

Responses to Part I recommendations from 22 January 2020

Revenue Budget 2020/21, Capital Strategy 2020/21 to 2024/25 and Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2020/21	
Recommendations	Responses
i. Supports the budget process that had been used to develop the 2020/21 budget and recommends that this process of early and improved Member engagement is repeated in future years	Response from Jeremy Hunt: Yes, this is already in hand and the first Members budget day – looking at both the Revenue budget and the Capital Programme – is scheduled for 17 June 2020.
ii. Strongly supports the continuing lobbying of Government to undertake a funding review and provide fair funding to the County Council	Response from Paul Marshall: Cabinet and I will continue to engage with our MPs and Ministers to make the case for a sustainable, long term funding settlement for local government which recognises the growing demand pressures, particularly in adults and children’s services.
iii. Recommends that the West Sussex Plan and priorities are reviewed by Cabinet and that the proposed plan is brought to PFSC for scrutiny as soon as possible	Response from Paul Marshall: Cabinet is currently reviewing the West Sussex Plan and its priorities for 2021/2022 onwards. This review will be done alongside the Governance/Corporate improvement programme which will be expected to commence from April 2020 onwards. Political engagement on the emerging West Sussex Plan priorities will be taking place along with Executive Leadership Team, who will be responsible for delivering the reviewed plan. As this develops the Plan will be available for scrutiny.
iv. Recognises the lack of transparency and complex nature over the future of Business Rates and supported the requirement to seek clarity over this	Response from Katharine Eberhart: The Council will continue to press central government for transparency and simplicity in the proposed future Business Rates Retention system.
v. Requests that the Cabinet Member for Environment considers introducing methane targets and supports the promotion of the food waste reduction programme following the results of the pilot project currently being undertaken	Response from Deborah Urquhart: The Cabinet Member - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • championed the introduction of the food waste reduction pilot project in Mid Sussex District Council and will evaluate the

	<p>results of the pilot and consider further support. She is currently engaged in discussions with other district and borough councils with a view to introducing food waste collections across the county. The government has indicated that it will legislate to introduce a core set of consistent recyclable materials (including food waste) to be collected from all households and businesses, supporting frequent and comprehensive rubbish and recycling collections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will consider options/methods to report a reduction of methane levels as a result of diversion from landfill.
vi. Requests that the Chief Executive provides a briefing on the requirements of the budget accountability for Executive Directors and Directors	<p>Response from Becky Shaw: Executive Directors and Directors will be held accountable for delivering their services within the budget agreed at Full Council in February. The expenditure measured against the budget will be monitored monthly at our Executive Leadership Team meeting. The ownership of the budgets will be reinforced by the completion of budget accountability statements for each Director and Executive Director. Financial outturn against budget will be discussed during 1.2.1s and be included in the appraisal process.</p>
vii. Recommends that the corporate risk register is reviewed by the scrutiny committees' Business Planning Group meetings in order to identify future priorities for scrutiny	<p>Response from David Barling: This will be added to the Children & Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee's Business Planning Group Agenda in February 2020.</p>
viii. Supports the need to develop a long-term plan for Adult Services and supports progressing plans around independent living	<p>To Amanda Jupp for information.</p>
ix. Notes that the Children First Strategic Approach is still to be scrutinised and that Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee members would be invited to the Children & Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee meeting on 4 March to contribute to the debate	<p>To Nigel Jupp, Jacquie Russell, David Barling for information.</p> <p>Response from David Barling: This has been added to the June meeting of the Children & Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee, and members of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee will be invited to attend.</p>

<p>x. Requests that officers provide further information on the split between permanent and temporary funding for 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 included within the Children First improvement programme</p>	<p>To Jacquie Russell for information.</p> <p>Response from Katharine Eberhart: The response between permanent and temporary funding is included in the resources for the Children’s Improvement Plan included in the December TPM being presented to the March meeting. 2018/19 is not within the timeframe of the Children’s First improvement programme.</p>
<p>xi. Recognises the pressures on home to school transport and supports a review and scrutiny in this area whilst ensuring the needs of children are maintained</p>	<p>Response from Nigel Jupp: The Business Planning Group of the Children and Young People’s Services Scrutiny Committee are receiving a briefing on home to school transport at their March meeting; following this the BPG will decide whether they feel the issue requires consideration and further scrutiny by the wider Committee. I have asked the Chairman and Vice Chairman of CYPSSC to update the PFSC Chairman after the BPG to advise whether this item has been identified for future scrutiny.</p>
<p>xii. Recognises that it will be receiving a report in March 2020 on the Whole Council Design Programme Review and future focus and requested that the report includes information on how much has been spent to date and the savings made as well as future spend and savings targets</p>	<p>Response from Bob Lanzer: A report providing an update to the Whole Council Design programme will be presented to the Committee at its March meeting. The report will include spend and savings information.</p>
<p>xiii. Expresses concerns over the One Public Estate programme and the progress being made</p>	<p>To Jeremy Hunt and Lee Harris for information.</p>
<p>xiv. Recommends that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure carry out a review on the systems and processes around the repair of potholes including the quality of repairs, timeliness and inclusion of all repairs required in an area into one job</p>	<p>Response from Roger Elkins: The Cabinet Member is undertaking a review into the methodology and quality of pothole repairs and will report back to the Scrutiny Committee in due course.</p>
<p>xv. Requests that when the Environment & Communities Scrutiny Committee scrutinises highways maintenance standards at a future meeting that potholes, white lines, signage and cats’ eyes are included within the review. Also</p>	<p>Response from Andrew Barrett-Miles: The ECSC BPG will consider how best to take forward the issues at its March meeting.</p>

requests that the committee examine the outcomes achieved of the £30m investment in highways undertaken approximately five years ago	The outcomes achieved through the Better Roads Programme were considered by the Committee in July 2016. The report can be found here .
xvi. Requests that the Business Planning Group consider the effectiveness of using consultants to deliver the capital programme	No response required – added to PFSC work programme.
xvii. Recommends that the Cabinet Member for Finance reviews the resources needed to meet the Capital Programme	Response from Jeremy Hunt : Agreed, this is being reviewed by the Director of Assets and Property
xviii. Requests that the transparency and messaging around specific projects within the capital programme are improved	Response from Jeremy Hunt : Work is ongoing to improve the transparency and messaging in the Capital Programme.
xix. Requests further information on the progress of community hubs and One Public Estate Projects be shared with the committee	Response required from Bob Lanzer : An update on One Public Estate projects was shared with the Committee’s Business Planning Group on 4 March.
xx. Requests that the Environment & Communities Scrutiny Committee reviews the funding of the backlog of highways works in the capital programme and review whether the capital budget is sufficient to meet need	Response from Andrew Barrett-Miles : In consultation with the Service and Cabinet Member, it has been determined that the most effective way to undertake scrutiny would be through a scrutiny TFG. The timing remains to be confirmed, potentially in summer 2020.
xxi. In relation to the knowledge and training of capital programme project managers the committee request that appraisal monitoring figures are included within the future quarterly workforce reports to the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee	Response from Bob Lanzer : We will report on appraisals quarterly as part of the workforce information included in the TPM.
Procurement for the Provision of Agency Workers Recruitment Services	
Recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Economy & Corporate Resources	Response from the Cabinet Member for Economy & Corporate Resources
The Committee asks the Cabinet Member for Economy & Corporate Resources to include options in the tender for knowledge and IT transfer and for no transfer, giving contractors the option to tender on both or one of the options.	Response from Bob Lanzer : We carefully considered the concerns raised by the scrutiny committee around the potential appetite and risk surrounding the option for including knowledge and IT transfer in the

	<p>contract specification. These actions were considered as potential enablers for an in-house service option in the future. However, reflecting the concerns raised, it was decided that in order to develop a commercially sustainable internal model, it would be advisable to more thoroughly assess the viability of adopting this model and bringing the service in-house at the next opportunity of contract. This is a three-year contract with an optional one-year extension so there would be an opportunity to consider this different approach at the end of year three, which is only one year later than the original proposal which included an exit option with the winning contractor "leaving behind" their vendor management system.</p>
<p>Update on Procurement of Joint Venture Partner in Property Development</p>	
<p>Recommendation to</p>	<p>Response from</p>
<p>i. Stresses the importance of consulting the local council and planners at the early stages of feasibility works</p>	<p>Response from Jeremy Hunt: This will be the responsibility of the Joint Venture Company (the JV LLP)</p>
<p>ii. Expresses concern over the time it will take for the Council to receive any monetary gains</p>	<p>Response from Jeremy Hunt: The process of how the CC receives any monetary gains will be clearly set out in the final Partnership Agreement.</p>
<p>iii. Requests that a further report is brought to the Committee when more certainty over the joint venture arrangements have been designed and that the decision report, when it comes for formal scrutiny, contains a clear outline of the governance arrangements to be put in place</p>	<p>Response from Jeremy Hunt: Agreed.</p>
<p>iv. Requests that the Chairman of the Committee contacts other scrutiny chairmen in other appropriate local authorities to seek their views on the success of joint venture arrangements</p>	<p>Response from Joy Dennis: The matter is in hand and it has been arranged for me to speak to a Leader of another Council on 11 March.</p>