EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of a MEETING of the EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL held at Council Chamber, County Hall, Lewes on 7 FEBRUARY 2017 at 10.00 am

PresentCouncillors John Barnes MBE, Colin Belsey, Nick Bennett,
Bill Bentley, Mike Blanch, Ian Buchanan, Carla Butler,
Peter Charlton, Tania Charman, Charles Clark,
Godfrey Daniel, Angharad Davies, Chris Dowling,
Claire Dowling, Stuart Earl, David Elkin, Michael Ensor
(Chairman), Kathryn Field, Kim Forward, Roy Galley,
Keith Glazier, Philip Howson, Carolyn Lambert,
Carl Maynard, Ruth O'Keeffe MBE, Peter Pragnell (Vice
Chairman), Pat Rodohan, Judy Rogers, Jim Sheppard,
Stephen Shing, Alan Shuttleworth, Rupert Simmons,
Rosalyn St. Pierre, Bob Standley, Richard Stogdon,
Barry Taylor, Sylvia Tidy, David Tutt, John Ungar,
Trevor Webb, Francis Whetstone and Michael Wincott

41 Minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2016

41.1 RESOLVED – to confirm the minutes of the previous meeting of the County Council held on 18 October 2016 as a correct record.

42 Apologies for absence

42.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Keeley, Phillips, Pursglove, Scott, D Shing and Wallis

43 Chairman's business

NEW YEAR'S HONOURS

43.1 On behalf of the Council the Chairman congratulated all those who lived or worked in East Sussex who had been recognised in the New Year's Honours List. In particular, the Chairman congratulated Councillor John Barnes who had been awarded an MBE for voluntary services to the community.

CHAIRMAN'S ACTIVITIES

43.2 The Chairman reported that he had attended a number of engagements since the last meeting of the County Council including: the presentation of awards ceremony for the South East Reserve Forces and Cadets Association, the Cuckmere Buses 40th Anniversary tea, the Pestalozzi founders day, the All Saints church dinner, the Lewes Bonfire celebrations and the Eastbourne Silver Band's 5th Annual Remembrance Concert. I have also attended an East Sussex Prayer Breakfast, a RNLI Service, the BBC South East Awards, the Christmas Pontifical Sung Vespers and the Heathfield Works Graduation Evening. I attended carol concerts at Newhaven, St John's Ambulance, the Mayor of Lewes' concert, the West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service, Hastings Sea Cadets and the County Council carol concert. I have also attended a Christmas reception at Surrey County Council, 2 Citizenship Ceremonies and the Eastbourne and the Lewes Holocaust memorial events. I have also visited the

refurbished Grangemead care home. I have hosted a Christmas reception and a carol concert in Lewes. The Vice Chairman has also attended a number of events.

CHINESE NEW YEAR

43.3 The Chairman indicated that the Chinese New Year began on 28 January. The Chairman wished all present a very happy Chinese New Year.

PRAYERS

43.4 The Chairman thanked Reverend Steve Daughtery for leading prayers before the meeting

PETITIONS

43.5 The Chairman informed the Council that immediately before the meeting the following petitions had been received from members:

Councillor Barnes	 calling upon the County Council to support traffic calming measures in Etchingham. 	
Councillors Charman and Daniel	 calling on the County Council to stop Castledown School, Hastings becoming part of the ARK Academy Group 	
Councillor Elkin	 calling on the County Council to address traffic calming at 10 Brisbane Quay, Sovereign Harbour North, Eastbourne 	
Councillor O'Keeffe	 calling on the County Council to support the provision of a school crossing patrol person to assist children and families crossing Prince Edwards Road, Lewes 	
Councillor Rogers	 calling on the County Council to provide traffic wardens outside Hastings schools as often as possible. 	
Councillor Ungar (on behalf of Councillor Wallis)	 calling on the County Council to urgently review the traffic situation in and around Bourne School, Eastbourne 	

44 Questions from members of the public

44.1 There were no questions from the public.

45 Declarations of Interest

45.1 There were no declarations of interest.

46 Reports

46.1 The Chairman of the County Council, having called over the reports set out in the agenda, reserved the following paragraph for discussion:

Cabinet - paragraph 1

NON-RESERVED PARAGRAPHS

46.2 On the motion of the Chairman of the County Council, the Council ADOPTED those paragraphs in the reports of the Committees that had not been reserved for discussion.

47 Report of the Cabinet

Paragraph 1 – Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources

47.1 Under Standing Order 23, the Council agreed that the speeches of the Leaders of the six groups (or their nominees) on paragraph 1 of the Cabinet's report should be extended beyond five minutes.

47.2 Councillor Elkin moved the adoption of paragraph 1 of the Cabinet's report.

47.3 The following amendment was moved by Councillor Tutt and seconded:

Delete paragraph 1.78 of the Cabinet's report and replace with:-

(1) approve, in principle, the draft Council Plan at Appendix 1 and authorise the Chief Executive to finalise the Plan in consultation with the relevant Lead Members;

(2) approve the net Revenue Budget estimates for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 2 with the following amendments

- 1. Reinstate early help savings in 2017/18 £0.610m
- 2. Reinstate Standards and Learning Effectiveness Service savings in 2017/18 £0.122m
- 3. Reinstate East Sussex Better Together savings by investing to support the establishment of integrated locality teams to reduce the call on acute care- £1.957m
- 4. Reinstate Connecting 4 You savings (for carers, substance misuse, working age adult care, directly provided services and older people community care) totalling £0.581m
- 5. Reinstate core funding for SPARK £0.045m
- 6. Provide additional investment into village maintenance support £0.050m

Total of proposed revenue amendments - £3.365m

To be funded by:

- 7. Reduce the Revenue Contribution to Capital by a further £1.0m to £3.0m £1.0m
- 8. Transfer in part the New Homes Bonus contribution to capital to revenue £1.175m
- 9. Capitalise investment into highways drainage £1.0m
- 10. Recognising that items 7-9 have an associated cost relating to increased borrowing reducing the sums available by $-(\pounds 0.700m)$
- 11. Reduce the budget for communications £0.500m
- 12. Use parking surplus for existing transport services £0.150m
- 13. Increase target savings for BSD/Orbis £0.200m
- 14. Delete post for Culture Strategy £0.040m (part year) in 2017/18

Total of proposed revenue funding amendments - £3.365m

(3) in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to agree that:
(i) the net budget requirement is £365.0m and the amount calculated by East Sussex County Council as its council tax requirement (see Appendix 7) for the year 2017/18 is £257.4m;
(ii) the amount calculated by East Sussex County Council as the basic amount of its council tax (i.e. for a band D property) for the year 2017/18 is £1,314.36 and represents a 4.99% (3% of which relates to the Adult Social

Care precept) increase on the previous year;

(4) advise the District and Borough Councils of the relevant amounts payable and council tax in other bands in line with the regulations and to issue precepts accordingly in accordance with an agreed schedule of instalments as set out at Appendix 7

(5) authorise the Chief Operating Officer, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, Leader and Deputy Leader, to make adjustments to the presentation of the budget to reflect the final settlement and budget decisions;

(6) approve the fees and charges set out in Appendix 6 and delegate authority to the Chief Finance Officer to approve an increase to all other fees and charges by up to 2%; (7) approve the Capital Programme for 2016 – 2023, including a commitment to a 5 year Highways maintenance programme of £91.3m as set out at Appendices 2 and 8; with the following amendments:

1. Additional capital investment in highways maintenance - £1m in 2017/18

2. Capital allocation of £10m for Property Investment Strategy to fund primary care and

sheltered accommodation, to produce revenue surplus of £200K in due course (8) Without binding future budget setting decisions of the Council, make the following amendments to the planning assumptions within the Medium Term Financial Plan forecast for the period 2018/19 to 2020/21 as set out in Appendix 3:

in 2018/19:-

- 1. Delete ISEND savings £0.332m
- 2. Delete locality social worker savings £0.304m

Total of proposed revenue amendments in 2018/19 - £0.636m To be funded by:

- 3. Additional use of New Homes Bonus £0.325m
- 4. Use of Transformation & Delivery Risk provision £0.127m
- 5. Savings to be realised from moving to a full highways client function £0.170m
- 6. To reflect the full-year savings of Culture Strategy Post £0.014m

Total of proposed revenue funding amendments in 2018/19 - £0.636m

(9) note the comments of the Chief Finance Officer on budget risks and robustness as set out in Appendix 9;

(10) note the draft Strategic Investment Plan for East Sussex Better Together as set out in Appendix 5; and

(11) note the comments from the engagement exercises as set out in Appendix 10

47.4 A recorded vote on Councillor Tutt's amendment was taken. The amendment was LOST, the votes being cast as follows:

FOR THE AMENDMENT

Councillors Blanch, Butler, Charman, Daniel, Field, Forward, Lambert, O'Keeffe, Rodohan, Rogers, Shuttleworth, St Pierre, Tutt, Ungar, Webb, and Wincott

AGAINST THE AMENDMENT

Councillors Barnes, Belsey, Bennett, Bentley, Buchanan, Charlton, Clark, Davies, Chris Dowling, Claire Dowling, Earl, Elkin, Ensor, Galley, Glazier, Howson, Maynard, Pragnell, Sheppard, Simmons, Standley, Stogdon, Taylor, Tidy and Whetstone

ABSTENTIONS Councillor S Shing

47.5 The following amendment was moved by Councillor Webb and seconded

Delete paragraph 1.78 of the Cabinet's report and replace with:-

(1) approve, in principle, the draft Council Plan at Appendix 1 and authorise the Chief Executive to finalise the Plan in consultation with the relevant Lead Members;

(2) approve the net Revenue Budget estimates for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 2 with the following amendments

- 1. East Sussex Better Together Strategic Investment Plan reinstatement of savings -£1.232m
- 2. Adult Social care Connecting 4 You reinstatement of savings:

Older People Independent Sector Budget – review of older people service funding: delete proposed saving £0.093m

Older People Independent Sector Budget – review of older people mental health service funding: delete proposed saving £0.011m

Working Age Adult Independent Sector Budget – review of mental health service funding: delete proposed saving of £0.010m

Working Age Adult Independent Sector Budget – review of learning disability service funding: delete proposed saving of £0.067m

Carers – Adult Social Care contribution to the Better Care Fund: delete proposed saving of £0.173m

Supporting People – review of Home Works and Steps services: reduce proposed savings by £0.014m

3. Children's Services reinstatement of savings; Standards and Learning Effectiveness Service £0.122m, Safeguarding unit £0.023m, SWIFT Specialist Family Service and Youth Offending Team posts £0.180m and early help £0.098m - £0.423m

Total of proposed amendments - £2.023m

To be funded by:

- 1. Remove Transformation and Delivery Risk provision (2017/18 only) £0.127m
- 2. Remove Economic Development Grants (2017/18 only) £1.0m
- 3. Reduce Revenue Contribution to Capital by a further £1.0m to £3.0m (£0.175 of which will support additional borrowing) £0.825
- 4. Remove budget for Your County £0.071m

(3) in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to agree that:

- (i) the net budget requirement is £365.0m and the amount calculated by East Sussex County Council as its council tax requirement (see Appendix 7) for the year 2017/18 is £257.4m;
- (ii) the amount calculated by East Sussex County Council as the basic amount of its council tax (i.e. for a band D property) for the year 2017/18 is £1,314.36 and represents a 4.99% (3% of which relates to the Adult Social Care precept) increase on the previous year;

(4) advise the District and Borough Councils of the relevant amounts payable and council tax in other bands in line with the regulations and to issue precepts accordingly in accordance with an agreed schedule of instalments as set out at Appendix 7

(5) authorise the Chief Operating Officer, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, Leader and Deputy Leader, to make adjustments to the presentation of the budget to reflect the final settlement and budget decisions;

(6) approve the fees and charges set out in Appendix 6 and delegate authority to the Chief Finance Officer to approve an increase to all other fees and charges by up to 2%;

(7) approve the Capital Programme for 2016 – 2023, including a commitment to a 5 year Highways maintenance programme of £91.3m as set out at Appendices 2 and 8;

(8) note the Medium Term Financial Plan forecast for the period 2018/19 to 2020/21 as set out in Appendix 3; and

(9) note the comments of the Chief Finance Officer on budget risks and robustness as set out in Appendix 9;

(10) note the draft Strategic Investment Plan for East Sussex Better Together as set out in Appendix 5; and

(11) note the comments from the engagement exercises as set out in Appendix 10

47.6 A recorded vote on Councillor Webb's amendment was taken. The amendment was LOST, the votes being cast as follows:

FOR THE AMENDMENT

Councillors Buchanan, Charman, Daniel, Forward, O'Keeffe, Rogers, S Shing, Webb, and Wincott

AGAINST THE AMENDMENT

Councillors Barnes, Belsey, Bennett, Bentley, Charlton, Clark, Davies, Chris Dowling, Claire Dowling, Earl, Elkin, Ensor, Galley, Glazier, Howson, Maynard, Pragnell, Sheppard, Simmons, Standley, Stogdon, Taylor, Tidy and Whetstone

ABSTENTIONS

Councillors Blanch, Butler, Field, Lambert, Rodohan, Shuttleworth, St Pierre, Tutt and Ungar

47.7 The following motion was moved by Councillor Elkin to adopt paragraph 1 of the Cabinet report:

(1) approve, in principle, the draft Council Plan at Appendix 1 and authorise the Chief Executive to finalise the Plan in consultation with the relevant Lead Members;

(2) approve the net Revenue Budget estimates for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 2;

(3) in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to agree that:

(i) the net budget requirement is £365.0m and the amount calculated by East Sussex County Council as its council tax requirement (see Appendix 7) for the year 2017/18 is £257.4m;

(ii) the amount calculated by East Sussex County Council as the basic amount of its council tax (i.e. for a band D property) for the year 2017/18 is £1,314.36 and represents a 4.99% (3% of which relates to the Adult Social Care precept) increase on the previous year;

(4) advise the District and Borough Councils of the relevant amounts payable and council tax in other bands in line with the regulations and to issue precepts accordingly in accordance with an agreed schedule of instalments as set out at Appendix 7

(5) authorise the Chief Operating Officer, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, Leader and Deputy Leader, to make adjustments to the presentation of the budget to reflect the final settlement and budget decisions;

(6) approve the fees and charges set out in Appendix 6 and delegate authority to the Chief Finance Officer to approve an increase to all other fees and charges by up to 2%;

(7) approve the Capital Programme for 2016 – 2023, including a commitment to a 5 year Highways maintenance programme of £91.3m as set out at Appendices 2 and 8;

(8) note the Medium Term Financial Plan forecast for the period 2018/19 to 2020/21 as set out in Appendix 3; and

(9) note the comments of the Chief Finance Officer on budget risks and robustness as set out in Appendix 9;

(10) note the draft Strategic Investment Plan for East Sussex Better Together as set out in Appendix 5; and

(11) note the comments from the engagement exercises as set out in Appendix 10

47.8 A recorded vote on Councillor Elkin's motion was taken. The motion was CARRIED with the votes being cast as follows:

FOR THE MOTION

Councillors Barnes, Belsey, Bennett, Bentley, Buchanan, Charlton, Clark, Davies, Chris Dowling, Claire Dowling, Earl, Elkin, Ensor, Galley, Glazier, Howson, Maynard, Pragnell, Sheppard, Simmons, Standley, Stogdon, Taylor, Tidy and Whetstone AGAINST THE MOTION

Councillors Blanch, Butler, Charman, Daniel, Field, Forward, Lambert, Rodohan, Rogers, Shuttleworth, St Pierre, Tutt, Ungar, Webb, and Wincott

ABSTENTIONS Councillors O'Keeffe and S Shing

48 Questions from County Councillors

ORAL QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS

48.1 The following members asked questions of the Lead Cabinet Members indicated and they responded:

Questioner	Respondent	Subject
Councillor St Pierre	Councillor Simmons	Report from Department of Transport regarding possible development of a Brighton to Uckfield railway line
Councillor Rodohan	Councillor Maynard	Highway maintenance, pothole repair and monitoring of contract. I vehicles
Councillor Tutt	Councillor Glazier	Opportunity for the Council to take maximum advantage of the apprenticeship levy.
Councillor Charman	Councillor Bennett	Consultation regarding possibility of Castledown School, Hastings becoming an academy and ESCC involvement in the process
Councillor Daniel	Councillor Glazier	Implication of budget cuts in relation to domestic abuse on the Council's White Ribbon status.
Councillor S Shing	Councillor Glazier	Use of electronic voting in Council meetings
Councillor Ungar	Councillor Simmons	Possibility of requesting compensation from the Government to reflect the impact on the local economy of the industrial action on Southern Rail
Councillor Charman	Councillor Maynard	Response to Hastings Borough Council regarding the possibility of Hastings having representation on a Transport Action Group.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 44

48.2 Three written questions were received from Councillor Lambert for the Lead Member for Transport and Environment. The questions and answers are attached to these minutes.

48.3 There were no supplementary questions.

THE CHAIRMAN DECLARED THE MEETING CLOSED AT 12.49 pm

The reports referred to are included in the minute book

WEITTEN QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 44

1. <u>Question by Councillor Lambert to the Lead Member for Transport and</u> <u>Environment</u>

I previously asked a written question about parking permits for residents which is becoming an increasing problem in our towns.

I would like clarification on whether or not a written policy exists which clearly sets out the criteria for parking permit schemes. It is important to have this clarification so that councillors and members of the public are clear that the assessment of requests is carried out in a transparent and equitable manner in accordance with an agreed procedure.

Answer by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment

There is no formal County Council Policy for the installation of new resident permit parking schemes, applications for resident permits schemes are assessed on an operational basis and on a site by site basis. When assessing requests for residents permit parking schemes, County Council Officers look at the number of requests or complaints received and generally would expect at least 40% of local addresses to support the installation of a permit scheme. This saves any abortive costs to the County Council when final proposals are consulted and do not meet widespread support. It is not usual to introduce a resident permit scheme in a single road and we would look for support from a wider area so that the perceived problem is not simply transferred to adjacent residential areas.

Resident permit parking schemes are designed to provide a reasonable chance for carowning residents to park near to, although not necessarily directly outside, their houses as often the demand for permits exceeds the number of parking bays available.

In assessing applications for new resident permit schemes or extensions to existing schemes, Officers are guided by the level of local support and also take into consideration local conditions such as proximity to railway stations, shopping areas, hospitals, schools and each application needs to be considered on its own merit. All requests for a permit parking scheme are processed in a fair and consistent way.

More and more households now own more than one vehicle, placing a greater strain on the available kerb-space, and often generating complaints from other residents.

The times of operation of resident permits also need to be considered as well as prospective enforcement. It may be that a request for a permit scheme is not the most appropriate option, for example if most residents have suitable off-road parking. Equally there may be other remedies to combating commuter parking and school drop-off problems, such as time limited parking restrictions at certain times of the day.

It must also be noted that there is a cost to introduce resident permits to cover the cost of introduction, installation, maintenance, and enforcement.

For these reasons it is felt that the assessment of, and potential introduction of, resident permit parking schemes should not be policy driven, but instead remain managed on an operational basis, with due consideration to the circumstances surrounding each application. However every application is assessed in a consistent and fair approach.

2. <u>Question by Councillor Lambert to the Lead Member for Transport and Environment</u>

Residents frequently raise concerns about parking on grass verges and pavements. It would appear that no action is taken to prevent people from parking on these spaces which annoys

residents, damages the infrastructure and is dangerous for those with sight and mobility issues and parents with pushchairs.

Will the County Council take action to prevent people parking on verges and pavements including considering placing bollards on key problem sites if residents are prepared to contribute to the cost?

Answer by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment

There is no national legislation, outside London, to prevent parking on verges and pavements. However, where there are existing yellow lines these extend to verge and pavement and in Lewes District our parking enforcement contractor NSL is able to enforce those existing lines and signs.

The County Council introduced a trial scheme that was approved by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment in October 2014 following requests to ban vehicles from parking on pavements and verges. A prioritisation process was developed to enable Officers to assess requests for a verge-parking ban. Various criteria are used to assess a particular location, such as whether it is close to schools, shops, hospitals, or if it is on a bus route etc. It also takes into account the duration and frequency of the problem, whether damage is being caused to footways and verges, and if such a ban would cause congestion.

Footways are designed for use by pedestrians and as you have witnessed, vehicles parking on the footway can cause damage, breaking paving slabs and leaving the footway unsightly and potentially unsafe for pedestrians. Verges can also be damaged by vehicles parking on them. A footway and verge parking ban helps prevent damage to paving caused by vehicles parking on the footways and verges in identified areas.

Banning vehicles from parking on the pavement is not always appropriate and could lead to congestion in narrow or heavily trafficked roads. This could have a detrimental effect, especially in town centre areas where commercial vehicles would have no option but to frequently load and unload in the road. Any such ban in a busy town centre area should not be introduced on its own, but instead should be assessed as part of a wider assessment and consideration given to alternative arrangements for loading and unloading.

At locations where it is not considered appropriate to implement traffic regulation orders to enable enforcement to take place, consideration will be given to installing bollards to prevent inconsiderate parking. Clearly, with limited budgets the County Council has to prioritise what it does on the highway and therefore contributions may be sought from local communities.

Any requests for new or changes to existing parking controls where we operate civil parking enforcement (CPE) should be directed to Parking Services. Our current CPE areas are Eastbourne borough, Hastings borough, and Lewes district. Requests outside the CPE areas should be forwarded to the Highways Contact Centre.

3. <u>Question by Councillor Lambert to the Lead Member for Transport and Environment</u>

Seaford is the biggest town in Lewes District and has a high percentage of older people with complex and chronic healthcare needs. These older people struggle to access healthcare services provided by local hospitals, particularly those provided by Eastbourne District General Hospital. It is not possible to take a bus direct to the hospital – people have to travel first to Eastbourne town centre and then get a further bus out to the hospital. This is unsuitable and difficult for those with mobility issues, particularly in bad weather and in the dark winter evenings. Taxis are extremely costly: the average cost of a single fare is £20 - £25 from Seaford to the hospital and this is simply unaffordable for those on fixed incomes.

Will the County Council address these health inequalities by funding an enhanced service so that the Community Transport for the Lewes Area (CTLA) or a similar organisation could offer low cost or free travel to hospital appointments for older people in Seaford and other vulnerable and disadvantaged groups?

Answer by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment

Whilst I understand the concerns raised, the County Council cannot take on the additional commitment to provide communities and individual residents with subsidised transport to medical appointments.

Councillor Lambert refers to the need for Seaford residents to change buses in Eastbourne town centre so as to access the District General Hospital. I would add that buses run every 10 minutes between Seaford and Eastbourne town centre, with a similar frequency from there to the Hospital. The change of bus in Eastbourne involves crossing the road in the buses only Terminus Road precinct.

Hospital appointments by their nature require the transport provision to be appropriate to the patient's individual appointment times. This is why the East Sussex Community Transport Operators Forum, which includes CTLA, have said to the County Council that it is not usually appropriate to look to community transport minibuses, with paid drivers and therefore higher costs of provision, to provide a cost-effective solution for these patients.

Some communities have gone some way to addressing the problems of transport access to medical appointments through setting up their own volunteer car scheme. This community self-help is a practical and rewarding way of helping those who have these transport issues. I am however not aware that such a scheme exists in Seaford. Information on how to go about setting up such a scheme, which was developed with the help of our community voluntary action partners, is available on the County Council's website. The toolkit can be found on our Community Transport page.