

Council**Thursday, 16 May 2019, County Hall, Worcester - 10.00 am****Minutes****Present:**

Mr B Clayton (Chairman), Mr A A J Adams, Mr R C Adams, Ms P Agar, Mr A T Amos, Mr T Baker-Price, Mr R W Banks, Mr R M Bennett, Mr C J Bloore, Mr G R Brookes, Mrs J A Brunner, Mr P Denham, Ms R L Dent, Mr N Desmond, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr A Fry, Mr S E Geraghty, Mr P Grove, Mr I D Hardiman, Mr A I Hardman, Mr P B Harrison, Mr M J Hart, Ms P A Hill, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson, Dr A J Hopkins, Dr C Hotham, Mr M E Jenkins, Mr A D Kent, Mr R C Lunn, Mr P M McDonald, Mr S J Mackay, Mr L C R Mallett, Ms K J May, Mr P Middlebrough, Mr A P Miller, Mr R J Morris, Mr J A D O'Donnell, Mrs F M Oborski, Ms T L Onslow, Dr K A Pollock, Mrs J A Potter, Prof J W Raine, Mrs M A Rayner, Mr A C Roberts, Mr C Rogers, Mr J H Smith, Mr A Stafford, Ms C M Stalker, Mr C B Taylor, Mr R P Tomlinson, Mrs E B Tucker, Mr R M Udall, Mrs R Vale, Ms S A Webb and Mr T A L Wells

Available papers

The members had before them:

- A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);
- B. 7 questions submitted to the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (previously circulated); and
- C. The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2019 (previously circulated).

2085 Apologies and Declaration of Interests (Agenda item 1)

An apology was received from Mr P A Tuthill.

Mr J H Smith declared an interest in item 9 (b) as his wife Mrs F Smith was proposed as Vice-Chairman of Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and he did not participate in that item.

2086 Chairman (Agenda item 2)

The outgoing Chairman described his year of office and thanked Council and its officers for their support.

RESOLVED that Mr R P Tomlinson be elected Chairman to hold office until his successor becomes entitled to act.

**2087 Vice-Chairman
(Agenda item 3)**

The nomination of Mr G R Brookes was moved by Mr A A J Adams and seconded by Mr A P Miller.

It was then proposed by Mr R C Lunn and seconded by Mr L C R Mallett that Mr P Denham be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Council.

RESOLVED that Mr G R Brookes be appointed Vice-Chairman to hold office until immediately after the election of a Chairman at the next Annual meeting of the Council.

**2088 Public
Participation
(Agenda item 4)**

Mr R C Lunn presented a petition in relation to calls for a safe road crossing at the junction of St Davids House and Willow Way, Redditch.

Ms J Phillips presented a petition to urge the Council to reduce the speed limit on the A44 at the junction of Peopleton and Drakes Broughton villages.

The following public participants all spoke in support of Notice of Motion 3 – Climate Change:

Mr J Rhymer made comments in support of the request in Notice of Motion 3 calling on the Council to declare a “Climate Emergency”.

Mr R Brakspear asked a question about the designation of a lead councillor with the remit of champion for Climate Change

Ms J Higgins asked a question about setting up a working party of councillors and other interested partners to design a county plan to reduce Worcestershire's agricultural greenhouse gas contributions and to devise and implement farm-based carbon sequestration measures.

Mr P Oliver made a comment and asked a question about pension fund investment in fossil fuels.

Ms L Lewis-Farley asked a question about measures to both minimise further impact on biodiversity and also work to improve biodiversity opportunity.

Ms N Addo asked questions in relation to the Council's tree-planting strategy.

Mr C Lewis-Farley asked a question about bike parking spaces at County Hall, Worcester.

	<p>Mr C Haines made a comment and asked a question about the Council’s staffing and resourcing commitment to its sustainability and other agendas.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked all the public participants for their contribution and said they would receive a written reply from the relevant Cabinet Member.</p>
<p>2089 Minutes (Agenda item 5)</p>	<p>RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>
<p>2090 Chairman's Announcements (Agenda item 6)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>2091 Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 3 - Climate Change (Agenda item 10)</p>	<p>On being put to the vote, it was agreed that Notice of Motion 3 – Climate Change be brought forward for consideration on the agenda.</p> <p>The Council had before it a Notice of Motion set out in the agenda papers standing in the names of Mrs E B Tucker, Prof J W Raine, Mrs F M Oborski and Mr M E Jenkins.</p>
	<p>The motion was moved by Mr M E Jenkins and seconded by Mrs E B Tucker who both spoke in favour of it, and Council agreed to deal with it on the day.</p>
	<p>In the ensuing debate, the following points were made:</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The science was clear about the impact of planetary warming. Difficult decisions needed to be made now to protect future generations. The motion asked Council to declare a “Climate Emergency” and to take action now by setting tough targets to reduce emissions • The Council had a good record on sustainability but must do more. For the Council to reach net zero emissions would mean making all council property more energy efficient, increased use of renewable energy, the Council fleet using non-fossil fuel power, the implementation of smart energy storage solutions and increased tree planting. Up-front investment would lead to long-term savings. The process needed to be speeded up and the Council should sign up to the pledge to be carbon neutral by 2030 • The Council’s sustainability team should have an adequately resourced plan that set out all

available options to address the “Climate Emergency”.

The following amendment was then moved by Mr A P Miller and seconded by Dr K A Pollock:

“The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in their October report stated that if the planet wants to avert dangerous climate breakdown, we need to cut emissions in half by 2030, and hit zero by the middle of the century.

Worcestershire is already committed to reducing emissions from our own estate and activities by 20% from a 2015/16 baseline by the end of March 2021. Our performance so far has exceeded this goal.

The IPCC's report suggests that the world has just a dozen years left to restrict global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels. Should they increase by 2 degrees Celsius, humanity's capacity to prevent catastrophic food shortages, floods, droughts, extreme heat and poverty will be severely impaired.

The IPCC says that limiting Global Warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius may still be possible, but only with ambitious action from national and sub-national authorities, civil society, the private sector and local communities.

The Climate Change Committee, in their report published two weeks ago, recommends that the Government aim for a zero carbon society by 2050, replacing the existing target of an 80% reduction, as required in the 2008 Climate Change Act.

As a result, we call on Worcestershire County Council to:

- 1. Note the Government has declared a "Climate Emergency";*
- 2. Pledge to make Worcestershire County Council in all areas where it is directly responsible, carbon neutral by 2050, taking into account both production and consumption emissions;*
- 3. Call on Westminster to provide the powers and resources to make the 2050 target possible;*
- 4. Continue to work with partners across the county and region, such as district, town and parish councils and Worcestershire LEP, to deliver this new goal; and*
- 5. Request the Economy and Environment Panel*

monitors the progress made by Worcestershire County Council towards this goal."

A point of order was raised that the amendment was a "wrecking motion" and negated the original motion and should be ruled out of order. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that there was no mention in the constitution of the term "wrecking motion". The constitution was clear that an amendment must not negate the motion before Council ie nullify or make it ineffective. The purpose of an amendment was to find the most accurate statement of the democratic will. He considered that a lot of the commentary in the amendment was either identical or very similar and the amendment overall followed the same direction of travel of the original motion. The main change was to note another party's declaration of a climate emergency rather than declare one, and pledge carbon neutrality by 2050 rather than 2030. Therefore he concluded that this amendment was relevant to, did not negate the original motion and was therefore valid.

Those in favour of the amendment made the following comments:

- The Cabinet Member for Environment commented that he had the role of the champion for the Environment for the Council, liaising with all interested bodies to ensure the Council met its sustainability targets. The Council had received a number of awards for achievements in sustainability. The Council had reduced its carbon emissions in the last two years by 24%, over and above the expected target. 39 schools had a green flag eco status. 94% of schools were registered with the eco-school programme. The Council provided and would continue to provide advice and guidance and work with partner organisations to deliver these new goals. The Council had helped over 5k homes to reduce energy consumption and worked with 400 businesses to save over 3,500 tonnes of CO2 and had reduced their energy costs by 25%. 150 businesses had been supported in the green sector with 7k employees working in green and blue sectors. The creation of an additional scrutiny task group was unnecessary when the Economy and Environment Panel was already carrying out this scrutiny function. The Council had reduced CO2 emissions by 34% since 2005 in the county with a 28% decrease in CO2 emissions from

street lighting in the last two years. Savings of over 80k had been achieved by investing in renewable energy systems

- The Climate Change Committee had recently released a report that suggested that the Government should change its target from an 80% to 100% reduction in carbon emissions by 2050. This was the target that the Council would aim for ahead of the Government. The Chairman of that Committee had indicated that to attempt to achieve zero carbon ahead of that timescale would not be feasible. There was a great deal of emotion surrounding the subject of climate change and the target of 2030 was not achievable and was unreasonable
- The use of water from the River Severn to heat and cool the Hive was a prime example of the forward-thinking sustainability work of the Council. The Council had altered mileage rates to penalise drivers of larger vehicles, encouraged working from home, introduced electric charging points, bought green energy, and increased recycling rates. The Council included sustainability as an aim throughout its actions. To achieve the zero carbon emissions target by 2030 would have a severe impact on the use of county buildings and more generally on people's lives
- There was a balance to be struck between a top down approach to tackling climate change and a bottom up process based on community action
- Parish and town councils had a process for raising petitions which might be a more appropriate means of increasing the profile of climate change
- The Cabinet Member for Environment indicated that the motion had been submitted too early. Officers had not had time to disseminate the findings of the Climate Change Committee report. He gave an assurance that the Council would improve and achieve. The timescale set out in the amendment gave the Council more breathing space to take the necessary action. He encouraged members to attend relevant meetings and access the available biodiversity grants in their divisions

Those against the amendment made the following comments:

- It was Parliament not the Government that had declared a "Climate Emergency". This amendment appeared to be based on a misinterpretation of

what Parliament had agreed

- The amendment unnecessarily delayed the urgent action needed to prevent a “Climate Emergency”. It was acknowledged that the 2030 deadline was challenging and risks would need to be taken to achieve it
- It was queried whether it was possible to move an amendment to the amendment. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that it was not possible under the constitution to move an amendment to an amendment currently under debate. If the amendment were passed by Council, it would become the substantive motion and further amendments could then be moved
- Although it was acknowledged that the Council had won awards and had a good track record for its sustainability work, it continued to build and widen roads and allowed bus services to fail. There remained much work to be done to improve performance
- This amendment merely provided the existing Economy and Environment Panel with a general overview role on climate change which was unsatisfactory
- The proposed actions in the amendment were too little, too late and took away the urgency element of the original motion
- The Government had taken away incentives for people to tackle the impending “Climate Emergency” by disinvesting in wind turbines and withdrawing incentives for households to install solar panels
- The amendment was passive in nature, lacked any commitment to action and seemed complacent. The Council needed leadership to recognise and tackle its responsibilities as community leaders by addressing climate change as a matter of urgency
- How would the views of children and young people on climate change be taken into account without the establishment of a specific task group?
- The Council was not doing enough to address climate change and the target date of 2050 date was far too late to address the “Climate Emergency”. The outcome of the Climate Change Committee might be politically expedient but it was not scientifically accurate and did not deal with the “Climate Emergency”.

The mover and seconder of the amendment accepted the alteration to wording of the amendment for accuracy so

that “the Government” was replaced by “Parliament”.

At the conclusion of the amendment debate and on a named vote the amendment as altered was carried and became the substantive motion.

Those voting in favour of the amendment were Mr A A J Adams, Mr R C Adams, Mr A T Amos, Mr T Baker-Price, Mr R W Banks, Mr R M Bennett, Mr G R Brookes, Mrs J A Brunner, Mr B Clayton, Ms R L Dent, Mr N Desmond, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr S E Geraghty, Mr P Grove, Mr I D Hardiman, Mr A I Hardman, Mr P B Harrison, Mr M J Hart, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson, Dr A J Hopkins, Mr A D Kent, Mr S M Mackay, Ms K J May, Mr P Middlebrough, Mr A P Miller, Mr R J Morris, Mr J A D O'Donnell, Ms T L Onslow, Dr K A Pollock, Mrs J A Potter, Mr A C Roberts, Mr C Rogers, Mr J H Smith, Mr A Stafford, Mr C B Taylor, Mrs R Vale, Ms S A Webb. (38)

Those voting against the amendment were Ms P Agar, Mr C J Bloore, Mr P Denham, Mr A Fry, Ms P A Hill. Dr C Hotham, Mr M E Jenkins, Mr R C Lunn, Mr P M McDonald, Mr L C R Mallett, Mrs F M Oborski, Prof J W Raine, Mrs M A Rayner, Ms C M Stalker, Mrs E B Tucker, Mr R M Udall, Mr T A L Wells. (17)

A further amendment was then moved by Mr R M Udall with the following wording inserted at the start of the substantive motion: *“Council declare an immediate “Climate Emergency” and calls on Council, our partners, and district councils to do likewise.”* In addition, any reference to 2050 be replaced by 2030. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that Council had just decided not to adopt the target for zero carbon emissions by 2030 but instead had adopted the target of 2050. Therefore to revert to the target of 2030 was negating the decision taken by Council and was therefore ruled out of order. Council had decided not to declare a “Climate Emergency” therefore to request Council to call a “Climate Emergency” would also be a negation of the Council decision and was also out of order.

An amendment was moved that the word “Emergency” be replaced with the word “Crisis” and reference to 2050 be replaced with the wording “at a date to be determined”. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that this proposed amendment to the target date for zero carbon emissions which Council had just decided represented a negation of the decision made by Council and was therefore ruled out. He advised that it was possible for Council to consider whether there was a

“Climate Crisis” as the wording did not represent a negation of the substantive motion which referred to a “Climate Emergency” and there was sufficient distinction between the 2 states.

The following amendment to the substantive motion was then moved by Mr R M Udall and seconded by Mrs F M Oborski that the wording in 1. of the newly substantive motion be amended to read:

“Council recognises there is a “Climate Crisis” and urges district council authorities to similarly recognise a “Climate Crisis”.”

Council agreed to extend the 90 Minute deadline for the consideration of Notices of Motion by a maximum of a further 30 minutes to conclude the debate on this particular Notice of Motion.

Those in favour of the amendment made the following comments:

- It was hoped that if this amendment was passed that the Council could encourage all district councils and schools to enable young people to plant trees to mitigate the impact of climate change

Those against the amendment made the following comments:

- The Cabinet Member for Environment commented that the proposed amendment was unnecessary and Council should have faith in the work already being undertaken and future proposals to address climate change.

At the conclusion of the debate and on a named vote the amendment was lost.

Those voting in favour of the amendment were Ms P Agar, Mr C J Bloore, Mr P Denham, Mr A Fry, Ms P A Hill, Dr C Hotham, Mr M E Jenkins, Mr R C Lunn, Mr P M McDonald, Mr L C R Mallett, Mrs F M Oborski, Prof J W Raine, Mrs M A Rayner, Ms C M Stalker, Mrs E B Tucker, Mr R M Udall, Mr T A L Wells. (17)

Those voting against the amendment were Mr A A J Adams, Mr R C Adams, Mr A T Amos, Mr T Baker-Price, Mr R W Banks, Mr R M Bennett, Mr G R Brookes, Mrs J A Brunner, Mr B Clayton, Ms R L Dent, Mr N Desmond,

Mrs E A Eyre, Mr S E Geraghty, Mr P Grove, Mr I D Hardiman, Mr A I Hardman, Mr P B Harrison, Mr M J Hart, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson, Mr A D Kent, Mr S M Mackay, Ms K J May, Mr P Middlebrough, Mr A P Miller, Mr R J Morris, Ms T L Onslow, Dr K A Pollock, Mrs J A Potter, Mr A C Roberts, Mr C Rogers, Mr J H Smith, Mr A Stafford, Mr C B Taylor, Mrs R Vale, Ms S A Webb.
(36)

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion was agreed by a strong majority.

RESOLVED: “The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in their October report stated that if the planet wants to avert dangerous climate breakdown, we need to cut emissions in half by 2030, and hit zero by the middle of the century.

Worcestershire is already committed to reducing emissions from our own estate and activities by 20% from a 2015/16 baseline by the end of March 2021. Our performance so far has exceeded this goal.

The IPCC's report suggests that the world has just a dozen years left to restrict global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels. Should they increase by 2 degrees Celsius, humanity's capacity to prevent catastrophic food shortages, floods, droughts, extreme heat and poverty will be severely impaired.

The IPCC says that limiting Global Warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius may still be possible, but only with ambitious action from national and sub-national authorities, civil society, the private sector and local communities.

The Climate Change Committee, in their report published two weeks ago, recommends that the Government aim for a zero carbon society by 2050, replacing the existing target of an 80% reduction, as required in the 2008 Climate Change Act.

As a result, we call on Worcestershire County Council to:

- 1. Note Parliament has declared a "Climate Emergency";**
- 2. Pledge to make Worcestershire County Council in all areas where it is directly responsible, carbon neutral by 2050, taking**

2092 Reports of Cabinet - Matters which require a decision - New Grant to support additional costs that may arise as a result of Brexit (Agenda item 7)

into account both production and consumption emissions;

3. Call on Westminster to provide the powers and resources to make the 2050 target possible;
4. Continue to work with partners across the county and region, such as district, town and parish councils and Worcestershire LEP, to deliver this new goal; and
5. Request the Economy and Environment Panel monitors the progress made by Worcestershire County Council towards this goal."

The Council considered a new Grant to support additional costs that may arise as a result of Brexit.

In the ensuing debate, the following points were raised:

- The Leader of the Council introduced the report and commented that although the Government had made it clear that there might be further funding, the Council needed to agree an increase to the revenue budget cash limits to reflect the use of £0.175 million grant funding over 2018/19 and 2019/20 to support additional costs that may arise because of Brexit
- Should the cost of Brexit be higher than expected for this Council, would the Government rather than Council taxpayers be approached for additional funding? The Leader responded that the costs to the Council of Brexit were unknown at this stage. When the final cost was known, if necessary, a case would be made to Government for further funding.

RESOLVED that an increase to the Financial Services revenue budget cash limits be approved to reflect the use of £0.175 million grant funding over 2018/19 and 2019/20 from MHCLG to support additional costs that may arise because of Brexit, noting that central Government has indicated this is not the only funding it may allocate to Local Government for this purpose.

2093 Reports of Cabinet - Summary of decisions taken (Agenda item 7)

The Leader of the Council reported the following topics and questions were answered on them:

- Development of Worcestershire Children First
- Progress Update on Joint Local Area Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Written Statement of Action/Improvement Plan

2094 Constitutional Report - Worcestershire Pension Fund Governance Arrangements (Agenda item 8)

- Resources Report – Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring to Period 10 (Month ending 31 January 2019)

The Council considered changes to the Worcestershire Pension Fund Governance Arrangements.

The recommendation in paragraph 1 on page 7 of the agenda papers was moved by Mr R M Banks and seconded by Mr A I Hardman.

An amendment was proposed by Mr L C R Mallett and seconded by Mr R C Lunn that the number of Worcestershire County Council voting representatives on the Investment Sub-Committee be increased from 3 to 5 members.

In the ensuing debate, the following points were raised:

- The problem with the make up of a relatively small sub-committee was that the absence of one or more members impacted on its decision-making capacity
- As the Sub-Committee had become a formal meeting, there was merit in increasing the number of representatives including from an additional opposition Group.

The mover and seconder of the recommendation accepted the amendment that the number of Worcestershire County Council voting representatives on the Investment Sub-Committee be increased from 3 to 5 members in accordance with political balance, which then became the substantive motion.

The rationale was queried for reducing the number of the non-voting representatives from a relevant union from 2 members (on the previous Pension Investment Advisory Panel) to 1 member on the Investment Sub-Committee and for making the co-opted member non-voting, given the increased decision-making responsibility of the Sub-Committee. The Head of Legal and Democratic Service advised that it was a matter for Council but there was a distinction between employer representatives from the councils and union representatives.

An amendment to the substantive motion was moved by Mr L C R Mallett and seconded by Mr R C Lunn that there should be up to 2 co-opted employee representatives with voting rights on the Pension Investment Sub-Committee.

In the ensuing debate, the following points were raised:

- Although voting was rarely necessary, the Sub-Committee would be making important decisions about current and former employee's pension contributions and therefore it would be appropriate to have up to 2 co-opted employee representatives with voting rights on it
- Although the employee representative on the Sub-Committee would be acting in an observer capacity, their views would still be reported to the Pensions Committee
- The report was not clear as to whether the Sub-Committee had decision-making powers or acted in an advisory capacity to the Pensions Committee. It was also unclear as to whether the membership of the Sub-Committee would be politically balanced or based on knowledge and skills
- The report indicated that the Sub-Committee would be a decision-making body and therefore it was important that the employers and employees worked in partnership for the benefit of pension fund members
- The Chairman of the Pensions Committee indicated that the issue of co-option was a matter for the Committee to decide upon.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion was agreed by a strong majority.

RESOLVED: that

- a) the creation of the Investment Sub-Committee (replacing the Pensions Investment Advisory Panel) be endorsed with the Terms of Reference for the Pensions Committee and Investment Sub-Committee as set out in Appendix 1 to the report subject to the number of Worcestershire County Council representatives increasing from 3 to 5; and**
- b) The revised and updated Governance Policy Statement set out in Appendix 2 to the report be approved.**

**Matters
(Agenda item 9)**

County Council meeting dates were currently scheduled up to November 2019. To enable the 2020 meetings programme to be produced and help members plan their commitments, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services suggested that further meetings of the Council were now scheduled for 2020. In accordance with the usual practice and pattern of meetings, further meetings (Cabinet, Committees and Panels) would be arranged in the light of the Council dates and members notified in due course.

RESOLVED that the Council meeting dates for 2020-21 be approved as follows:

16 January
13 February
14 May
16 July
10 September
12 November.

b) Chairman and Vice-Chairmen of Member Bodies

The Council needed to make the appointments to various chairmanships and vice-chairmanships of member bodies and of Lead Scrutiny Members. The nominations for a number of appointments were set out in the Appendix to the report.

As Council had agreed to set up the Investment Sub-Committee which will report to the Pensions Committee, it was subsequently asked to appoint its Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

RESOLVED that the constitutional appointments as set out in the Appendix to the report be confirmed.

2096 Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 1 - The Living Wage (Agenda item 10)

There was insufficient time to consider this motion within the allotted 90 minute time limit for the consideration of Notices of Motion.

2097 Notices of Motion - Notice

There was insufficient time to consider this motion within the allotted 90 minute time limit for the consideration of Notices of Motion.

	of Motion 2 - Parish and Town Councillors (Agenda item 10)	
2098	Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 4 - Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Agenda item 10)	There was insufficient time to consider this motion within the allotted 90 minute time limit for the consideration of Notices of Motion.
2099	Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 5 - Availability of sanitary products (Agenda item 10)	There was insufficient time to consider this motion within the allotted 90 minute time limit for the consideration of Notices of Motion.
2100	Report of the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Highways (Agenda item 11)	<p>The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Highways presented his report to Council which covered various topics.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member then answered a broad range of questions from members.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for his report.</p>
2101	Question Time (Agenda item 12)	Seven questions had been received by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and had been circulated in advance of the meeting. The answers to all the questions are attached in the Appendix.
2102	Reports of Committees - Audit and Governance Committee	The Council received the report of the Audit and Governance Committee containing a summary of the decisions taken.

	(Agenda item 13)	
2103	Reports of Committees - Pensions Committee (Agenda item 13)	The Council received the report of the Pensions Committee containing a summary of the decisions taken.
2104	Reports of Committees - Planning and Regulatory Committee (Agenda item 13)	The Council received the report of the Planning and Regulatory Committee containing a summary of the decisions taken.
2105	Reports of Committees - Standards and Ethics Committee (Agenda item 13)	The Council received the report of the Standards and Ethics Committee containing a summary of the decisions taken.

The meeting was adjourned from 1.55pm to 2.55pm and ended at 4.05pm.

Chairman

COUNCIL 16 MAY 2019 - AGENDA ITEM 12 – QUESTION TIME

Questions and written responses provided below.

QUESTION 1 – Mr R C Lunn will ask Alan Amos:

"Does the Cabinet Member for Highways agree that local bus companies could learn from the 11% increase in bus journeys in Guernsey in the first quarter of 2019, further strengthening an already popular service? Does he also agree that regular repeatable services with a clear fare pattern tend to increase use?"

Answer

I thank Cllr Lunn for his question and continued interest in bus services.

Certainly, we can learn from the innovative ways that other bus companies operate. I understand that the 11% increase in bus journeys in Guernsey was based on comparing data for January 2018 as against January 2019 but it must be noted that, in January 2018, they experienced some harsh winter weather which would inevitably have affected this data. However, Guernsey has reported increases in patronage since 2017 consisting of a 3.2% increase in the number of fare-paying passengers, a 3.1% rise in student travel, and 1.6% rise in concessions (OAPs). It has attributed this success to reliable, frequent, and timely bus services and believes that these are essential factors in improving confidence in bus services.

That is entirely consistent with my own view that any successful bus network depends on reliability and punctuality and that providing them is the best way to increase demand, especially for people who have a choice.

On the question of a clear fare pattern, again I entirely agree with Cllr Lunn. Fares should be published, simple, and as flexible as possible for the passenger. We are exploring ways to develop the existing Connecta ticket which allows for multi-operator journeys using different providers throughout the County on one ticket. One system that does impress me is the one used in San Francisco whereby anybody purchasing a ticket on a bus, or swiping- in on the bus, automatically gets a transfer which allows unlimited travel for 2 hours so that passengers can change buses and generally get on and off without having to buy another ticket, the only proviso being that the last journey is completed within 2 hours of the commencement of their original journey. This certainly encourages bus travel by making the experience so flexible and convenient for the passenger.

I can assure colleagues that our Passenger Transport Strategy in Worcestershire will be looking at all examples of best practice, including this.

Supplementary Question

It was queried whether more could be done to improve the marketing of bus services and whether local bus operators would benefit from an educational visit to Guernsey. Alan Amos acknowledged the importance of marketing but noted that there were some good examples of marketing taking place locally. All these issues would be addressed in the Bus Review. He queried whether Guernsey was the best comparator given its older age profile.

QUESTION 2 – Mrs J A Brunner will ask Alan Amos:

"Could the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Environment please confirm when the updating of lighting columns to LED will be completed in my division of Arrow Valley East?"

Answer

I thank Cllr Brunner for her question and congratulate her on the very proactive approach she has adopted to improving the street lighting in her Division, following which I was able to assist her in installing extra columns.

Worcestershire County Council has a duty of care under the Highways Act 1980 to maintain a safe highways network, including street lighting. Whilst we have progressively rolled-out the use of LEDs, in 2018 we launched the next phase of the Street Lighting Programme, beyond part-night switch off. This programme makes provision for the roll-out of two significant initiatives:

- Dealing with the ageing concrete columns, and replacing them with steel columns and an LED lantern; and
- Progressive replacement of low efficiency lanterns with new LED stock.

The aim of this is to improve our asset base and maximise delivery of energy savings.

The initial tranche of work has focused on the replacement of concrete columns, on a worst-first basis, and the majority of lantern changes to LEDs is clustered around this. By the end of 2019/20 it is expected that some 35% of the street lighting will have been converted to LED, resulting in a reduction in energy usage.

Arrow Valley enjoys a relatively new lighting stock, with very few concrete columns and so has not seen a significant increase in LEDs as part of this phase of the programme.

We also exchange higher-power consumption lighting on high speed routes where opportunities arise to share traffic management, e.g. with other cyclic maintenance, a recent example being on the Redditch Highway.

Should Members wish to consider the use of divisional and/or local funds to change additional lanterns to LED, I would commend them to contact their Liaison Engineer who will be able to assist them.

Specifically, with regard to the timescale and funding of the scheme, I can confirm that Phase 1 of the Street Lighting Programme was the part-night switch off. In 2018, we agreed to invest £4m (through the HIF) for the replacement of the worst concrete columns and a further roll-out of LEDs to reduce energy usage. We are now in the second year of this programme.

The funding is for 2-3 year programme but will not provide replacement for all concrete columns and will not replace all lanterns with LEDs. Further funding will be required to replace further columns and roll-out LEDs beyond this phase

By the end of this phase once we have spent the £4m, as I said previously, we expect about 35% of our street lighting to be LED, which recognizes the need to balance use of the funding as between LEDs and concrete columns.

With regard to her own Division, I know Cllr Brunner will be pleased to know that Redditch is the first large town where a District has been subject to a widespread LED roll-out as part of the LED lighting upgrade programme. In addition, Redditch has had the highest number of LED upgrades on average compared to other larger towns in the County, and

Matchborough East area has had the highest number of LED upgrades in the Redditch area. Highways are currently upgrading the poorest condition concrete columns in the Redditch area.

Supplementary Question

The running cost of an individual LED light compared to that of an individual sodium lantern was queried. Alan Amos stated that the cost comparator figures were as follows:

Residential lighting:

LED – £7.54 per annum

Sodium Lantern - £34.97 per annum

Road lighting

LED - £51.22 per annum

Sodium Lantern - £102.57 per annum

QUESTION 3 – Mr L C R Mallett will ask Alan Amos:

"Please could the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Highways provide an update on the Council's position in relation to implementing new 20MPH zones?"

Answer

I thank Councillor Mallett for his question.

Colleagues may know that Highways undertook a 20mph zone trial in Rubery a little while ago and the results were both interesting and significant. It showed that in a majority of sites (56%) there was actually an increase in speed; and that introducing a 20 mph speed limit appears to have little effect on reducing speeds without additional traffic calming measures. The role of the police here is critical since they will be the enforcers of such limits. They told us that it is not acceptable for them to enforce such speed limits as a matter of routine and that local speed limits should not be set in isolation i.e. they need to be part of a package of engineering works. So, Highways cannot expect the police to enforce 20 mph signs and zones, and almost certainly will not do so in those circumstances. The Report concluded by saying "benefits from the introduction of this 20 mph pilot scheme have not been realized".

The data from that trial has informed a draft 20 mph policy now in preparation that will be included in the updated Traffic Management Policy due to be completed this summer. However, obviously, notwithstanding all the factors above, there are certain locations where a case could be made for a 20 mph zone so any policy would support investigation into the possibilities for speed reduction to 20 mph as appropriate for the following 4 types of situation:

- 1) outside schools through advisory limits;
- 2) at accident collision cluster sites;
- 3) in connection with major projects as appropriate;
- 4) for all new residential development through appropriate design

Supplementary Question

Either before or after the 20 mph policy was published and further to a petition submitted a couple of years ago, Alan Amos agreed to meet Mr L C R Mallett to discuss ways to address speeding issues experienced in the Millfields area of Bromsgrove

QUESTION 4 – Mr R M Udall will ask Alan Amos:

"The Cabinet Member will be aware of the opposition which I have expressed to the new parking restrictions being proposed for the A44 Bromyard Road in St John's. He will also be aware of the total opposition from residents; who have indicated concerns about increased traffic speed, safety, displacement, the impact on local services and businesses and the lack of any alternative parking places. The proposal has not won a single letter of support from any resident. There is growing discontent and anger in the local community, every time residents have been consulted they have responded with a firm no. Can he therefore confirm that he has no plans to overrule the local member and that he will not impose the proposed restrictions on to the local residents who have shown total unity in their opposition to new parking restrictions?"

Answer

I thank Cllr Udall for his question.

It gives me the opportunity to start by reminding him of the initiative I took last year to run a 6-month pilot scheme in Worcester City to involve the public more meaningfully in TROs putting down yellow lines. Previously, very often, the first any resident knew about new yellow lines was when they appeared outside their house because, understandably, they hadn't seen a Notice stuck on a lamppost or in the local paper. So I decided to introduce a pilot scheme to properly consult residents who are now proactively consulted on any scheme which directly affects their property. I am pleased to say that, as a result of this initiative, nobody should not know about these proposals.

In response to the ongoing concerns about congestion in the City, we're looking at packages of proposals along the key strategic corridors of the City, in this case the A44 from the M5 to St. John's. The proposals here along Bromyard Road are being pursued to reduce the impact of pinch points where turning vehicles hold up traffic, or two large HGV's and/or buses find it difficult to pass, causing congestion. This type of congestion causes 'platooning' (bunching) of vehicles, with the consequence that traffic signals along the route operate less efficiently causing further congestion.

The original proposals were for a 7 a.m. - 7 p.m. restriction 7 days a week but, having listened to what residents told us, we decided to amend that so that the new/current proposals exclude any restrictions on Sundays. With the revision of the original proposals, the public have now been re-consulted on the variations to ensure proper process has been followed. The current version minimises the impact on residents as the restriction is only in place during the day for the minimum period to cover peak traffic flows, allowing residents to park at night. When making the final decision to move forward with this Traffic Regulation Order all factors and comments will be considered and an appropriate balance on road space occupation determined.

We are still currently going through the proper process and are now at the stage where we are considering all the representations. I have asked officers for some more information, as I am well aware of the strength of feeling amongst some people, and would want to be satisfied that we have all the facts before coming to a decision. I have no intention of interfering with the proper process nor of making any pre-emptive announcement or decision until all the consultation has been fully examined.

Supplementary Question

It was queried whether the Cabinet Member would be willing to meet local residents in the St John's division so that they could make him aware of their concerns about the proposed parking restrictions on Bromyard Road. Alan Amos responded that he would not wish to interfere with the existing consultation process. No decision had been taken as yet. The delay in the process was due to more information being sought in response to the strength

of local feeling. The final decision would take all the facts and views expressed into account.

QUESTION 5 – Mr R C Lunn will ask Karen May:

"Does Liberata offer us a free upgrade of software when one becomes available, on the systems we buy in from them?"

Answer

Thank you very much Cllr Lunn for your question.

All systems require upgrades and patching work to ensure they remain up to date with legislation, security and application needs. The contract for service with Liberata UK includes implementation of improved system functionality via 'patches' (i.e. minor upgrades) which are applied free of charge e.g. annual statutory changes from HMRC, security developments and 'bug' fixes. A major upgrade to the system or a change at our request such as setting up Worcestershire Children First is chargeable. This is industry practice and would be the case even if there were no third party contract. Some industry contracts do include the cost of all up grades in the initial contract price, however the client can end up bearing a higher cost if there are fewer up grades than forecast. This formed part of the contract discussions with Liberata and the current arrangement was set. I can confirm that to date no major upgrade has been implemented by the Council and thus no additional costs borne.

QUESTION 6 – Mrs J A Brunner will ask Adrian Hardman:

"Could the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Adult Social Care inform me what steps he is taking to share the success of the Transforming Care Programme in Worcestershire with a wider audience?"

Answer

In 2011, documentary producers Panorama exposed horrific abuse of patients and vulnerable people by carers in the Winterbourne View Hospital. In Worcestershire, we formed the Worcestershire Transforming Care Partnership. This partnership includes members from the Health and Social Care sectors as well as voluntary, charity and patient groups.

Road to success

The success of the Worcestershire TCP could not be achieved without partners working together. We have developed collaborative working with many partners including: NHS England, NHS England Specialist Commission, Community Learning Disability teams, Local Authority commissioning, Continuing HealthCare, Clinical Commissioning Groups, Speakeasy N.O.W. and Worcestershire Association of Carers.

In line with our aims of the programme to enable people with a Learning Disability to be integral to our local service and programme delivery we worked with Speakeasy N.O.W to identify a member, Rachel Barrett, who received special training and support to be an advocate for people with Learning Disabilities and Autism throughout the programme.

Success and sustainable outcomes

As a result of the programme all patients with a Learning Disability and/or Autism detained in an inpatient locked and secure service, had the opportunity for an independent review. All of Worcestershire's locked inpatient facilities have been closed, and admissions secure inpatient services have reduced by 50%.

The TCP programme is nearing completion but as its legacy we intend to take the learning and continue to transform the way we deliver our local services.

- Individuals with a Learning Disability continue to have a voice that supports their own service delivery.
- A local policy has been written and embedded which supports better outcomes for people and avoids admission to inpatient services.
- We are now developing a new Complex Needs pathway that sits across health and social care, this will embed our learning experiences from the TCP, and ensure that all Worcestershire residents with a Learning Disability and Autism will be monitored robustly and reviewed at our TCP multi-disciplinary panel to ensure that our residents are in receipt of the right care and support at the right time.

The Worcestershire TCP is recognised within the West Midlands region as being a centre of excellence and I am delighted to say that the national lead for the programme, Ray James, frequently references the Worcestershire experience as good practice.

I have recently had the pleasure of supporting the programme for a Municipal Journal award and I very much hope that everyone working on the programme get the recognition they deserve.

QUESTION 7 – Mr R M Udall will ask Lucy Hodgson:

“Can the Cabinet Member confirm she has no plans to introduce car parking charges at Worcester Woods Countryside Centre?”

Answer

I can confirm that there are no plans to introduce car parking charges at Worcester Woods Countryside Centre.

Supplementary Question

In response to a query, Lucy Hodgson undertook to liaise with officers to look at possible ways of increasing revenue for Worcester Woods Countryside Park.