

# West Sussex County Council – Ordinary Meeting

---

**13 December 2013**

At an Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday, 13 December 2013, at County Hall, Chichester, the members present being:

Mrs A J Jupp (Chairman)

Mr W E Acraman	Mr G V McAra
Mrs P A C Arculus	Mr P G Metcalfe
Mr D H Barling	Mrs M E Millson
Mr L H Barnard	Mrs J S Mockridge
Mr A J Barrett-Miles	Mr J A P Montyn
Mr P J J Bradbury	Mrs S R Mullins
Mr M J Brown	Mr R J Oakley
Mrs H A Brunsdon	Mr S J Oakley
Mr I J R Buckland	Mr J J O'Brien
Mr R D Burrett	Mr F R J Oppler
Mr P C Catchpole	Mr C G Oxlade
Mr P J Circus	Mr L W Parsons
Mr M R Clark	Mr A Patel
Mr M A Cloake	Mr N F Peters
Mr D G Crow	Mrs J E Phillips
Dr N P S Dennis	Mr B J Quinn
Mrs J E Duncton	Mr J G Rae
Mr P C Evans	Mrs A M Rapnik
Mrs C M Field	Mr J L Rogers
Mr M J Glennon	Mr R Rogers
Ms M L Goldsmith	Mr D P Sheldon
Mr P A D Griffiths	Mr B A Smith
Mrs P A Hall	Mrs B A Smith
Mr P D High	Mr A C Sutcliffe
Mr J C Hunt	Mr B W Turner
Ms S James	Mr G M Tyler
Mrs A F Jones, MBE	Mrs D L Urquhart
Mr G L Jones	Mr S G Waight
Mr M G Jones	Dr J M M Walsh, KStJ, RD
Ms D M K Kennard	Mr B R A D Watson, OBE
Mrs E Kitchen	Mrs E M Whitehead
Mr P K Lamb	Mr L S Wickremaratchi
Mr R A Lanzer	

## **Apologies and attendance**

**92** Apologies were received from Mrs Bennett, Mr Petch, Mr Smytherman and Mr Whittington. Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Circus, Mr McAra, Mr Sheldon and Mr Waight gave their apologies for the afternoon session.

## **Deaths of Mr John de Mierre and Brigadier Denys Begbie OBE**

**93** The Chairman reported the deaths of a member of the current Council –

## Minutes

---

Mr John de Mierre, who had been the member for Haywards Heath East from 2005 to 2009 and from May 2013 and of Brigadier Denys Begbie OBE, a former member, who had represented the Mid Sussex South electoral division from 1989 to 1993.

94 The Council stood for a minute's silence.

### **Global Business Continuity Manager of the Year Award**

95 The Chairman offered the Council's congratulations to Alan Jones, the County Council's Head of Resilience and Emergencies, who had received the 'Global Public Sector Business Continuity Manager of the Year' award.

### **Interests**

96 Members declared interests as set out at Appendix 1.

### **Minutes**

97 It was agreed that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 18 October 2013 (pages 127 to 156) be approved as a correct record.

### **Result of By-Election**

98 The Council received the County Returning Officer's return of the by-election held on 24 October 2013 for the county councillor for the Warnham & Rusper Electoral Division.

### **Review of Proportionality**

99 The County Council was reminded of its statutory duty to review the proportionality on its committees following the by-election. A paper on the application of the proportionality rules and how they were applied was set out at pages 157 and 158. Given that a further by-election for the Haywards Heath East electoral division was due to be held on 19 December 2013, it was proposed that there should be no change to the overall current committee allocations to political groups until the outcome of the by-election was known.

100 However, as there were currently Conservative vacancies on four committees; the Environmental and Community Services Select Committee, the Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee, the Performance and Finance Select Committee and the Planning Committee, after consultation with the group leaders, it was agreed that the Conservative Group should be allowed to fill two of the four current vacancies at this stage.

101 Resolved –

That there be no change to the overall current committee allocations to political groups until the outcome of the Haywards Heath East by-election is known, but that the Conservative Group be allowed to fill two of the current four vacancies on committees.

### Appointments

- 102** The following changes to appointments were made which took effect from the end of the meeting:

Committee	Change
Adult Safeguarding Panel	Mr Wickremaratchi to fill vacancy
Governance Committee	Mr Lanzer in place of Mr Griffiths
Environmental and Community Services Select Committee	Mr Circus to fill vacancy
Health and Adult Social Care Committee	Mr Griffiths in place of Mr Lanzer
Performance and Finance Select Committee	Mr Tyler in place of Mr Patel
Planning Committee	Mrs Kitchen to fill vacancy
Treasury Management Panel	Mr Brown as Chairman Mr Burrett in place of Mr Lanzer

### Cabinet and Written Questions

- 103** The Cabinet Member question time report included information on the budget and savings proposals. Notice had been given of the intention, given the importance of and public interest in the item, to change the order of question time to take Cabinet Member question time first, followed by Leader's question time and, finally, written questions. It was also proposed to extend Cabinet Member question time from one and half hours to two hours. The Chairman informed the Council that she would use her discretion to extend the time further if there were significant matters still to be covered.

## Minutes

---

104 The Council agreed to the proposed arrangements.

### Cabinet Member Question Time

105 The Leader and the Cabinet Member for Finance both made statements at the start of the item. Members asked questions on the Cabinet Members' reports (pages 159 to 165), as set out at Appendix 2. Members also had before them statements on the budget and savings proposals, together with a schedule of describing proposals from each Cabinet portfolio for savings over the next two financial years.

### Leader's Question Time

106 Members questioned the Leader on matters currently relevant to the County Council, as set out at Appendix 2.

### Written Questions

107 Questions and answers pursuant to Standing Order 15(2), as set out at Appendix 3, were circulated. Members asked questions on the answers as set out at Appendix 3.

### Adult Safeguarding Panel

108 Mrs Arculus, on behalf of the Adult Safeguarding Panel, moved the report of the Panel (page 166) and accompanying newsletter on its recent work.

109 Resolved -

That the report and newsletter be noted.

### Corporate Parenting Panel

110 The Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Panel moved the report of the recent work of the Panel (pages 167 to 171).

111 Resolved -

That the report be noted.

### Governance Committee: PropCo Panel

112 The County Council was asked to consider the establishment of a PropCo Panel to consider land and property investment proposals, monitor development and manage performance in investments, in the light of a report by the Governance Committee (pages 172 and 173).

113 Resolved -

That a property investment panel with the title of PropCo Panel be established with terms of reference, as set out at the Appendix to the report.

### Appointments to the PropCo Panel

- 114** The following appointments were made to the PropCo Panel which took effect from the end of the meeting:

Panel	Members
PropCo Panel	Mr Barling Mr Brown (Chairman) Ms Goldsmith Mrs Millson Mr Peters

### Governance Committee: Member Roles - Champions

- 115** The County Council was asked to consider proposals for the inclusion of the role of Champion in the Constitution and the deletion of the role of Adviser to a Cabinet Member, in the light of a report by the Governance Committee (pages 174 and 175).

- 116** Resolved -

- (1) That the role of Champions, as set out at the Appendix to the report, be approved;
- (2) That the role of Adviser to a Cabinet Member be deleted and the Constitution amended accordingly; and
- (3) That consequential amendments be made to the Constitution.

### Governance Committee: Minor Changes to the Constitution

- 117** The County Council was asked to consider and approve minor amendments to the terms of reference of the Adult Safeguarding Panel, the Care Commissioning Planning Group and the Health and Wellbeing Board, in the light of a report by the Governance Committee (pages 176 to 185).

- 118** Resolved -

- (1) That the changes to the terms of reference of the Adult Safeguarding Panel, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be approved;

## Minutes

---

- (2) That the revised terms of reference for the Care Commissioning Planning Group, as set out at Appendix 2 to the report, be approved; and
- (3) That the revised terms of reference for the Health and Wellbeing Board, as set out at Appendix 3 to the report, be approved.

### **Performance and Finance Select Committee: Select Committee Outline Work Programme 2013-15**

**119** The Council considered the Select Committee outline work programme for 2013-15 (pages 186 to 202).

**120** Resolved -

That the Select Committee outline work programme 2013-15, including Task and Finish Groups, attached at Appendices 1 and 2 to the report, be approved.

### **Chairman**

The Council rose at 3.10 p.m.

### Agenda Item No. 1 - 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
7(a) CMQT all items	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
7(a) CMQT paragraph 1 (Budget)	Mrs Duncton	Director of Chichester Festival Theatre Board
	Mr Griffiths	Registered carer
	Mr Hunt	Chichester Festival Theatre in his division
	Ms James	Member of Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council
	Mr Parsons	Son-in-law is West Sussex County Council Firefighter
7(a) CMQT paragraph 6 (Caring for our Future)	Mr Griffiths	Registered carer
7(a) CMQT paragraph 9 (Worthing Age of Transfer)	Mr Cloake	Member of Worthing Borough Council and has children in the education system in Worthing
	Mr Evans	Governor of Ferring C E Primary School (adjoining Worthing catchment area)
	Mr High	Member of Worthing Borough Council and as a parent of a child at a school in Worthing
	Mr R Rogers	Member of a Panel of Governors in Worthing
7(a) CMQT paragraph 10 (West Sussex Music)	Mr Griffiths	School Governor and Board Member of Sussex Arts Academy

## Minutes - Appendix 1

---

Item	Member	Nature of Interest
7(a) CMQT paragraph 15 (Triennial valuation of the West Sussex Pension Fund)	Mr Burrett	Member of the Local Government Pension Scheme and as a member of the Local Government Pensions Committee, appointed by the Local Government Association Conservative Group
	Mr G L Jones	In receipt of a West Sussex pension
	Mr Lanzer	Member of the Local Government Pension Scheme
	Mr R J Oakley	Member of the Local Government Pension Scheme
	Mr Rapnik	In receipt of a West Sussex pension
	Mr J L Rogers	In receipt of a West Sussex pension
	Mr Waight	Deferred member of the Local Government Pension Scheme
7(b) Leader's QT	Mr Bradbury	Member of Mid Sussex District Council
7(c) Written Question 1 (Eligibility Criteria)	Mr Catchpole	Spouse is employed by Carers Support Services
7(c) Written Question 3 (Investment Assets)	Dr Walsh	Governor of Littlehampton Academy
All items - any questions on public health	Mr Turner	Member of the Royal Pharmaceutical Society and is licenced by the General Pharmaceutical Council

### **Agenda Item No. 7(a) - Cabinet Member Question Time**

Members asked questions on the Cabinet Members' reports as set out below. In instances where a Cabinet Member undertook to take follow-up action, this is also noted below.

#### **Leader and all Cabinet Members**

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance answered questions on their statements supporting paragraph 1, Portfolio Budget and Savings Proposals, from Mr M G Jones, Mr Waight and Dr Walsh.

Members asked questions of Cabinet Members on lines within the accompanying schedule as follows:

Line 1, Early childhood services, from Mr Oxlade.

Line 3, Learning Service, from Mr Griffiths and Mr Parsons.

Line 4, Youth Services, from Mr Cloake, Mrs Millson, Mr Oppler and Mr Sheldon.

In response to a request from Mrs Millson, the Cabinet Member for Children – Start of Life agreed to provide members with a geographical breakdown of where specialist youth services would be located.

Line 5, relocate increase in public health grant for 2014/15, from Mr Turner.

Lines 5 and 9, relocate increase in public health grant for 2014/15 and maintain healthy lifestyles programme at current levels, from Dr Walsh.

Line 16, support services activities, from Mr Glennon and Mrs Millson.

In response to a request from Mr Glennon, the Cabinet Member for Corporate Relations agreed to provide information about the proportion of the £625,000 which would come from savings in-house as opposed to income from the use of the Capita contact by other partners, and who the partners might be.

Lines, 21, Integration Fund Transformation, from Dr Walsh and Mr Watson.

Lines, 21, 23 and 25, Integration Fund Transformation, referral processes for cost of care and integration of Health and Adults' Services, from Mrs Smith.

Line 22, personalised community-based care, from Mr Bradbury, Mrs Millson and Dr Walsh.

Lines 22, 27 and 31, personalised community-based care, Regain Independence Support Service and more effective use of Shaw nursing beds, from Mrs Jones.

Line 26, review of options for directly provided services, from Mrs Mullins.

Line 31, more effective use of Shaw nursing beds, from Mrs Millson.

## **Minutes - Appendix 2**

---

Lines 38 and 41, review of passenger transport and initial review of bus services, from Dr Dennis, Mrs Jones, Mr M G Jones and Dr Walsh.

Line 40, change to street lighting, from Mr Smith.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agreed to provide schedules for members of areas where part-night lighting was to be provided.

Line 47, future Fire & Rescue arrangements, from Mrs Arculus, Mr Glennon, Ms James and Mr Lamb.

Line 56, Chichester Festival Theatre, from Mr Hunt.

### **Leader**

The Leader answered questions on paragraph 2, West Sussex: Our Vision for the County, from Mrs Millson, Mrs Smith and Mr Watson.

In response to a comment from Mrs Smith, the Leader noted a request for any future briefing in Crawley to be in a central location and for more notice to be given.

### **Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 7, National Eye Health Week, from Mrs Millson.

Mrs Millson agreed to provide the Cabinet Member with details of the RNIB 12 days of Christmas campaign in relation to the Care Bill.

### **Cabinet Member for Finance**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 16, the County Council's 2012/14 financial statements, from Mr Rae.

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

The Cabinet Member answered questions on the following paragraphs.

Paragraph 17, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, from Ms James, Mrs Millson, Mrs Mockridge, Dr Walsh and Mrs Whitehead.

Paragraph 19, Adur Ferry Bridge, from Mr R J Oakley.

Paragraph 23, investment for resurfacing unclassified roads, from Mrs Arculus, Mr Buckland and Mr Burrett.

### **Cabinet Member for Residents' Services**

The Cabinet Member answered questions on paragraph 21, 'Tell Us Once' from Mrs Smith.

### **Agenda Item No. 7(b) - Leader's Question Time**

The Leader answered questions from members on the following topics:

State of the West Sussex economy and the Chancellor's Autumn Statement from Mr Bradbury.

Announcement in Chancellor's Autumn Statement of reduction by 50% of tax on granny flats to encourage extended families to stay together, from Mrs Mockridge.

Increase in members' allowances versus staff pay, from Mr Glennon.

Merger of councils in West Sussex to create unitary authorities to save administrative costs and transfer of public health functions to democratic control, from Dr Walsh.

Closure of Discovery Free School in Crawley, from Mr M G Jones.

13 December 2013

1. Written question from **Mrs Smith** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health**

### Question

- (a) The Care Bill which is set to become law in April 2015 will introduce a national standard for an eligibility threshold for care needs that local authorities will be required to meet. It is intended that the threshold will be the equivalent to the 'substantial' threshold in place under the current eligibility framework.
- (i) In light of the proposed threshold in the Care Bill, can the Cabinet Member provide a firm commitment that he will not be raising the existing, substantial threshold employed by the County Council before April 2015?
- (ii) Can the Cabinet Member also confirm if he is confident that the application of the County Council's current threshold will correspond to the new national threshold?
- (b) The Care Bill also places a number of responsibilities upon the County Council in relation to carers. The County Council will be required to assess and meet carers' needs that go beyond the current level of support. Can the Cabinet Member provide detail of the work that has been undertaken to identify the financial and organisational implications of these new responsibilities?

### Answer

- (a) (i) As I stated at the Health and Adults Services Select Committee, I can confirm that there is no intention of raising the existing substantial threshold.
- (ii) The national threshold has been set as 'substantial'. Draft national regulations are currently being developed and the South East Region of the Association of Directors of Adults' Social Services (ADASS) has seconded an assistant director to represent the County Council and other local authorities in the South East in these discussions. All councils with adults' services responsibilities will develop staff guidance to ensure that the national eligibility criteria underpinning the national threshold of 'substantial' will be implemented.
- (b) The County Council has been diligent in considering the implications of the Care Bill in regards to carers. The County Council recognises the positive implications for carers to have their rights strengthened and also acknowledges the potential challenge in terms of meeting the predicted increase in demand for carer assessments, especially as it is only prudent not to expect any significant increase in funding to help with this.

In order to start to plan how this potential increase will be met, modelling using differing scenarios of demand was undertaken during the summer to help predict the annual need for additional assessments. Work is now in progress to determine if any of these assessments should be delegated to another provider to help manage the increased demand.

Discussions are actively underway between commissioners and Adults' Services and also Carer Support West Sussex to explore which agency is most appropriate to undertake assessments depending on the circumstances and complexity of the needs of a particular carer. Current thinking is that assessments for carers with more straight forward and lower-level needs could be delegated to Carer Support West Sussex. This will enable current contracts to be used more flexibly to allow increased capacity for assessments. Work is on-going regarding future assessment arrangements for those carers with more complex needs.

It is anticipated that negotiations with providers will be concluded by March 2014. By then the County Council will know the details of any funding to support the implementation of the Care Bill. This will allow it up to one year to ensure that robust arrangements are put in place and have identified the detailed cost and capacity needed. On-going dialogue has been initiated with three other local authorities with a similar demographic and commitment to carers so that concerns and potential solutions can be shared. A full communication plan will accompany the implementation which will take place from 1 April 2015.

### Supplementary Question

Could consideration be given to the fact that services provided to the cared for, such as day centres, also provide much needed respite to carers when considering the budget cuts?

### Supplementary Answer

Yes, the assessment of carers will take account of the cared for person as well as the carer's responsibility so that the family is looked at holistically.

2. Written question from **Mrs Millson** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing**

### Question

A recent annual survey by Women's Aid has produced some worrying statistics which show that during the early part of the current year an increasing number of women and families have been turned away from the first refuge they have tried to access. I understand that the County Council provides funding to three women's refuges in West Sussex which provide 20 units of accommodation for women and families and that this funding is mostly used to employ staff to work in the refuges.

## Minutes - Appendix 3

---

It is recognised that alternative solutions, including preventative/early intervention measures focused on lower risk households and other forms of short-term accommodation, are favoured to the placement of women and families in refuges but in some cases there will still be a requirement that such accommodation is provided.

- (a) Can the Cabinet Member confirm if any women/families who have required accommodation in a refuge in West Sussex have been turned away due to full occupancy over the course of the current year?
- (b) What evidence can the Cabinet Member present that demonstrates that the new countywide service providing outreach support to those at risk of or recovering from domestic abuse has been effective in reducing admissions to refuges and justifies the decision to reduce funding to refuges in order to support this service?

### Answer

- (a) In common with other refuge providers the three West Sussex refuge services accept referrals from a wide range of sources including self-referrals and the 24-hour national domestic violence helpline. Refuges run at, or close to, capacity and providers are selective about the referrals they can accept so there will always be circumstances in which those seeking help are offered other forms of assistance as opposed to shared accommodation in a refuge. No one experiencing domestic abuse is ever turned away from the WORTH Independent Domestic Violence Adviser (IDVA) Service, which operates seven days a week across the county and those needing safe accommodation are provided with this immediately. The needs of the individuals are fully addressed at all levels of risk.

The County Council's role is to make sure that those at risk due to domestic abuse are offered a range of options appropriate to their needs. In practice accommodation in a refuge can work well for women and children who need or wish to make a fresh start in a new area, but may be less appropriate in other circumstances.

- (b) The Stonham Outreach service which was commissioned from the start of the year is not a substitute for refuge services, nor has its creation resulted in any loss of refuge accommodation. Instead it represents an attempt to improve the range of solutions available to women and families at risk. Commissioning this service through a single countywide contract and co-locating the service with the County Council's WORTH service is providing a much more resilient and flexible service than had been previously been available. The advantages of commissioning the service in this way include:
  - Improved **accessibility** for the public through a seven day per week service availability via telephone, e-mail and text and for referral agencies such as the Police who can now signpost to a 'one-stop' service.

- More **consistency** through a single service as opposed to three independent services whose principal role is to offer an accommodation based service to its current residents.
- Improved **accountability** through the much closer tie-in with the WORTH IDVA service and the opportunity to provide a more seamless, tiered service to clients reflecting different levels of risk in turn leading to:
- Improved **efficiency** arising from specialisation on outreach support which has allowed an expansion of the number of clients who are receiving support.
- Greater **inclusivity** for victims of domestic abuse; irrespective of gender.

### Supplementary Question

Would the Cabinet Member undertake to ensure that all refuges in West Sussex are defined as 'exempt' accommodation under current housing benefit rules to ensure that no funding is lost under welfare benefit changes?

### Supplementary Answer

I cannot guarantee to do so but I will discuss the matter to see if there is a possibility of so doing.

### 3. Written question from **Ms James** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Finance**

#### Question

- (a) With regard to the list of investment assets presented to the Performance and Finance Select Committee in October 2013, can the Cabinet Member please confirm how he will seek to prioritise the development of these sites? Could he prioritise Brownfield Sites before Greenfield Sites, so as to preserve green space for as long as possible?
- (b) In the case of Greenfield Sites, such as the Littlehampton Community College land, could he seek to utilise this land for income generation other than building development, so as to preserve open green space for the community?

#### Answer

- (a) The list provided to the Performance and Finance Select Committee in October was a list of Investment Assets as noted on the County Council's current balance sheet. These are assets currently leased and thus subject to a variety of occupational interests. They will not form the core for 'development' activities. The County Council is targeting development activity on a number of brownfield sites held currently vacant and/or declared surplus to operational needs and/or sites for which it is seeking or has secured planning consent.

Sites include Barnham (for 86 units) where the County Council secured an outline planning consent in 2011, and where it has now submitted a 'Reserved Matters' application (this is the detail required as a condition of the approved scheme regarding scale, design and landscaping issues). Other sites include Orchard Street, Chichester (where the County Council proposes to submit a planning application for four units), and a site south of the Littlehampton Community College (where the County Council anticipates a scheme for approximately 65 to 69 units).

Whilst the County Council is concentrating its thinking on brownfield site developments there will be options for wider reviews which may include greenfield opportunities.

- (b) The land at Littlehampton noted in (b) is land south of the Community College being land which formed the original school campus so is a brownfield site. The land north of the College is land within the Settlement Policy Area where there is a presumption in favour of development, and for clarity the site is not school land. This parcel of land has limited income generating opportunities in its existing use (for grazing only) and I am intent on ensuring the County Council maximises best value from all its assets

The site has been subject to considerable local debate over recent years and considered as part of wider North Littlehampton opportunities. The local member has been closely involved in the three-tier Steering Group set up in 2009 which has been guiding collaborative thinking around town-wide infrastructure and development. Part of the County Council-owned land is allocated to deliver the Fitzalan Link Road as part of the approved development to the north and also identified for housing within the evolving neighbourhood plan. Once the Link road is built, the site does offer the opportunity to deliver local housing which the County Council has already stated will be linked to a generous open space provision.

The County Council will review whether it is possible to bring any part of its land holdings into earlier development by using existing road networks in an endeavour to support its wider economic development aspirations as well as support local planning policy progression.

### **Supplementary Question**

Could the Cabinet Member give an assurance that the strategy being employed will be integrated into the communities' local plans as part of the Localism Act?

### **Supplementary Answer**

Yes, I can give that assurance.

### **Additional Question**

An additional question was asked by Dr Walsh.

#### 4. Written question from **Mr Oxlade** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

##### **Question**

Can the Cabinet Member confirm to me if there was any money from the Crawley Highways and/or the Crawley Highways community and economic budget directed to another area in West Sussex in years 2012/13 and 2013/14 and, if so, what was the reason?

##### **Answer**

##### **Asset Management Roads Maintenance**

**2012/13** – Of the schemes listed in the approved Integrated Works Programme (IWP) for 2012/13 only one scheme was not completed (Furnace Drive surface dressing) due to the need to prioritise work by utility companies on the road and was slipped to 2013/14. There was no budget from the Crawley area directed to another area in West Sussex.

**2013/14** - Of the schemes listed in the approved IWP for 2013/14 to date, there has been one confirmed change (Maiden Lane micro asphalt surfacing scheme). This has been deferred due to the need to prioritise work by the utility companies. It is possible that five further carriageway micro asphalt surfacing schemes may slip to 2014/15 for the same reason. The IWP 2013/14 included the following within the Crawley area:

- £402,810 of carriageway schemes
- £80,000 of footway schemes
- £240,000 of structures schemes
- £187,900 of road safety measures

This represents 6% of the total available works budget for the county.

To date, there has been no budget taken from the Crawley area to other areas in West Sussex. There has been £250,000 of additional money spent on work in the Crawley area to enable Manor Royal Business Park to be resurfaced.

##### **Improvement Schemes**

The Community-led improvement budget supports local investment in response to schemes identified within communities. There were eight improvement schemes in Crawley within the 2012/13 IWP and all were identified prior to the establishment of priority schemes within the West Crawley and East Crawley CLC Infrastructure Plans (IPs). Seven of the schemes were delivered in 2012/13 and one scheme was deferred to the forward programme for delivery in either 2014/15 or 2015/16 along with the associated funds.

The 2013/14 IWP identifies five improvement schemes:

- Two IP schemes are complete
- One IP scheme remains outstanding for delivery in 2013/14

## Minutes - Appendix 3

---

- One IP scheme has been deferred along with the associated funding to the forward programme for delivery in either 2014/15 or 2015/16

One scheme is a deferral from the 2011/12 IWP and is due for completion within 2013/14. In 2012/13 or 2013/14, no funds allocated to support specific schemes in Crawley have been reallocated to other schemes outside the area.

### Supplementary Question

Could the Cabinet Member confirm how many carriageway micro asphalt surfacing schemes have been completed in Crawley during the current year and what consultations have been conducted with the utility companies in a bid to avoid the deferral of five such schemes in the IWP?

### Supplementary Answer

The County Council will do its best to avoid deferring work but if a utility company needs to do work it has the right to do so.

### 5. Written question from **Mr Parsons** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

#### Question

UKIP remains committed to its opposition to the building of wind farms. Electricity produced by wind turbines is many times more expensive than that produced by conventional means. Off-shore wind farms with their huge maintenance costs can be up to 22 times more expensive to produce electricity than a gas-fuelled generating plant.

News that the German company RWE has cancelled its plans to build the 'Atlantic Array', a massive wind farm off the North Devon coast, has been welcomed by many in the area, including Conservative politicians. It was seen by many as an expensive and inefficient White Elephant that would have had a hugely negative impact on the environment.

What reassessment has the Cabinet Member made of the support in principle provided by the County Council for the Rampion wind farm in light of the objections to the Atlantic Array by local councils in North Devon, including:

- (a) Visual impact of the development on the seascape;
- (b) The potential for sediment and detritus disturbance during drilling operations for the foundations of the turbines and the settlement of this material upon Sussex beaches with a consequent impact upon the tourist economy;
- (c) Adverse impacts on local business, in particular the positioning of turbines within established shipping routes to Shoreham Port?

### Answer

In March 2013, E.ON applied to the Planning Inspectorate for a Development Consent Order (DCO) in relation to the proposed Rampion Offshore Wind Farm, off the Sussex Coast. Subject to approval by the Secretary of State, the DCO will permit (amongst other things) up to 175 offshore wind turbines and foundations (and associated offshore infrastructure), a landfall located between East Worthing and Lancing, onshore underground circuits, and an onshore substation near Bolney, Mid Sussex.

The Planning Inspectorate is currently examining the application for the DCO and it will make a recommendation to Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, who will make the decision on whether to grant or to refuse development consent. The County Council, as a local authority affected by the proposed Rampion Offshore Wind Farm development, was invited to submit representations by 8 August 2013 to form part of the Planning Inspectorate's considerations in making a recommendation to the Secretary of State. It should be noted, however, that the County Council is only a consultee in the process and it does not have any decision-making responsibility or powers with regard to the grant or refusal of the DCO.

In July 2013, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport approved the County Council's formal response to the consultation on the DCO following scrutiny by the Environmental and Community Services Select Committee early that month. In summary, the response stated that lower-carbon energy generation and proposals for a wind farm located off the Sussex Coast were supported in principle by the County Council. With specific regard to the proposed Rampion Wind Farm, although the decision to locate the cable underground was welcomed, only qualified support was given to the proposal because there were a number of issues that still needed to be addressed. The decision also authorised officers to negotiate with E.ON and other parties to resolve any issues that remained outstanding prior to the close of the Examination held by the Planning Inspectorate, provided that the resolution of those matters was in keeping with the position approved. Accordingly, since the Cabinet Member's decision and the submission of the formal response, officers have been representing the County Council at the Examination which started in August and which is due to finish by the end of December 2013.

At the end of November 2013, RWE Innogy issued a statement that it had reviewed the Atlantic Array Project and the Round 3 Bristol Channel Zone and that it was not viable for RWE to continue with the development in the Bristol Channel Zone at the current time. This decision by RWE was made taking into account other opportunities in the UK offshore wind portfolio and in light of the significant technical challenges specific to the zone.

In conclusion, there is no scope for a reassessment of the County Council's position with regard to the Rampion Wind Farm proposal. The position, as set out in the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport's decision in July 2013 (decision HT8(13/14) refers), has been subject to examination by the Planning Inspectorate since August 2013 and the Inspectorate's consideration of the proposal is drawing to a close. Furthermore, there are no grounds for a reassessment of the County Council's position. The decision made by RWE about

## Minutes - Appendix 3

---

the Atlantic Array Project was based on issues specific to that location and on commercial considerations. Accordingly, it is considered that RWE's decision has no bearing on the proposal by E.ON for the Rampion Wind Farm.

### Supplementary Question

What assurance has the Cabinet Member received that there will be adequate mitigation to address any issues of potential disturbance from the development of wind turbines within the West Sussex area?

### Supplementary Answer

Such questions should be addressed to the Planning Inspectorate which is responsible for granting planning permission. The matter has been discussed by the relevant Select Committee and I have written, as requested, to the company expressing the Select Committee's concerns. I am not totally satisfied with the reply and have therefore sent it to the Chairman of the Select Committee for further comment.

### Additional Questions

Additional questions were asked by Mr Acraman, Mr Griffiths and Dr Walsh.

#### 6. Written question from **Mr Quinn** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

##### Question

I have received many complaints from residents in Crawley regarding the lack of concessionary bus travel available to senior citizens after 11.00 p.m. on weekdays (Monday to Friday), in West Sussex the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme timings for concessionary travel has been adopted and I understand that any extension to these timing is at the discretion of the local authority.

- (a) Can the Cabinet Member confirm what consideration he has undertaken of an extension of the timings to allow concessionary travel on buses after 11.00 p.m. on weekdays?
- (b) Can he share any cost projections associated with such an extension to the concessionary travel timings?

##### Answer

- (a) In 2011 responsibility for the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS) was transferred from the borough and district councils. There was also a transfer of funding. There are two funding pressures for the County Council as a result of this transfer:
  - (i) There was, and remains, a funding shortfall from the Government of over £2m for the scheme. This continues to be met by the County

Council (the complexities of government grant funding means that this figure is not exact).

- (ii) The subsequent additional costs of patronage growth must be funded by the County Council. Initial estimates for the cost of the scheme were based on historic passenger numbers. Since then passenger numbers have increased with the net result that existing budgets are forecast to be over-subscribed by a further £800,000.

The statutory minimum operating times for the scheme are between 9.30 a.m. and 11.00 p.m. Monday to Friday and all day at the weekend. Prior to the County Council assuming responsibility for the scheme a study on the costs and benefits of extending the scheme to beyond the statutory minimum was undertaken. It was estimated that extending the hours of operation to allow free travel all day on Monday to Fridays would cost £250,000 per year. No estimate was made at the time or since of the costs of extending the scheme beyond 11.00 p.m. to midnight or later. The number of service users that would benefit from such a change is relatively few because there are relatively few services that are available at this time. Most of the late night services cover Crawley and parts of route 700 (Brighton to Bognor Regis.)

- (b) It is extremely difficult to predict the cost of extending the scheme. It could be relatively modest in comparison to the overall scheme cost, but could easily be in the region of £20,000 to £50,000. It is of course very difficult to accurately ascertain this estimate because the level of demand is unknown.

Any decision that is made generally about the free bus pass has, by definition, to apply countywide. Given the localised nature of late night bus services, extending this provision would only benefit a relatively low number of service users within specific localities. It is therefore more appropriate that Mr Quinn and other members may wish to raise this issue with the County Local Committee for consideration as a priority for local funding.

### **Supplementary Question**

In relation to concessionary fares after 11.00 p.m. Monday to Friday, could the Cabinet Member confirm what progress has been made to establish a joint contact between East and West Sussex to administer the concessionary fare scheme?

### **Supplementary Answer**

The Council is not planning to extend the scheme beyond 11.00 p.m. but will work with East Sussex if there is a purpose in doing so.

### **Additional Questions**

Additional questions were asked by Dr Dennis and Mrs Mullins.

7. Written question from **Mr Bradbury** for reply by the **Cabinet Member for Residents' Services**

### Question

Could the Cabinet Member please provide an update on progress with the Joint Fire Service Control Room project with East Sussex Fire Authority? In particular please can the Cabinet Member confirm:

- (a) The timetable for the project;
- (b) Whether the project is on budget; and
- (c) If there is any variance to the projected savings?

### Answer

- (a) **Sussex Control Centre (SCC) timetable**

### Property/Accommodation

The County Council's Capital and Infrastructure team and West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service (WSFRS) will deliver the new control centre building on 20 December 2013 on target.

### Integrated Technology Delay

The 'go live' date of 31 March 2014 can no longer be achieved. It is advised that the authorities do not announce any further 'go live' deadlines until after the further FATs test in February.

- (b) **Budget**

### Capital Programme

The forecast final project cost for property/accommodations work is currently at £2,090,193 against the revised budget of £2,200,000.

### Integrated Technology

The £3.6m (£1.8m per authority) grant from the Department for Communities and Local Government is on target.

- (c) **Variance on savings**

The delay means that the financial impacts are currently estimated costs of £72,000 per month totalling £288,000 over the estimated period of the delay which will be shared equally between ESFRS and WSFRS. The WSFRS annual saving of £475,000 will be impacted with an estimated additional one-off pressure of £144,000 on WSFRS in 2014/15. Once the SCC is operational the £475,000 saving will be met from 2015/16 onwards.

### **Supplementary Question**

Does the Cabinet Member agree that the answer shows how wise and prudent it was to take a cautious approach to joint working arrangements? May I also urge him to arrange some sort of ceremony once the control room is open?

### **Supplementary Answer**

I am sure there will be suitable arrangements made to celebrate the opening. The time taken to complete the project shows how important it has been to take time to get it right.

### **Additional Question**

An additional question was asked by Mrs Smith.