatives?

Answer

Road Space Audits (RSAs) are an innovative approach so there was some learning as the County Council implemented a new way of thinking about parking and road space. Originally, the service was trying to manage the work alongside business as usual, which has not proved to be sustainable, and a new post has been

created in the last six months to create capacity. The County Council has worked hard to keep stakeholders on board; this inevitably builds in more time but is helpful in the long run in creating proposals that have better prospects of local support.

- (a) The feasibility work that led to the production of the RSA document for Chichester cost £32,000. The design/consultation costs for the first stage of the RSA (Parking Management Plan) will cost £50,000. The full £82,000 is funded from the County Council's On-Street Parking Account.
- (b) To date, feasibility work leading to the production of a draft RSA for Crawley has cost £36,000 (including VAT). It is expected that design/consultation costs will replicate those of Chichester and come from the same account. The production of a draft design for a parking plan in Manor Royal (Mrs Mullins' division) has been carried out in-house and informal consultation is currently being carried out by the Manor Royal Business Improvement District with technical input from County Council officers.
- (c) In each area, £110,000 has been allocated from the On-Street Parking Account - £60,000 to cover feasibility and £50,000 to cover design/consultation for Parking Management Plans. The one-off costs of implementing any parking management plans (e.g. signs and lines) may be met from the following sources:
- Capital funding
 - Additional income generated from new parking controls implemented
 - Section 106 funds
 - Community Infrastructure Levy
 - Local Enterprise Partnership Growth Programme Funding
- (d) The On-Street Parking Account is regularly monitored and profiled in order to ensure that it does not fall into deficit. The costs of running the Civil Parking Enforcement Service (including enforcement, maintenance and development) will continue to be met from that account and on-street parking charges will also be reviewed on an annual basis. Officers are equally keen to identify areas for improvement where necessary. Each Agency Agreement is under continuous review in order to ensure that every opportunity is taken to reduce costs and improve the efficiency of the service. As an example, the recent introduction of a new back office case management system (Chipside) in Chichester District is expected to result in significant processing efficiencies and annual savings of £15,000 per year, with further savings projected through the introduction of virtual permits. Chipside was also introduced in Crawley Borough Council in April 2017 and Mid Sussex in January 2018 and it is hoped that the remaining district/borough councils in West Sussex will follow suit over the next two to three years. Coupled with other opportunities, such as development of contactless on-street parking payments (with an associated reduction in cash collection costs) and scaling down the production/distribution of parking vouchers, it is expected that a further efficiency saving of £250,000 could be achieved countywide over the next one to two years.

This page is intentionally left blank

Question Time: 14 December 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 4, Pause Programme (Cabinet Member for Children and Young People), from Mr Baldwin.

A Prosperous Place

Paragraph 6, Network Rail Main Line (Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure), from Mr Bradford, Dr Dennis, Mrs Dennis and Dr Walsh.

In response to a request from Mr Bradford, the Cabinet Member agreed to press Govia Thameslink to extend the Thameslink service from Horsham to Chichester.

In response to a request from Dr Dennis the Cabinet Member agreed to ask Network Rail if, rather than the complex junction plans for East Croydon, they would consider adopting the Japanese model of simple, high frequency routes with passengers changing trains where necessary.

In response to a request from Mrs Dennis, the Cabinet Member agreed to write to Network Rail to urge them to try to ensure there is a minimum impact to current services on the Brighton Main Line and that planning in relation to the upgrade proposals is realistic.

In response to a request from Dr Walsh that, in responding to the Brighton Main Line report, the Council should support the suggestion of the development of the new Arundel chord section of railway line which would open up the west coastway route and increase the capacity of the Arun Valley line and link to lines into Waterloo, the Cabinet Member agreed to do so.

A Strong, Safe and Sustainable Place

Paragraph 15, Armed Forces and Veteran Breakfast Club (Leader/Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities), from Mr Buckland, Mr Edwards, Mr Quinn and Dr Walsh.

In response to a request from Mr Buckland for consideration to be given to working jointly with borough and district councils to provide dedicated housing for veterans, the Leader agreed to discuss possible options with the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities and respond to Mr Buckland.

A Council that works for the Community

Paragraph 26, Growth Deals (Leader/Economy), from Mr Jupp.

Finance Settlement (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources), from Mrs Purnell and Dr Walsh.

Local Government Association Peer Challenge (Leader), from Mr Crow and Mrs Mullins.