

Council**Thursday, 12 November 2020, Online only - 10.00 am****Minutes****Present:**

Mr G R Brookes (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, Mrs J A Brunner, Mr B Clayton, Mr K D Daisley, 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, 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 P A Tuthill, Mr R M Udall, Ms S A Webb and Mr T A L Wells

Available papers

The members had before them

- A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);
- B. 5 questions submitted to the Assistant Director for Legal and Governance (previously circulated); and
- C. The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2020 (previously circulated).

2218 Apologies and Declaration of Interests (Agenda item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Ms P Hill and Mrs R Vale.

Mr J H Smith declared an interest in item 7 (b) as his wife Mrs F Smith was proposed as Vice-Chairman of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and did not participate.

2219 Public Participation (Agenda item 2)

Mr M E Jenkins presented a petition relating to 20mph and traffic calming in Flag Meadow Walk and Shrubbery Avenue area, Worcester, on behalf of a constituent who was unable to attend the meeting.

Mr D Lavelle asked a question about the St. John's Road scheme, Worcester.

Mr A Lyon asked a question about county-wide greenhouse gas emission reductions.

Dr J Birks asked a question about the Net Zero Carbon Plan.

Mr D Whiting asked a question about the Net Zero Carbon Plan.

Mr C Cooke asked a question about the County Council in Partnership with the Community on climate change.

The Chairman thanked all the public participants for their contribution and said they would receive a written response from the relevant Cabinet Member.

Ms P McCarthy had submitted a question about the Net Zero Carbon Plan but was unable to attend the meeting. Her question was not read out but the Chairman said that she would receive a written response from the relevant Cabinet Member.

**2220 Minutes
(Agenda item 3)**

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**2221 Chairman's
Announcements
(Agenda item 4)**

Noted

**2222 Fire and Rescue
Authority
(Agenda item 5)**

The Chairman welcomed Mr Nathan Travis, the Chief Fire Officer, to the meeting. The Vice-Chairman of the Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority, Mr P Tuthill, presented his report to the Council and he and Mr Travis answered questions asked by members of the Council.

On behalf of the Council, the Chairman thanked Mr Travis for his contribution to the fire service over a number of years and wished him well on his imminent retirement.

**2223 Reports of
Cabinet -
Matters which
require a
decision by**

The Council had before it a detailed report on the Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring - Month 4 (31 July) 2020/21.

The Leader introduced the report and moved the recommendation as set out in paragraph 1 of the report;

**Council -
Resources
Report -
Revenue and
Capital Budget
Monitoring -
Month 4 (31
July) 2020/21
(Agenda item 6)**

**2224 Reports of
Cabinet -
Matters which
require a
decision by
Council -
Update on the
County
Council's Covid
Response and
Recovery
(Agenda item 6)**

this was seconded by Mr A I Hardman. The Leader commented that the capital programme was appraised during the financial year to ensure it reflected the correct allocations and the latest information. It was not a question of adding anything new to the capital programme.

RESOLVED that the updated capital programme as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

The Council had before it an update on the County Council's Covid Response and Recovery.

The Leader introduced the report and moved the recommendation as set out in paragraph 1 of the report; this was seconded by Mr A I Hardman. The Leader commented that it was proposed to increase the existing funding allocation for rail stations and economic activity around them from £5m to £20m. Cabinet would be responsible for determining how that funding would be subsequently deployed. This proposal would enhance the Council's ability to take advantage of opportunities to grow the economy as the county emerged from the Covid 19 pandemic.

In the ensuing debate, the following points were made:

- Was funding being sought for the flood prevention scheme on the Wribbenhall side of the River Severn at Bewdley? The Leader responded that funding for flood defence schemes, and in particular Bewdley, would be sought from the Getting Building Fund, in association with the LEP
- It was requested that this funding pot be used to address the parking issues at Malvern Link Rail Station, given that there were plans to build flats on part of the private land currently used for parking. In addition, it was queried who had taken over responsibility for this area of work within the Council. The Leader responded that the aim of the additional funding at this stage was to ensure that there were sufficient resources to support the rail network. It was too early to comment on individual projects. He confirmed that the officer responsible for this area of work had now left the organisation but both Internal and external officer support would be available to support this work
- The Leader undertook to provide details of the number of businesses that were closed in the

2225 Reports of Cabinet - Summary of Decisions Taken (Agenda 6)

current lockdown. He added that although this lockdown was different to the original lockdown, there would still be significant impact on local businesses. The Council would do everything it could to provide support to businesses in liaison with the LEP and local MPs

- Would some of the temporary changes introduced in response to the Covid 19 pandemic become permanent? The Leader commented that there were some pre-existing economic changes that had been accelerated by the pandemic particularly in relation to retail, work/life balance, and the environment. This was reflected in the proposal to invest in the rail network to recognise different working patterns. It was important that Worcestershire benefitted from the positive changes whilst mitigating any negative impacts
- It was important that bus travel was integrated into any proposals to improve the rail network. The Leader responded that the public should be able to access rail facilities through a number of different modes of transport including buses but that was a revenue rather than capital issue
- Was this funding available for any other form of economic development? The Leader indicated that there were other sources of funding available in the capital programme totalling around £200m for the next generation of economic game-changers as well as other capital schemes.

RESOLVED that the financial summary be noted and a £15m addition be agreed to the updated Capital Programme at Appendix 2 to the report.

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

- Use of Children’s Centre Buildings – Transfer of the Centre at Bewdley Primary School
- A New Approach to Delivering Integrated Services for Adult Mental Health
- Minerals and Waste Local Development Scheme
- Resources Report – Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring – Month 4 (31 July) 2020/21
- A38 Bromsgrove Route Enhancement Programme
- Reducing Congestion Update
- Council provided Day Services for Adults with a Learning Disability
- County Council Net Zero Carbon Plan
- Update on COVID-19 Response and Recovery

Including Economic Development.

2226 Constitutional Matters (Agenda item 7)

(a) Political Balance

Following recent changes to Group membership the Council was required to review the political balance. The changes were that the 2017 and Independent Alliance Groups had ceased, replaced by the Liberal Democrat and Independent and Green Alliance Groups respectively. As a result, a proposed revised allocation of seats on Committees which reflected the political composition of the Council, and which was compliant with the principles of political balance was proposed.

RESOLVED that the recalculation of political balance set out in Appendix 1 to the report be approved and the Assistant Director for Legal and Governance be required to give effect to it in accordance with the nominations from the respective Group leaders from time to time.

(b) Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Member Bodies

The Council from time to time appointed Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of member bodies to fill certain positions within its constitutional structures. As a result of recent changes to the political balance there were some vacancies in various chairmanships and vice-chairmanships of Scrutiny Panels and thus Lead Scrutiny Members. In addition, the Council was asked on an annual basis to agree the appointment of a Vice-Chairman of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) when the nomination of the District Councils had been made.

The Leader thanked Mrs F M Oborski for her work on the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Panel and welcomed Mr T A L Wells to his new role as Chairman of that Panel.

RESOLVED that the constitutional appointments as set out in Appendix 2 to the report be confirmed, including the appointment of the nominee of the District Council representative on the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC), Mrs Frances Smith, as Vice-Chairman of HOSC.

2227 Report of the Cabinet Member with

The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Children and Families presented his report.

The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Children and

	<p>Families then answered a broad range of questions from members.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Children and Families for his report.</p>
<p>2228 Responsibility - Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Children and Families (Agenda 8 (a))</p> <p>Report of the Cabinet Member with Responsibility - Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Education and Skills (Agenda 8 (b))</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Education and Skills presented his report.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Education and Skills then answered a broad range of questions from members.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Education and Skills for his report.</p>
<p>2229 Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 1 - Worcestershire's rivers and waterways (Agenda item 9)</p>	<p>The Council had before it a Notice of Motion set out in the agenda papers standing in the names of Mr P Middlebrough, Mrs L C Hodgson, Mr R J Morris Mr P A Tuthill and Mr T Baker-Price.</p> <p>The motion was moved by Mr P Middlebrough and seconded by Mr R J Morris 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 raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The waterways of Worcestershire had had a positive impact on the mental health of local residents during the Covid 19 pandemic • The waterways of Worcestershire made a positive contribution to the county. This important role affected every Cabinet Member portfolio and must be reflected in all policies to enable the Council to achieve its corporate objectives. It was important to ensure that the arrangements for the governance of the waterways did not prevent the waterways becoming a key player in 21st century Worcestershire • Greater prominence should be afforded to the county's waterways to attract visitors to the county • The waterways of the county not only supported the leisure industry but also many other different local businesses and allowed the local economy

to thrive

- As part of LTP4, the Council was promoting the use of canal towpaths for walking and cycling
- It should be noted that only two of the county's watercourses were considered of an acceptable standard by the EA. The environment and biodiversity benefits of maintaining healthy rivers and watercourses were considerable. The Council and its local MPs should support the Sewage Inland Waterways Bill which aimed to make the utility companies more responsible for the discharge of untreated sewage into waterways at times of flood
- The Cabinet Member for Environment commented that the Council worked closely with partner agencies including the Environment Agency and Severn Trent to maintain the county's waterways. Work was taking place with Worcestershire Wildlife Trust to slow the flow of waterways and improve the quality of the water entering into the county's rivers. Boats using the river had an important role in aerating the water and improving the quality of the water. The creation of the fish passes on the River Severn would also improve the quality of the water as a result of the natural feeding habits of the fish. Work was taking place with farmers to help improve farming practices to improve the health of waterways
- The county's waterways had a significant role in supporting the horticulture and agriculture sectors of the economy. There were also educational benefits for young people learning about the county's waterways
- In the future, the Council should place greater emphasis on the diversity and opportunities that the waterways brought to the county, not least to harness all aspects of water power which could help the Council reduce its carbon footprint.

RESOLVED "Worcestershire rivers and waterways make an important contribution to the vibrancy of the county.

- **They are important to the biodiversity of the county**
- **They provide opportunities to promote the health agenda**
- **They support the leisure economy**
- **They are a source of materials for the construction economy**
- **They contribute to reducing the carbon**

2230 Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 2 - Time limit for discussing Notices of Motion (Agenda item 9)

footprint.

Council asks the Cabinet to ensure the positive role made by Worcestershire's rivers and waterways is reflected in all its policies."

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion set out in the agenda papers standing in the names of Prof J W Raine, Mrs M A Rayner, Mr T A L Wells, Dr C Hotham and Mr M E Jenkins.

The motion was moved by Prof J W Raine and seconded by Dr C Hotham who both spoke in favour of it, and Council agreed to deal with it on the day.

Those in favour of the Motion made the following points:

- There were limited means for opposition members to influence the Council agenda other than through questions and notices of motion. The introduction of time limits for the consideration of motions had further constrained this opportunity. At recent meetings, attempts by opposition members to raise motions had been thwarted by the filibustering tactics of the controlling group with repetitive, time-wasting and verbose contributions on non-controversial issues. It was disrespectful not just to opposite groups but also local residents, waiting for discussions on important issues. There was now some doubt as to whether the first come first served approach to submitting motions was appropriate or fair. It led to an unseemly race to submit motions as soon as possible in advance of the meeting. It was therefore proposed that a system be implemented that would allow each group the opportunity to submit at least one motion at each Council meeting and to extend the time limit to 120 minutes
- The restrictions resulting from the pandemic had led to further erosion of practices and procedures with artificially imposed time limits being further reduced. At recent meetings, the motions put forward by the controlling group had been non-controversial yet took up a disproportionately large amount of the allocated time
- It was important to have an inclusive system in place that allowed all members from all groups the opportunity to bring forward policy suggestions
- Whilst acknowledging that council meetings should not be unnecessarily prolonged, the

introduction of time limits on motions had stifled debate, led to a backlog of motions that lost their immediacy, benefited the group that submitted their motion first and led to important subjects not being debated. The time limits on motions should be discussed and agreed by group leaders prior to formal ratification at the first meeting of Council after the elections

- It had never been suggested that motions were the property of the opposition groups but there were plenty of other ways for members to celebrate aspects of the county. The consideration of issues that impacted policy decisions would be a better use of this time.

Those against the Motion made the following points:

- The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills commented that the Council's constitution had been amended by Council in May 2018 so that motions would be considered on a first come first served basis for a maximum period of 90 minutes. It would be inappropriate to amend the constitution at this stage of the life of the Council and in such a piecemeal way. It was a task for the new council to determine after the elections next year. A 60-minute time limit for motions had been agreed between group leaders as a result of concerns about the length of virtual meetings. However, the Chairman had now agreed that the 90-minute time limit be reintroduced. The accusation of filibustering was subjective given that every councillor had an equal right to speak at a Council meeting, was limited to a 2-minute contribution, and no doubt believed their contribution to be as important as anyone else. This motion was too specific in nature as there was no way of knowing how many groups would be created post elections
- The changes to the constitution had been brought about as a result of the recommendations of a cross-party working group. This working group had been established by Council to prevent unnecessarily lengthy meetings. However, it was noted that the Labour Group had not participated in this work
- At a previous Council meeting, a motion had been brought forward on the agenda papers at the request of an opposite group. That motion had then taken the whole 90-minute allocation
- The time spent by councillors discussing this

motion could be better spent discussing other important council business or motions

- The motion appeared to suggest that councillors could not celebrate the good work being carried out in their local community
- All councillors should be treated equally. Backbenchers would be particularly disenfranchised should this motion be carried
- The Chairman had an independent role in facilitating the order of Council business. The opposition groups had an opportunity ahead of the meeting to make requests to the Chairman to change it
- The vast majority of motions considered by this Council over the last five meetings had been submitted by opposition groups so the facts did not support the accusation that motions were being dominated by the controlling group.

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

2231 Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 3 - Kinship Carers (Agenda item 9)

There was insufficient time to consider this motion within the allocated 60-minute time limit for the consideration of Notices of Motion.

2232 Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 4 - Covid 19 - Track and Trace System (Agenda item 9)

There was insufficient time to consider this motion within the allocated 60-minute time limit for the consideration of Notices of Motion.

2233 Question Time (Agenda item 10)

Five questions had been received by the Assistant Director for Legal and Governance and had been circulated in advance of the meeting. The answers to all the questions are attached in the Appendix.

2234 Reports of Committees - Audit and Governance Committee (Agenda item 11 (a))

The Chairman of the Committee introduced the report and commented that the Council's Statement of Accounts had now been signed off by the external auditor with an unqualified audit opinion. This Council's accounts had been the 4th set of Accounts to be signed off in the country, well ahead of the statutory deadline on 30 November. He recognised the hard work and dedication of the members of the finance team over the last 3-4

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>2235 Reports of Committees - Pensions Committee (Agenda item 11 (b))</p> | <p>years to get the Accounts to this point which was a considerable achievement.</p> <p>The Council received the report of the Audit and Governance Committee containing a summary of the decisions taken.</p> <p>The Chairman of the Committee introduced the report and commented that he was pleased to report that the Funding level of the Pension Fund had reached nearly 90%. This was a return to the pre-Covid funding level as in March 2020. He drew Council's attention to the work being undertaken with respect to Environment Social and Governance and climate change, the outcome of which would be reported to the Committee early next year. The Pension Fund Statement of Accounts had been signed off by the external auditor with an unqualified opinion.</p> <p>The Council received the report of the Pensions Committee containing a summary of the decisions taken.</p> |
| <p>2236 Reports of Committees - Planning and Regulatory Committee (Agenda item 11 (c))</p> | <p>The Chairman of the Committee introduced the report and thanked Dr C Hotham and Mrs P Agar for their contribution to the work of the Planning and Regulatory Committee. He welcomed Mrs F M Oborski to the membership of the Committee.</p> <p>The Council received the report of the Planning and Regulatory Committee containing a summary of the decisions taken.</p> |
| <p>2237 Reports of Committees - Standards and Ethics Committee (Agenda item 11 (d))</p> | <p>The Council received the report of the Standards and Ethics Committee containing a summary of the decisions taken.</p> |

The meeting was adjourned from 12.45pm to 1.30 pm and ended at 3.20pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL 12 NOVEMBER 2020 - AGENDA ITEM 10 – QUESTION TIME

Questions and written responses provided below.

QUESTION 1 – Mr P Middlebrough will ask Alan Amos:

“There is a great deal of concern in Kempsey that the A38 needs more controlled foot crossings along the A38. Will the Cabinet Member undertake a review to identify suitable locations for new crossings to be installed in Kempsey?”

Answer

I thank Cllr Middlebrough for his question, always assiduously looking after the interests of his constituents.

Worcestershire County Council recognises the need to frequently review the changing needs of developing communities like Kempsey, as a result of which Kempsey has been subject to regular monitoring in recent years.

Data collected at 3 locations in 2019 was compared against data collected in 2018, the data focuses on the points below:

- **Speeds** - speed of traffic would determine what type of crossing could be installed or not if speeds are too high; and
- **Gap analysis** i.e. how many gaps are available in traffic for people to cross the road safely during peak times.

I am happy to provide Cllr Middlebrough with this data if he would like to have it.

Whilst the data showed that traffic speeds have remained consistently the same, it did identify that the number of gap crossing opportunities appears to have reduced by approximately 1/3 indicating that there has been a volumetric increase in traffic, which in turn has impacted on the number of crossing opportunities. However, the number of crossing opportunities does not fall below 12 during the survey, which is considered a trigger point for intervention, as the data in the written answer shows.

Summary Data

Location	2018	2019
	85% Speeds	
A = Close to the Community Centre	31.1mph	31.mph
B = Close to the junction of Old Rd North & Church St	32.9mph	32.21mph
C = Close to The Lawns, Residential	36.2mph	36.35mph

Currently, as there are adequate gaps in the traffic during peak times at each of the locations, we would not at the moment support the installation of controlled crossings.

However, having said that, the monitoring does indicate that there is demand and - with the level of local development being undertaken - that this demand will increase. Consequently, I can confirm that we will undertake monitoring again in the Spring of 2021 to establish whether the demand has increased and if gaps have reduced. At that point, I will report back to Cllr Middlebrough to discuss whether and how a crossing improvement can be pursued.

Appendix attached with detailed comparable data for Kempsey

QUESTION 2 – Mr P M McDonald will ask Karen May:

"Would the Cabinet Member with Responsibility please inform me of the cost from travelling expenses so far this year, compared with this time last year?"

Answer

Thank you for your question. I can confirm we have had the opportunity to look at officer travelling costs related predominantly to mileage, for claims between April-September 2020 compared to the same period last year. Overall, including WCC & WCF, there has been a 48% reduction in claims over the two periods. In 2019/20 the total travelling costs paid for the areas outlined was £847,970 compared to £439,589 in 2020/21.

Travelling costs continue to be highest in our two frontline service areas being Worcestershire Children First and People Services.

Because of the restructures that have happened since September 2019, including the Councils' review of its overall functional design which was effective 1 December 2019, it's not straightforward to conduct a direct comparison between the two dates by Directorate. We would however expect to see a significant reduction in the amount of officer travelling costs during the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020/21 which has seen an instruction of 'work at home wherever possible' for the workforce for the majority of this time period.

I am also able to inform you that Member mileage claims between April and the end of September 2019 were £10,663 compared to Member mileage claims between April and the end of September of 2020 were £1,768.

QUESTION 3 – Dr C Hotham will ask Alan Amos:

"The A441 at Bordesley, outside Alvechurch, has had horrendous problems with temporary traffic lights causing asymmetric traffic flow. The provision of "spotters" had little impact as they seem to spend most of their time in the van on their phones. Does the Cabinet Member for Highways agree that the Council's proposed new "lane rental" road repair scheme should also address this costly and frustrating annoyance with sanctions for transgressing operators?"

Answer

Can I thank Cllr Hotham for his question, which is very helpful.

As he will know, this Council's top priority is to address traffic congestion which, as surveys regularly tell us, is the biggest area of concern amongst the County's residents. Last Cabinet approved another four huge congestion-busting schemes across the County with widespread support from residents and the business community. Easily the biggest cause of traffic congestion is roadworks, mainly but not exclusively undertaken by the utilities, not the County Council.

There is no doubt that a Lane Rental Scheme, whereby undertakers are charged by the day or hour within which to carry out their works, will bring about a dramatic reduction in road closures and delays as the undertakers will have a real incentive - the financial one - to carry out their work efficiently and with the interests of the motorist, not themselves, at the centre.

There are currently two trial Lane Rental Schemes in operation in England, one run by Transport for London and another by Kent County Council, so there is a good cross section of locations, including both a major urban area and a County Council. I'm very pleased to say that the initial indications are positive, with both schemes reporting a reduction in the duration of road works during peak hours and an increase in collaboration between works promoters on streets covered by the Lane Rental Scheme.

In Worcestershire, we are currently working to establish a scheme for a Worcestershire Lane Rental Scheme.

In answer to Cllr Hotham's specific question regarding sanctions, under the current legislation, the Traffic Management Permit Scheme Regulations 2007, enable a Local Authority to issue fixed penalty notices to offences set out in the regulations, and this will be the same for authorities operating a Lane Rental Scheme. However, whilst charges that are already being applied under Lane Rental Schemes do vary considerably, Cllr Hotham can be assured that it is our intention to charge across the maximum extent covering as many aspects of any work as possible, and at the highest levels allowable under the law which will necessarily include an assessment of how traffic-sensitive the lanes are. This will maximize the incentive for undertakers to get the work done in a timely manner and reduce the burden of congestion on the motorist.

A Lane Rental Scheme will be an important tool for Worcestershire and, alongside works promoters, we would be able to bid for investment in equipment, technology etc, to improve the efficiency of Street Works. So under such a scheme, residents, businesses, and the County Council are all winners.

QUESTION 4 – Mr R M Udall will ask Ken Pollock:

"The government has announced measures to help some of the self-employed during the current lockdown, however, many Worcestershire self-employed residents do not meet the eligibility criteria for support. What help and support can he provide or offer to assist those in Worcestershire who are self-employed during this difficult time?"

Answer

As we entered the second lockdown the government announced additional support for businesses, which included extending the Self-Employment Income Support Scheme grant, from 1 Nov to end of April 2021, with eligible people being able to claim up to 80% of profits. The third grant payment will cover a 3-month period from 1 November 2020 until 31 January 2021. Under the new offer the government will provide a grant calculated at 80% of the 3 months average monthly trading profits, paid out in a single instalment and capped at £7,500 in total. This is an increase from the previously announced amount of 55%.

Changes to the Local Restrictions Support Grants also announced:

- For properties with a rateable value of £15k or under, grants to be £1,334 per month, or £667 per two weeks;
- For properties with a rateable value of between £15k-£51k grants to be £2,000 per month, or £1,000 per two weeks;

- For properties with a rateable value of £51k or over grants to be £3,000 per month, or £1,500 per two weeks.

Funding will be also be available from district councils to support local businesses; they will receive funding of £20 per head. This is a discretionary sum, and our district colleagues are expecting additional guidance this week. This funding will be administered at the discretion of the district councils but primarily targeting those businesses that have been required to close, those severely affected, and can also provide direct business support.

As part of Worcestershire County Councils Here2Help business programme, start-up businesses can take advantage of our support package which will provide access to business experts in the fields of Finance, Marketing and Technology.

On 4 November the Council launched the new Enterprising Worcestershire programme. We can offer grants of up to £15,000 (on a 60/40 match funded basis, with 60% from the business), to a business that has been trading up to 3 years and to meet our funders requirements the business must be trading predominately business to business. Both revenue and capital funding is available. The first grant call will close on 27th November 2020. We have also commissioned advice and support for people wishing to become self-employed. The service will launch later his month once the procurement process is complete. The Enterprising Worcestershire programme is supported by the district councils and we are working together to put in place support for people starting "business to consumer" businesses, to ensure support is available for all. District Councils are also making available grants of between £500 and £1,000 on a 50/50 match funded basis to these businesses.

While we have worked to ensure support is put in place where we can, we do acknowledge that there are freelancers and owner-directors and the newly self-employed who are have not been able to access government support.

QUESTION 5 – Mr R C Lunn will ask Lucy Hodgson:

"Can the Cabinet Member with Responsibility explain how the success or otherwise of the Careers advice given to 14-18 year olds in the County is measured?"

Answer

This in itself is a challenging question, careers advice can be measured for its quality but it alone is challenging to use as a measure of success due to the complexity of lives and external factors, that regardless of good careers advice, will affect our young people. We can only ensure that the advice they receive is quality, relevant to our labour market, explores their options realistically and allows young people to progress.

In December 2017 the government's Department for Education launched the latest version of their "Careers Strategy". This new strategy commissioned the Careers and Enterprise Company to driving forward careers provision for young people. Their enhanced role is to add pace in improving the landscape of careers and enterprise, supporting programmes that work, ensuring quality delivery, filling gaps in provision and ensuring coverage across the entire country.

This new strategy adopted the Eight Gatsby Benchmarks which measure the schools strategy. It also measures how information is provided to young people and the interactions with young people as well as engagement with young people and employers. These benchmarks were formally adopted by OFSTED at the start of the 2018/2019 academic year and now form part of their school inspection process.

The County Council has been supporting the delivery of these programmes in Worcestershire through the “Inspiring Worcestershire” programme, born out of the LEPs Employment and Skills Strategy 2012- 2017. This is reiterated within our Corporate Plan, ensuring that Worcestershire actively works towards meeting both the Worcestershire LEP and Worcestershire County Council key priorities which were to help strengthen the relationship between educational establishments and business.

The Careers and Enterprise Company (CEC) delivery in Worcestershire delivered by WCC in partnership with Worcestershire LEP incorporates every school with a year 7 and over pupil within including Middle, Secondary, Special Educational Need, Pupil Referral Unit and Further Education College. (65 establishments).

The Careers Hub initiative has just completed the 2nd year of its contract, having met all, and in most places exceeded, its contractual targets. Worcestershire had an exceptional year in terms of performance in comparison to the other Careers Hubs which have been developed across England. Worcestershire’s average benchmark performance is currently at 5.05 out of 8 benchmarks, exceeding the England average of 3.86 out of 8.

Supporting information on the delivery team’s work and the eight benchmarks used.

The delivery team work with member educational establishments to ensure they are meeting the mandatory requirements set out within the Department for Education’s Careers Strategy and achieve all eight of the Gatsby Benchmarks. The team also ensure that Worcestershire students are able to understand through increased employer encounters and activities the needs of the Worcestershire economy moving forward which will in turn prepare them to enter Worcestershire’s workforce.

The team supports those schools as follows: -

- Supporting educational establishments to engage local business by bringing employer encounters to support careers such as through event participation i.e. careers fayres, industry talks, assemblies, mentoring and work experience.
- Implementing careers strategy and embedding into school culture and values, ensuring that all levels of management such as Senior leadership teams and governors have buy in to the strategy and support the career planning in line with the needs of the Worcestershire economy.
- Embedding Worcestershire careers into curriculum by supporting to design and deliver lessons plans that bring curriculum to life and explore the industrial make-up of Worcestershire.
- Ensuring that all post 16 options relevant to young people and the needs of Worcestershire economy are highlighted to all students, including available apprenticeship in county, Higher Education pathway needs and Further Education college options
- Access to high quality careers advice which is locally relevant and discusses the economy of Worcestershire and its needs.

The team has recruited over 80 Advisers from local business working actively in educational establishments within the initiative as well as over 200 other Worcestershire employers pledged to offer support to educational establishments through activities.

This support continues virtually throughout this period.

The Eight Gatsby Benchmarks of Good Career Guidance are:

- 1) A stable career programme
- 2) Learning from career and labour market information
- 3) Addressing the needs of each pupil
- 4) Linking curriculum learning to careers
- 5) Encounters with employers and employees
- 6) Experience of workplaces
- 7) Encounters with further higher education
- 8) Personal guidance

Department
for Education



**Careers strategy:
making the most of
everyone's skills and
talents**

December 2017

CROSSING OPPORTUNITIES HAVE REDUCED BY 1/3 BUT STILL ABOVE THE MIN REQUIREMENT OF 12 GAPS PER 15 MINUTES

2018

Location A:

85% speeds – 31.1 mph

2019

85% Speed = 31.54 mph,

GAP SURVEY	
Date: 14-Feb-18	Census Taken By: SR JC
Location: Main Rd, Kempsey, N of Brookend Lane	Road No: A38
Width of Carriageway: 24ft	Minimum Gap Time Required: 8 secs
Time	No. of Gaps
Morning	
08:00 - 08:15	26
08:15 - 08:30	36
08:30 - 08:45	38
08:45 - 09:00	27
09:00 - 09:15	34
Afternoon	
15:15 - 15:30	28
15:30 - 15:45	30
15:45 - 16:00	36
16:00 - 16:15	32
16:15 - 16:30	31
12 gaps in each 15 minute period indicate a road, which is reasonably able to be crossed without undue delay.	

GAP SURVEY	
Date: 10-Jul-19	Census Taken By: SR & JC
Location: Main Road, Kempsey, Brookend Lane	Road No: A38
Width of Carriageway: 21 ft	Minimum Gap Time Required: 7 secs
Time	No. of Gaps in Excess of Minimum
Morning	
08:00 - 08:15	16
08:15 - 08:30	21
08:30 - 08:45	21
08:45 - 09:00	17
09:00 - 09:15	16
Afternoon	
15:15 - 15:30	20
15:30 - 15:45	20
15:45 - 16:00	17
16:00 - 16:15	19
16:15 - 16:30	22

Location B:

85% speeds – 32.9mph

GAP SURVEY	
Date: 21-Feb-18	Census Taken By: SR JC
Location: Main Rd, Kempsey, S of Post Office Ln	Road No: A38
Width of Carriageway 21ft	Minimum Gap Time Required: 7 secs

Time	No. of Gaps
Morning	
08:00 - 08:15	32
08:15 - 08:30	48
08:30 - 08:45	45
08:45 - 09:00	44
09:00 - 09:15	44
Afternoon	
15:15-15:30	39
15:30-15:45	36
15:45-16:00	40
16:00-16:15	41
16:15-16:30	42

12 gaps in each 15 minute period indicate a road, which is reasonably able to be crossed without undue delay.

85% Speed = 32.21 mph

GAP SURVEY	
Date: 10-Jul-19	Census Taken By: SR & JC
Location: Main Road, Kempsey, Church Street	Road No: A38
Width of Carriageway: 21 ft	Minimum Gap Time Required: 7 secs

Time	No. of Gaps in Excess of Minimum
Morning	
08:00 - 08:15	15
08:15 - 08:30	19
08:30 - 08:45	18
08:45 - 09:00	17
09:00 - 09:15	18
Afternoon	
15:15 - 15:30	17
15:30 - 15:45	17
15:45 - 16:00	18
16:00 - 16:15	18
16:15 - 16:30	18

Location C:

85% speeds – 36.2mph

85% Speed = 36.35 mph

GAP SURVEY	
Date: 14-Feb-18	Census Taken By: SR JC
Location: Main Rd, Kempsey, N of Centurian Way	Road No: A38
Width of Carriageway: 23ft	Minimum Gap Time Required: 8 secs

Time	No. of Gaps
Morning	
08.00 - 08.15	37
08.15 - 08.30	35
08.30 - 08.45	34
08.45 - 09.00	39
09.00 - 09.15	37
Afternoon	
15.15-15.30	39
15.30-15.45	35
15.45-16.00	38
16.00-16.15	37
16.15-16.30	34

12 gaps in each 15 minute period indicate a

GAP SURVEY	
Date: 10-Jul-19	Census Taken By: SR & JC
Location: Main Road, Kempsey, Centurian Drive	Road No: A38
Width of Carriageway: 21 ft	Minimum Gap Time Required: 7 secs

Time	No. of Gaps in Excess of Minimum
Morning	
08.00 - 08.15	17
08.15 - 08.30	20
08.30 - 08.45	21
08.45 - 09.00	21
09.00 - 09.15	24
Afternoon	
15.15 - 15.30	20
15.30 - 15.45	20
15.45 - 16.00	21
16.00 - 16.15	20
16.15 - 16.30	23

This page is intentionally left blank