

## MINUTES

---

# EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

---

**MINUTES of a MEETING of the EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL held at County Hall, Lewes on 20 OCTOBER 2015 at 10.00 am**

**Present** Councillors John Barnes, Colin Belsey (Chairman), Nick Bennett, Bill Bentley, Ian Buchanan, Carla Butler, Frank Carstairs, Tania Charman, Charles Clark, Godfrey Daniel, Angharad Davies, Chris Dowling, Claire Dowling, Stuart Earl, David Elkin, Michael Ensor (Vice Chairman), Kathryn Field, Kim Forward, Roy Galley, Keith Glazier, John Hodges, Laurence Keeley, Carolyn Lambert, Carl Maynard, Ruth O'Keeffe, Michael Phillips, Mike Pursglove, Phil Scott, Jim Sheppard, Daniel Shing, Stephen Shing, Alan Shuttleworth, Rupert Simmons, Rosalyn St. Pierre, Bob Standley, Richard Stogdon, Barry Taylor, Sylvia Tidy, David Tutt, John Ungar, Steve Wallis, Trevor Webb, Francis Whetstone and Michael Wincott

### **30 Minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2015**

30.1 RESOLVED – to confirm the minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 14 July 2015 as a correct record

### **31 Apologies for absence**

31.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mike Blanch, Peter Charlton, Philip Howson and Peter Pragnell

### **32 Chairman's business**

#### **NORMAN WILCOCK AND NOEL MACKILLIGIN**

32.1 The Chairman paid tribute to 2 former colleagues, Norman Wilcock and Noel Mackilligin. Noel was a County Councillor from 1974 to 1989 and served as Chairman from 1987 to 1989. Norman served a County Councillor from 1993 to 1999 and was a former Headteacher at The Grove School. On behalf of the County Council, the Chairman offered condolences to Noel and Norman's family and friends.

32.2 The Council stood in silence as a mark of respect for their former colleagues Noel Mackilligin and Norman Wilcock.

#### **HERO AWARD**

32.3 On behalf of the County Council the Chairman congratulated Louise Baxter from the Trading Standards Service who was honoured at the Chartered Trading Standards Institute Conference with a 'Hero Award'. The award was for the significant contribution Louise had made to consumer protection. Louise set up the National Trading Standards Scams Team 2 years ago. The Team works to protect residents, usually those that are vulnerable from scammers. The Team was established after Louise discovered that those who had already fallen prey to scams were put on a 'suckers' list and being scammed out of thousands of

pounds. Since then she has worked to provide a fundamental support system for residents, run campaigns and encouraged others such as banks and postal services to join the cause.

#### GARY WALSH

32.4 On behalf of the Council the Chairman welcomed Gary Walsh to his first meeting as Chief Fire Officer and Chief Executive. The Chairman also congratulated him on being awarded the Queen's Fire Service Medal which he received on 16 October

#### CHAIRMAN'S ACTIVITIES

32.5 The Chairman reported that he had attended a number of engagements since the last meeting of the County Council including: the Queen's Award for Voluntary Service for Children with Cancer Trust, East Sussex Youth Orchestra events, the Queen's Award Investiture for the Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Families Association, the Families for Autism Charity Gala, the Rugby World Cup Welcome Ceremony and the Royal Air Force Association Battle of Britain 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. The Vice Chairman also attended a number of events.

#### PRAYERS

32.6 The Chairman thanked Reverend Vicky Martin, Seaford Baptist Church for leading the prayers before the Council meeting

#### PETITIONS

32.7 The Chairman informed the Council that immediately before the meeting he had received the following petition from members as follows:

Councillor Webb	- calling on the County Council to implement parking regulations in the form of a residents parking permit zone in Silchester Road, St Leonards on Sea Hastings
-----------------	---

### **33 Declarations of Interest**

33.1 The following members declared personal interests in items on the agenda as follows:

<i>Member</i>	<i>Position giving rise to interest</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Whether interest was prejudicial</i>
Councillor Hodges	Director of Let's Do Business	Cabinet report, paragraph 1	No
Councillor Stogdon	Partner in a commercial fruit farm	Lead Member for Transport and Environment report, paragraph 1	No

## **34 Reports**

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

Cabinet	-	paragraph 1
Lead Member for Resources	-	paragraph 1
Lead Member for Transport and Environment	-	paragraph 1
East Sussex Fire Authority	-	paragraph 1

### NON-RESERVED PARAGRAPHS

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

## **35 Questions from members of the public**

35.1 There were no questions from the public

## **36 Report of the Cabinet - 22 September 2015**

36.1 Councillor Glazier moved the reserved paragraph of the Cabinet's report

36.2 The motion was CARRIED after debate

## **37 Report of the Lead Member for Resources**

37.1 Councillor Elkin moved the reserved paragraph of the Lead Member for Resources report

37.2 The motion was CARRIED after debate

## **38 Report of the Lead Member for Transport and Environment**

38.1 Following the withdrawal of the motion set out in paragraph 1.13 the report of the Lead Member for Transport and Environment the Chairman stated that the County Council would be voting on the motion set out in paragraph 1.1 of the report as follows:

*East Sussex County Council (ESCC) opposes the introduction of neonicotinoid pesticides when the 2 year ban, introduced in 2013, comes to an end and supports a continuation of the ban to support the numbers of bee keepers and farmers dependent on a healthy bee population.*

*Further, ESCC undertakes to ban any use of neonicotinoid pesticides in the ESCC owned or managed sites such as the Ashdown Forest, the country sites such as Seven Sisters Country Park, Ditchling and Chailey Commons and gardens associated with ESCC offices and properties throughout the county should the ban be overturned in the UK*

38.2 After debate, a recorded vote was requested and taken. The Motion was CARRIED, the votes being cast as follows:

### FOR THE MOTION

Councillors Belsey, Bennett, Bentley, Buchanan, Butler, Carstairs, Charman, Clark, Daniel, Davies, Chris Dowling, Claire Dowling, Earl, Elkin, Ensor, Field, Forward, Glazier, Hodges,

Keeley, Lambert, Maynard, O’Keeffe, Pursglove, Scott, D Shing, S Shing, Shuttleworth, Simmons, Standley, St Pierre, Tutt, Ungar, Wallis, Webb and Wincott

#### AGAINST THE MOTION

None

#### ABSTENTIONS

Councillors Barnes, Galley, Phillips, Sheppard, Stogdon, Taylor, Tidy and Whetstone

### **39 Questions from County Councillors**

#### ORAL QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS

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

<b>Questioner</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Subject</b>
Councillor St Pierre	Councillor Elkin	Total cost of the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road archaeology sub contract
Councillor Tutt	Councillor Maynard	Funding of grit for grit bins not on main routes
Councillor Butler	Councillor Glazier	County Council’s response to consultation on apprenticeship levy
Councillor Scott	Councillor Maynard	Opening of the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road
Councillor Daniel	Councillor Maynard	16 week time limit for dealing with planning applications requiring an environmental impact assessment such as applications for fracking
Councillor Ungar	Councillor Bentley	Impact of savings proposals on adult social care services
Councillor Hodges	Councillor Simmons	Department of Business Innovation and Skills scheme to assist small businesses
Councillor S Shing	Councillor Maynard	Removal of material after gulley emptying on A22 between Polegate and Hailsham
Councillor Field	Councillor Glazier	Reaction to unreasonable constraints from Government in relation to consideration of planning applications

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 44

39.2 Five written questions were received from Councillors Ungar, Tutt (2), Davies and Lambert for the Lead Member for Adult Social Care, the Lead Member for Learning and School Effectiveness, the Lead Member for Transport and Environment, the Lead Member for Economy and the Lead Member for Resources. The questions and answers are attached to these minutes.

39.3 The Lead Members responded to supplementary questions.

**40 Report of the East Sussex Fire Authority**

40.1 Members commented on paragraph 1 of the East Sussex Fire Authority's report.

THE CHAIRMAN DECLARED THE MEETING CLOSED AT 11.56 am

The reports referred to are included in the minute book

## **WRITTEN QUESTION PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 44**

### **1. Question by Councillor Ungar to the Lead Member for Adult Social Care**

Following the announcement of the Secretary of State for Health that the plan to limit care bills from next year with a cap of £72,000 for the over 65s and for younger adults with disabilities over 25 years of age has been delayed until 2020.

a) How much has the County Council spent in preparation for the cap on care costs which was to start from April 2016? The costs; including training of front line staff and managers, developing IT systems (software and hard-ware), finance systems, policy development and any other associated costs in relation to the care cap reforms; and

b) Is this money now lost as a result of the recent Government decisions?

### **Answer by the Lead Member for Adult Social Care**

a) The total costs incurred to date (August 2015) that can be attributed wholly to the Cap on Care costs are in the region of £118,000, representing:

- Development of a financial model to inform service and financial planning: £15,000.
- Staffing: engagement of staff to deliver to planned assessment and review timetable: £70,000 (total budget allocation being £1,595,000)
- Training and development requirements: £16,600 (total budget allocation being £164,800)
- Communications strategy: £16,500 (total budget allocation being £55,000)

The deferment of the elements of the Care Act and Cap on Care Costs until 2020 has meant that development of the Care Account will now not take place. The Care Account was being developed by external IT providers and as such no costs have been incurred.

b) The Department of Health Director General of Social Care has informed the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee that the department will not be seeking the return of the grant. We are currently awaiting written confirmation of this from the department and a ministerial statement is expected. The grants are being paid by monthly instalments; we have received funding to August 2015 of £1,724,214 from the total indicative allocation of £4,249,829.

### **2. Question by Councillor Tutt to the Lead Member for Learning and School Effectiveness**

Please can the Lead Member inform Council whether any officer has suggested to any East Sussex school that they should apply for Academy status and if so, whether they have suggested any particular chain they should consider joining?

### **Answer by the Lead Member for Learning and School Effectiveness**

We are regularly in discussion with schools about their performance and academy solutions and constantly on the lookout for sponsors. Where schools are considering

becoming an academy we suggest chains they may want to consider but it is ultimately for the governing body and Regional Schools Commissioner to agree on an appropriate sponsor.

### **3. Question by Councillor Tutt to the Lead Member for Transport and Environment**

Please can you inform the Council of the number and value of claims against the Council by those drivers who have suffered damage from potholes in each of the past four years and also how these figures compare with other Councils within the South East Region?

#### **Answer by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment**

The number of pothole claims received in the following years is as follows:

2014/15 = 895  
2013/14 = 1571  
2012/13 = 1287  
2011/12 = 353

The value of payments made in respect of pothole claims is as follows:

2014/15 = £264712  
2013/14 = £357731  
2012/13 = £114999  
2011/12 = £138726

It should be noted that these payments were made in the above financial years but do not necessarily relate to claims received in those years. Indeed some of the above claims are still open and have not yet been determined. The payments above include claims for personal injury as a result of potholes and third party solicitor costs (which can be substantial).

The majority of pothole claims are repudiated with repudiation rates rising from just under 60% in 2011/12 to 71% in 2014/15

ESCC does not have comparative data for other areas in the South East, but given the differences in size, population density and number of miles of road in each County or Unitary Authority, it would be very difficult to draw meaningful comparisons. However, the RAC have created a table (attached) which does show the information.

### **4. Question by Councillor Davies to the Lead Member for Economy**

Would the lead member agree that:

- 1) BT are acting as a monopoly provider in relation to our rural broadband service, in that non- BT providers have to pay to install their own equipment in the BT exchange?
- 2) BT should be broken up into a utility provider (Openreach) and a separate consumer arm?
- 3) Openreach should be forced to offer free access to the network, cabinets, ducts and poles, so as to allow other providers to compete to provide FTTdp (fibre to the distribution point) at reasonable prices?

4) What can ESCC do to ensure that the Rural Broadband programme is fair for rural as well as urban residents?

### **Answer by the Lead Member for Economy**

1) It is important to be clear that the County Council's project, which is presumably what Councillor Davies means by "our rural broadband service", is to bring better, faster broadband infrastructure to communities and it is not to provide internet packages. BT Openreach owns and manages the infrastructure network, and its customers are Retail Service Providers (also known as ISPs, for example TalkTalk, Sky PlusNet etc). These ISP customers, which include BT Retail, must pay to use the network in order to sell their internet services, from which they will make a profit, to the end customer. ISPs can buy a wholesale product or they can install their own equipment in the exchange; either way they have to pay to use infrastructure that has been paid for by someone else. BT is not acting as a monopoly provider – it is a commercial arrangement exactly like renting office space.

2) Should Openreach, the BT division that owns and manages the copper-and-fibre-network and sells its services not only to BT Retail but also to rivals such as TalkTalk, be run as a separate entity? That is an interesting question and one that is engendering much debate nationally. Many people are tempted to answer strongly in the affirmative, given that Ofcom itself says that Openreach's performance on behalf of phone and broadband providers has too often been poor. An independent business might be more inclined to invest more, and faster, in new broadband services, and possibly negotiate more joint ventures. Competition might well be enhanced if Openreach was accountable to many masters, not just the one.

However, ESCC has seen no compelling arguments that separation would improve Openreach's service – which has been as poor for BT Retail as it has for rival providers. Also, Openreach's record for investing in infrastructure is not bad. Broadband coverage in the UK is high and prices are low, by comparison with the rest of the European Union. The case for separation boosting competition is also weak. Only Virgin Media's cable network comes close to national coverage, although here in this part of the world, it is very poor indeed.

At this stage, ESCC can only await with interest the decision by Ofcom.

3) As has been explained, Openreach's customers are ISPs, who make their money by selling internet services to individuals and businesses. Openreach makes its money by selling use of the network to ISPs. If it did not charge, it could not afford to run and maintain the network. There would, therefore, be no network. In addition, what Openreach charges is benchmarked and regulated by Ofcom and it is not allowed to discriminate between ISPs who are all treated equally.

4) Again, presumably Councillor Davies means the infrastructure project that ESCC are funding. If this is so, then Councillor Davies can be reassured that coverage is spread widely over rural areas and is not just restricted to more urban areas, as the rollout table on the website ably demonstrates.

If Councillor Davies is however referring to the supply of Internet Services, ie internet packages, these are provided by ISPs who make commercial decisions about where they wish to sell them. ESCC has no influence over the commercial decisions of private sector companies in this regard.

#### **5. Question by Councillor Lambert to the Lead Member for Resources**

The County Council is aware of the pressure to provide housing across the county and in particular, of the need for affordable housing.

Seaford has recently lost out on two opportunities to provide affordable housing in the town and this is a growing concern.

Will the County Council seek as a priority to sell surplus assets in Seaford which include the Elm Court site in Blatchington Road and Homefield Place to an affordable housing provider to help meet this need?

#### **Answer by the Lead Member for Resources**

Having reviewed both sites I can advise that both sites are likely residential development opportunities. Elm Court will be going through the planning process in due course, with Homefield Place likely to follow in the new year. The Lewes Core Strategy stipulates 40% affordable housing. It would therefore be the intention of the Council to obtain outline consents for residential development before selling on the open market to a developer who will be required to provide the affordable housing.

<b>England</b>		<b>2014/15</b>				<b>2013/14</b>				<b>2012/13</b>			
<i>Local Authority</i>	<i>Rank based on 2014/15 number of claims</i>	<i>Number of claims</i>	<i>Value of Successful Claims*</i>	<i>Successful Claims</i>	<i>% successful claims**</i>	<i>Number of claims</i>	<i>Value of Successful Claims*</i>	<i>Number of Successful Claims</i>	<i>% successful claims**</i>	<i>Number of claims</i>	<i>Value of Successful Claims*</i>	<i>Successful Claims</i>	<i>% successful claims**</i>
Hampshire	1	1,760	£285,685	843	48%	1,899	£211,015	716	38%	844	£82,787	260	31%
Surrey	2	1,395	£131,241	299	28%	3,912	£250,289	842	22%	2,289	£468,474	385	17%
Essex	3	1,359	£23,386	65	5%	2,548	£156,008	98	4%	2,578	£120,896	195	8%
Kent	4	1,263	£17,841	102	8%	2,321	£42,575	224	10%	1,206	£45,147	197	16%
Hertfordshire	5	992	£49,419	133	13%	1,564	£93,212	248	16%	1,553	£201,388	373	24%
Devon	6	927	£141,385	662	71%	899	£108,415	359	40%	633	£100,344	253	40%
Cornwall	7	782	£12,928	41	7%	735	£11,275	40	5%	410	£9,778	35	9%
Staffordshire	8	641	£17,616	66	29%	875	£58,314	227	26%	1,040	£94,866	310	30%
East Sussex	9	600	£23,649	86	15%	1,540	£124,567	395	26%	1,289	£131,715	504	39%
Derbyshire	10	595	£80,447	300	50%	614	£66,832	271	44%	707	£23,658	99	14%
Wiltshire	11	585	£98,025	394	67%	780	£124,409	433	56%	596	£72,138	117	20%
Gloucestershire	12	575	£3,070	7	1%	576	£21,722	80	14%	736	£16,938	71	10%
Lincolnshire	13	568	£42,784	313	55%	917	£94,725	697	76%	1,127	£161,199	1,021	91%
Oxfordshire	13	568	£28,237	115	20%	884	£67,899	266	30%	703	£32,223	131	19%
Plymouth	15	518	£123,603	447	86%	427	£89,420	329	77%	129	£29,940	77	60%
West Sussex	16	482	£19,779	80	17%	1,727	£78,818	242	20%	1,386	£83,732	241	18%
Buckinghamshire	17	461	£3,747	12	5%	1,063	£3,745	11	1%	1,110	£13,213	44	4%

Lancashire	18	378	£35,958	101	27%	512	£61,950	240	48%	525	£88,322	272	52%
Northamptonshire	19	361	£15,493	50	14%	536	£31,130	110	22%	782	£14,758	47	6%
Somerset	20	359	£3,965	13	4%	508	£17,193	44	9%	516	£22,415	72	14%
Cambridgeshire	21	324	£24,319	71	22%	485	£104,264	242	50%	175	£55,080	37	21%
Cumbria	22	311	£19,321	52	26%	272	£16,801	41	15%	251	£11,136	51	20%
Suffolk	23	278	£7,591	27	12%	302	£14,059	51	17%	279	£8,554	40	14%
Isle of Wight	24	260	£6,700	38	15%	354	£4,000	21	6%	176	£5,669	25	16%
North Yorkshire	25	253	£5,713	22	9%	318	£12,344	43	14%	571	£32,743	104	18%
Leicestershire	26	252	£12,255	16	6%	251	£27,582	48	19%	302	£17,080	56	19%
Herefordshire	27	241	£21,559	57	24%	1,575	£111,022	387	25%	391	£18,549	36	9%
North Somerset	28	236	£11,595	55	23%	384	£17,908	84	22%	438	£29,803	140	32%
Norfolk	29	224	£19,237	49	22%	295	£12,641	48	16%	482	£24,599	80	17%
Nottinghamshire	30	208	£13,111	50	24%	279	£23,562	75	27%	284	£28,600	75	26%
Sheffield	30	208	£23,478	76	37%	255	£21,163	93	37%	156	£7,430	45	29%
Barnet	32	207	£40,333	90	43%	160	£32,253	77	48%	169	£27,910	69	41%
Liverpool	33	190	£9,524	33	17%	811	£5,335	15	2%	Information Not Held	Information Not Held	Information Not Held	Information Not Held
Birmingham	34	186	£4,217	19	10%	412	£8,412	26	6%	196	£380	1	1%
Dorset	35	185	£73	1	1%	458	£972	3	1%	511	£4,854	15	3%
Northumberland	36	181	£24,049	95	52%	353	£81,788	235	67%	579	£53,417	290	50%
Cheshire West and Chester	37	180	£2,885	25	18%	229	£5,514	17	7%	322	£22,695	40	12%
Manchester	38	170	£12,427	56	33%	281	£15,580	80	29%	212	£8,490	37	18%

TfL	39	164	£21,291	54	33%	456	£84,726	136	30%	464	£125,137	145	31%
Rotherham	40	163	£925	3	2%	138	£3,645	7	5%	183	£8,786	9	5%
Worcestershire	41	162	£13,982	32	20%	337	£13,183	58	17%	417	£19,762	73	18%
Solihull	42	161	£7,373	13	8%	290	£18,148	32	11%	115	£23,250	10	9%
Cheshire East	43	154	£1,477	2	1%	260	£7,799	15	6%	1,199	£133,434	308	26%
Warwickshire	44	143	£8,041	30	21%	266	£24,418	72	27%	340	£40,053	106	31%
Shropshire	45	141	£353	2	1%	207	£1,338	6	3%	292	£12,023	24	8%
Leeds	46	136	£11,575	44	32%	332	£29,709	96	29%	785	£99,419	294	38%
Kirklees	47	135	£8,547	21	16%	235	£5,075	24	10%	300	£20,233	50	17%
Bradford	48	131	£2,665	6	16%	144	£10,992	21	15%	150	£34,165	13	9%
Milton Keynes	49	124	£6,232	19	15%	174	£7,794	330	190%	248	£26,137	88	36%
Bath and North East Somerset	50	111	£13,525	52	47%	133	£1,087	53	40%	113	£7,820	22	20%
Bury	51	110	£21,466	97	88%	177	£35,280	119	69%	185	£33,806	132	73%
Medway	52	107	£4,660	2	2%	66	£3,498	4	6%	5	£5,201	1	20%
Havering	53	106	£84	1	1%								
Croydon	54	104	£84,453	18	17%	236	£14,201	46	20%	191	£18,458	53	28%
South Gloucestershire	55	99	£1,404	9	9%	164	£788	6	4%	261	£13,436	21	8%
Wokingham***	56	98	£5,023	10	10%	83	£2,186	8	10%	43	£513	2	5%
Dudley	57	97	£12,390	41	42%	148	£15,552	67	45%	154	£21,323	79	51%
Brent	58	95	£7,968	30	32%	179	£5,281	24	16%	119	£29,317	23	20%
Central Bedfordshire	59	94	£13,626	12	13%	252	£10,246	34	14%	263	£14,313	48	18%

Trafford	60	91	£4,628	24	26%	76	£9,444	31	41%	176	£12,580	42	24%
West Berkshire	61	90	£2,098	7	8%	409	£241	1	0%	377	£427	3	1%
Southampton	62	87	£0	0	0%	104	£376	2	2%	62	£0	0	0%
Barnsley	63	86	£5,799	32	37%	113	£6,226	23	20%	115	£6,451	20	17%
Bolton	64	84	£19,063	68	81%	90	£20,523	77	86%	76	£24,093	57	75%
Stoke-on-Trent	64	84	£8,776	25	58%	264	£24,345	101	50%	236	£22,349	78	34%
Greenwich	66	82	£1,775	8	14%	34	£3,387	15	44%	39	£8,869	18	46%
Oldham	67	77	£6,168	26	34%	144	£13,878	65	45%	272	£41,287	156	57%
Wakefield	67	77	£3,132	11	14%	86	£2,982	10	12%	194	£10,039	27	14%
Walsall	69	76	£10,000	31	47%	140	£15,267	81	58%	200	£37,595	116	58%
Warrington	69	76	£788	3	4%	101	£1,016	7	7%	202	£12,829	17	8%
Bristol	71	75	£336	1	1%	119	£6,112	17	14%	121	£2,161	6	5%
Bromley	72	72	£770	3	6%	109	£9,264	43	39%	113	£12,673	53	47%
East Riding of Yorkshire	72	72	£865	4	6%	103	£2,342	6	6%	225	£3,296	6	3%
Sunderland	74	69	£1,175	4	6%	70	£1,110	6	9%	101	£754	4	4%
South Tyneside	75	68	£3,614	12	18%	72	£2,796	10	14%	163	£4,378	20	12%
Wolverhampton	76	67	£2,275	10	15%	60	£2,963	12	20%	71	£5,377	21	30%
Derby	77	66	£599	2	10%	211	£8,136	8	6%	242	£12,455	12	7%
Hounslow	77	66	£919	2	3%	115	£1,848	10	9%	30	£3,347	8	27%
Stockport	79	63	£6,094	31	49%	68	£6,620	37	54%	156	£38,356	104	67%
North Lincolnshire	80	61	£1,225	7	11%								
Gateshead	81	59	£1,164	6	13%	46	£551	5	11%	70	£3,814	17	24%

Rochdale	82	58	£7,257	30	52%	39	£5,845	20	51%	114	£15,815	74	65%
Tameside	82	58	£3,563	11	19%	47	£3,956	13	28%	69	£5,688	18	26%
Doncaster	84	56	£4,054	12	21%	72	£11,907	23	32%	135	£21,644	53	39%
Swindon	85	55	£1,844	19	35%	110	£10,658	48	44%	69	£17,242	17	25%
Lambeth	86	54	£17,339	13	24%	123	£11,106	22	18%	82	£22,160	13	16%
Coventry	87	53	£7,906	11	21%	108	£9,333	43	40%	150	£16,518	63	42%
Kingston upon Hull	88	52	£6,790	34	65%	59	£15,076	35	59%	127	£63,908	70	55%
Sandwell	89	50	£1,613	10	20%	66	£8,725	27	41%	109	£25,306	65	60%
Bedford	90	49	£1,789	5	17%	93	£7,256	10	15%	74	£1,932	3	4%
Wirral	90	49	£321	1	2%	74	£1,147	3	4%	97	£4,916	9	9%
Calderdale	92	48	£4,737	8	38%	54	£3,849	4	7%	51	£150	2	4%
Nottingham	93	47	£290	2	4%	44	£2,076	7	16%	75	£6,683	18	24%
Luton	94	46	£1,419	4	25%	21	£0	0	0%	29	£233	1	3%
Brighton and Hove	95	40	£2,140	8	30%	76	£3,383	5	7%	48	£3,050	3	6%
Harrow	95	40	£4,387	8	20%								
Southend-on-Sea	95	40	£740	2	5%	84	£2,443	4	5%	49	£1,253	4	8%
Westminster	95	40	£8,915	9	23%	69	£2,892	8	12%	65	£6,908	9	14%
County Durham	99	38	£367	2	5%	201	£2,497	14	7%	415	£7,116	21	5%
Wandsworth	99	38	£7,289	24	63%	81	£24,498	51	63%	63	£10,220	25	40%
Windsor and Maidenhead	101	37	£740	4	11%	77	£1,778	7	9%	83	£542	3	4%
Salford	102	36	£3,409	7	19%	39	£956	7	18%	60	£3,954	12	20%
North Tyneside	103	35	£0	0	0%	83	£4,255	14	17%	105	£2,327	10	10%

Lewisham	104	34	£1,113	6	18%	63	£1,319	7	11%	103	£12,116	25	24%
Telford and Wrekin	104	34	£1,545	9	26%	100	£13,934	45	45%	154	£28,900	85	55%
Bracknell Forest	106	32	£0	0	0%	16	£232	1	6%	13	£0	0	0%
Haringey	107	30	£2,799	7	23%	75	£6,944	24	32%	49	£6,183	13	27%
Wigan	107	30	£1,811	9	30%	42	£1,427	7	17%	55	£4,094	13	24%
Blackburn with Darwen	109	29	£744	6	21%	37	£5,815	11	30%	32	£6,313	17	53%
Bournemouth	110	28	£1,550	6	150%	63	£3,862	12	19%	63	£5,612	22	35%
Newham	111	27	£0	0	0%	39	£1,654	3	8%	69	£15,744	18	26%
Richmond upon Thames	111	27	£1,632	10	37%	40	£4,016	10	25%	27	£3,507	9	33%
Middlesbrough	113	26	£259	1	4%	20	£85	1	5%	23	£1,396	7	30%
North East Lincolnshire	113	26	£0	0	0%	42	£4,255	1	2%	71	£2,327	13	18%
Tower Hamlets	113	26	£3,999	8	31%	64	£4,591	21	33%	87	£13,199	32	37%
Enfield	116	25	£4,349	6	24%	47	£5,290	13	28%	69	£3,020	13	19%
Hackney	116	25	£0	0	0%	15	£625	1	7%	32	£22,662	7	22%
Hillingdon	116	25	£1,476	7	28%	53	£2,248	12	23%	75	£7,314	20	27%
Sutton	116	25	£0	0	0%	57	£1,498	2	4%	27	£466	2	7%
Darlington	120	24	£72	1	4%	32	£0	0	0%	84	£0	0	0%
York	120	24	£0	0	0%	33	£312	2	6%	71	£880	7	10%
Waltham Forest	122	23	£115	1	33%	17	£1,608	7	47%	23	£1,568	6	26%
Kingston upon Thames	123	22	£1,393	5	23%	28	£6,498	9	32%	20	£810	5	25%

Poole	124	21	£544	4	19%	25	£0	0	0%	18	£0	0	0%
Merton	125	20	£3,787	7	35%	35	£2,394	12	34%	25	£1,557	5	20%
Stockton-On-Tees	125	20	£323	2	10%	35	£909	6	17%	55	£297	3	6%
Torbay	125	20	£2,400	5	25%	49	£2,498	9	18%	35	£827	6	17%
Leicester	128	19	£1,505	5	26%	26	£4,852	11	42%	76	£11,570	19	25%
Ealing	129	17	£832	5	29%	10	£1,665	1	10%	11	£1,975	2	18%
Newcastle upon Tyne	129	17	£2,580	5	29%	76	£4,603	15	20%	104	£4,214	16	15%
Hammersmith and Fulham	131	16	£2,389	4	25%	16	£15,561	12	75%	24	£9,892	9	38%
Peterborough	131	16	£0	0	0%	52	£609	1	2%	22	£0	0	0%
Redbridge	131	16	£734	1	6%	15	£145	1	7%	13	£0	0	0%
Camden	134	15	£956	5	33%	21	£3,139	3	14%	24	£4,106	4	17%
Redcar and Cleveland	134	15	£72	1	7%	38	£0	0	0%	70	£3,359	11	16%
St. Helens	134	15	£3,617	3	43%	22	£384	2	9%	27	£342	3	11%
Rutland	137	14	£220	2	14%	17	£331	2	12%	8	£0	0	0%
Sefton	138	11	£201	1	9%	10	£240	1	10%	16	£2,161	5	31%
Thurrock	139	10	£152	5	50%	113	£6,532	19	17%	88	£7,214	22	25%
Hartlepool	139	10	£92	1	10%	13	£406	3	23%	43	£4,690	16	37%
Barking and Dagenham	141	9	£500	2	22%	15	£1,609	3	20%	23	£1,290	6	26%
Halton	142	8	£225	1	13%	21	£741	3	14%	23	£273	2	9%
Islington	142	8	£3,534	4	50%	5	£0	0	0%	4	£0	0	0%
Knowsley	142	8	£84	2	25%	24	£1,898	9	38%	49	£3,939	15	31%

Southwark	142	8	£400	3	38%	48	£2,541	7	15%	29	£2,541	7	24%
Kensington and Chelsea	146	7	£0	0	0%	10	£100	1	10%	6	£0	0	0%
Slough	146	7	£110	1	14%	10	£0	0	0%	13	£3,623	4	31%
Reading	148	6	£0	0	0%								
Blackpool	149	3	£1,089	2	67%	19	£2,107	9	47%	20	£2,038	6	30%
City of London	150	2	£0	0	0%	3	£0	0	0%	0	£0	0	0%
Isles of Scilly	151	1	£0	0	0%	0	£0	0	0%	0	£0	0	0%
Bexley	152	0	£0	0	-	90	£6,165	5	7%	76	£498	2	3%
Portsmouth													

\*Value rounded to the nearest £.

\*\*Please note that the percentage of successful claims refers to completed claims. There may have been ongoing claims at the time of the Local Authority's response. Rounded to the nearest %

\*\*\*Data for calendar year 2014 rather than the financial year 2014/15