

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 14 JUNE 2011

**QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1**

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT

**(1) MR MIKE BENNISON (HINCHLEY WOOD, CLAYGATE AND
OXSHOTT) TO ASK:**

Experiencing severe problems with heavy goods vehicles transiting my division of Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott, and also my Borough seat of Cobham. It occurred to me that London has seen fit to create the low emission zone in London itself.

Thus they consider that the health of the London taxpayer is more valuable than the health of the Surrey taxpayer.

This appears to run along the northeast Surrey border from Tandridge to Staines, thus creating a situation where it would be cheaper to avoid paying £200 levy by transiting Surrey.

To add insult to injury, we in Surrey, allow them to put up low emission warning signs next to our highways thus encouraging them to avoid the zone and travel via Surrey.

Would the Cabinet Member, consider creating a hybrid low emission zone in Surrey, with charges of 50% more than London itself. Making a huge surplus for the Surrey taxpayer, which can be used either for roads, vulnerable children or vulnerable adults, or indeed to pay towards the health of our taxpayers suffering from things such as bronchitis and asthma.

Again, they are discouraging vehicles from using the London roads, such as junction nine on the M25 through Chessington, and instead get them to use junction nine M25 through Oxshott and Esher, and arguably, Cobham as well.

Do you agree that we could then ask London to put in place lower emission signs on the London roads preferably stating that it is cheaper to travel on their roads than the Surrey ones.

Do you further agree, that it is a flipping cheek to expect us in Surrey to take their unwanted traffic and thus damage our roads at Surrey taxpayer's expense.

Reply:

Surrey County Council was consulted when Transport for London initially proposed its Low Emission Zone (LEZ). We agreed to the zone on the basis

that it did not create additional problems for Surrey, either by additional lorry movements or by forcing goods operators to use their more polluting vehicles in Surrey.

Initial evidence is that the Low Emission Zone has had a positive effect on pollution levels in Surrey. Most logistics companies operating in the southeast have updated or retrofitted their vehicles to meet the LEZ requirements, resulting in cleaner lorries passing through or around Surrey. This is far more cost-effective for them than making lengthy detours to avoid London.

Imminent legislation means that the emission standards required by the LEZ will soon be mandatory for all new goods vehicles. The main effect of the LEZ has therefore been to speed up the introduction of cleaner vehicles in London and the South East.

We do not believe that there is a financial case for a Low Emission Zone in Surrey. It would achieve relatively little and it would be expensive to install and administer. The only vehicles it would affect would be a small number of local businesses running older goods vehicles and public service vehicles.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT

(2) MR CHRIS TOWNSEND (ASHTREAD) TO ASK:

In the light of Mr. Hodge's recent email on the subject of On-Street Parking Charges and the Tandridge decision to not go ahead with these charges, is it true that Local Committees have the ability to confirm or refuse On-Street Parking charges in their own local area ?

Reply:

The letter sent by the Deputy Leader delegated responsibility to Local Committees to decide how parking charges should be implemented in their areas. It also contained a number of factors for the Local Committees to consider in the decision making process.

The letter clearly set out:

'The criteria for the Local Committees to agree any changes to the proposals after public consultation has to be clearly defined.

These include:

- Proximity to free parking either borough and district off-street car park(s) or supermarket/superstore;
- To encourage use of municipal car parks, on street car parking charges should not be lower than municipal car parks;
- Enforcement improvement;
- Reduction of local traffic congestion;

- Improve churn;
- Vacancy rate of a parade of shops to support the local economy;
- Must ensure the financial viability of the local parking operation.

In addition the Local Committees can:

- Set the costs for residents parking permits above the minimum charge of £50 for the first car and £75 for the second;
- Commission and fund new parking reviews in response to the needs of local residents and businesses;
- Following on from the Leader's agreement with the Surrey Federation of Small Businesses, commission reviews of yellow lines outside shops;
- Scrutinise the performance of on street parking enforcement arrangements;
- In the eventuality that a surplus is generated and, if all or part is allocated to the Local Committee, decide which highways or transport schemes are funded, based on local need.'

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND HEALTH

(3) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:

What contingency plans has the County Council put in place to deal with the consequences for Surrey residents in the event of Southern Cross Healthcare closing its care homes in Surrey?

Reply:

This response provides details relating to Southern Cross Nursing and Residential Care Homes within Surrey: outlines the residents within each homes, and details of people funded out of County.

We have been monitoring the situation since March. Work began on a risk assessment and contingency plan in May 2011 in response to growing concern regarding the financial viability of the provider. The timing of this answer responds to an increasing media spotlight in relation to the companies "New Horizons" statement on 8 June 2011. There has been a shift in focus by the media from a financial concern to one of care standards.

Outlined is a summary of identified risks, and the proactive response of Adult Social Care to manage risk and preparation of mitigations and contingency plans.

Context :

Directors of Adult Social Services have been asked by the Care Quality Commission to prepare contingency plans amid emerging and mounting concern concerning the financial viability of the company. The Association of Directors of Adult Social Services has been aware for some time of the

difficulties surrounding Southern Cross PLC and the company's relationships with its landlords. ADASS has been involved in high-level discussions accordingly.

Surrey County Council purchases residential and nursing home placements with Southern Cross PLC homes, and currently continues to purchase placements on behalf of service users.

It is important to stress the position of Adult Social Care at the outset of this briefing. The primary focus of staff will be physical and emotional welfare of all residents as well as their families. This will be at the forefront of every decision we make as a consequence of any business continuity arrangements. If Southern Cross were to fail our starting point has to be 'don't move individuals' unless we absolutely have to - given their frailty and vulnerability of residents.

Southern Cross Healthcare published (on 19 May 2011) its interim results for the six month period ended 31 March 2011, and the company's auditor, PricewaterhouseCoopers has warned of "material uncertainties" which cast doubt over the group's ability to survive. The statement goes on to say that in the event that Southern Cross Healthcare does not reach agreements with its landlords and lenders, and no alternative finance is available, the group is unlikely to be able to trade.

Research of other analyst viewpoints e.g. Laing and Buisson, is that in the event that Southern Cross Healthcare enters into administration, the administrator would take over the operation and management of the care homes, retaining staff until a buyer can be found. However, some care homes within the Southern Cross Healthcare group may be regarded as unviable and be closed, if no buyer can be found.

Southern Cross's Chief Executive announced on 13 May 2011 that the company was confident that the company will reach agreements with landlords involving a temporary rent reduction of 30%, and is also negotiating with some landlords to take back care homes to run themselves or lease to rival operators.

Research on the business model has identified that the Southern Cross Healthcare business model is one under which a range of different property companies own the freehold of the care home which is then leased to Southern Cross. One of the major difficulties, which have led to the current position, is that rental commitments are unaffordable in a substantially changed economic climate where some Southern Cross Healthcare's homes have low occupancy levels, statutory sector fee levels have not increased, and placement rates have reduced.

On 8 June Jamie Buchan Chief Executive outlined plans to introduce a "New Horizons" change programme, and outlined a major process of staff engagement and consultation with the GMB. This consultation has begun on the potential implementation of a standard contract of employment for new and existing staff; the introduction of new roles in care, ancillary support and

maintenance supervision; and the proposed reductions in workforce of up to 3,000 staff.

The resulting response of media, in particular Channel 4, was to run an expose on the company highlighting poor practice concerns and challenged how the company can take this action amidst concerns about standards of care.

Current analysis of Surrey-wide commissioned services

Southern Cross Healthcare has three care homes located within Surrey. A summary table for each home is outlined below with capacity, registration status, and our funding responsibilities.

- Norfolk House, 9 Portmore Lane, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 8HQ
- Southern Cross Milner House, Milner House, Ermyn Way, Leatherhead, Surrey, KT22 8TX
- Dungate Manor Care Home, Flanchford Road, Reigate Heath, Surrey, RH2 8QT

Within Surrey:

Home	Area	Total Capacity on Website	Registration	Number funded by SCC
Milner House, Leatherhead	Leatherhead	53	Care Home Dementia Nursing * Dual registration	16 funded by SCC
Norfolk House	Weybridge	76	Care Home General Nursing * Dual Registration	39 funded by SCC
Dungate Manor	Reigate	45	Care Home Dementia Residential	2 funded by SCC

Note that current occupancy levels and voids are to be confirmed.

Outside Surrey:

There are 41 funded placements outside Surrey; these are largely dotted across 17 homes, the largest grouping being eight placements in Lavender Lodge, in Farnborough.

NHS Surrey and Continuing Health Care

NHS Surrey is fully funding two residents in Surrey under NHS Continuing Healthcare.

Action Plan

- Commissioners are in discussion with the Care Quality Commission Compliance Officer and Inspector regarding contingency planning
- The Council is preparing for a potential incident. A multiagency meeting has been held chaired by Ian Good, Emergency Management Team and a tactical support group has been formed to manage potential impact
- The Adult Social Care Quality Assurance Managers and Safeguarding Advisors have undertaken unannounced visits to the Surrey homes. We have also contacted the relevant Local Authorities to ascertain how risks are being managed in the out of county homes
- The Safeguarding Advisors have outlined a summary of safeguarding history relating to each of the Surrey homes
- The Sourcing Team is undertaking a full audit of vacancies and costings of alternative placement options if the need occurred
- Discussions to take place with Helen Walker in Estates Management Team and legal services relating to Surrey County Council's interest in leaseholding arrangement as a contingency plan
- A full risk assessment has been undertaken (financial data being completed by Paul Carey-Kent)
- Briefings are being prepared for the Public and Staff
- Letters will be sent to Residents and Families to provide reassurance
- Meeting to be held with Southern Cross on 15 June to agree how we jointly mitigate risk
- Meeting to be agreed and arranged between Legal services and Estates to plan for potential administration issues
- Social Care Practitioners and Health staff will undertake reviews of all Surrey residents' care plans
- A follow up meeting has been planned by the Emergency Management Team to review and monitor actions
- Surrey County Council and NHS Surrey will work on a joint agreed protocol to manage residential and nursing home closures for future business continuity planning, building on the existing Surrey County Council protocol for home closures.

CABINET MEMBER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

(4) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:

The Cabinet Member for the Environment will surely be aware that the Surrey Advertiser has reported that Surrey County Council will receive £213 million from the Waste PFI Contract, that £102 million has been paid so far to the County Council under that contract, and a total of £863 million will have to be repaid by Surrey taxpayers under the 25 year contract.

Please could the Cabinet Member inform the Council how much (a) is meant to be paid to this Council under the PFI deal, (b) has been paid to the Council so far, and (c) will need to be repaid over the 25 year life of the contract if the full amount is paid to the Council?

Please could the Cabinet Member detail and quantify what risks the Council will be liable for, such as loss of PFI grant, repayments to Defra and compensation to SITA if the Council fails to deliver all the conditions of the contract?

Reply:

Firstly, as a matter of fact, I would like to strongly refute the Member's statement that:

“£863m will have to be repaid by Surrey taxpayers under the 25 year contract”

That is not the case and it is not what the Surrey Advertiser article says.

The Member may be confusing contract payments to the contractor, with Government grant support to the Council, which are clearly different things.

In fact, the Council has received £102m over the last 12 years in Government grant to support the waste contract objectives of reducing waste going to landfill and increasing recycling. It is expected that a further £103m will be received by 2024, totalling £205m in Government grant paid to Surrey over the 25 year life of the contract.

The contract objective has always been the provision of the most economically advantageous, long-term solution for the disposal of waste for Surrey, taking into account SCC's environmental objectives. The proposed ecopark will provide much needed infrastructure to support the delivery of World Class Waste Solutions to Surrey residents. Any risks that the Council would face if it “fails to deliver all the conditions of the contract” obviously depend on what conditions the Council did not meet, but there is no reason why the contract should not continue to meet the objective I have set out above.

CABINET MEMBER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

**(5) MRS CAROLINE NICHOLS (LOWER SUNBURY AND HALLIFORD)
TO ASK:**

In a letter to the County Council dated 14 May 2010 regarding the Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Defra's Waste Infrastructure Delivery Programme Director stated:

"If the planning application has not been determined by the Authority's Planning Committee by the end of April 2011, Defra will advise DCLG that the contract has failed to provide a residual waste treatment facility set out in the Final Business Case and request that the PFI grant be reviewed to reflect the diminished scope of the project."

As Defra's deadline has now passed, could the Cabinet Member please update Members as to whether:

- 1) Defra have now taken the action outlined in their letter

2) If not, what further new deadline Defra have given the County Council to comply with the PFI requirements and what conditions have been set in meeting any new deadline.

Reply:

Defra is understandably interested in the Council's waste contract given the considerable grant support that it has provided.

April 2011 was a date by when the Council, as waste disposal authority, had estimated that a planning decision could have been taken. Officers supporting the waste disposal function of the council have liaised closely with Defra throughout the last few months and in March, when it became apparent that the Planning and Regulatory Committee would not determine the planning application before the end of April, those officers informed Defra and explained the reasons for delay. Defra appear satisfied with progress to date and have not given any indication that they will be reviewing the PFI grant allocation.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY

(6) MR JOHN ORRICK (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK:

Please could the Cabinet Member confirm how much the budget for, and how many posts will be cut from the Road Safety and Safer Travel team in the next year?

Reply:

The Public Value Review of Road Safety was approved by Cabinet on the 1 March 2011. This advised that staff savings in both the Road Safety Team (engineering and enforcement) and in the Safer Travel Team (education, training and school crossing patrols) would be undertaken as part of the wider restructure of the Environment and Infrastructure Directorate taking place during 2011/12. Proposals for the Environment and Infrastructure Directorate restructure are currently being developed with the aim of consulting with staff on proposals in September 2011.

The Public Value Review of Road Safety recommended a reduction in staff costs in the Safer Travel Team (education, training and school crossing patrols) from the 2010/11 base line of £953,800 to costs of £777,400 in 2012/13 (a saving of £176,400). There would also be a reduction in staff costs in the Road Safety Team (engineering and enforcement) from the 2010/11 baseline of £483,800 to costs of £381,100 in 2012/13 (a saving of £102,700). The precise reductions in posts will only be known following the Environment and Infrastructure Directorate restructure.

DEPUTY LEADER

(7) MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK:

Please would the Deputy Leader provide details of all spending by the County Council of over £500 using credit and charge cards?

Reply:

The council use Purchasing Cards (credit cards) as an efficient and cost-effective method for low value purchases of goods and services for Council use. They reduce the need for petty cash, cheque requests and certain types of purchase orders such as one-off purchases from suppliers with whom we may not trade again. They also reduce the paperwork and administrative effort involved in processing requisitions, purchase orders and invoices and give purchasers the power and flexibility to purchase on-line or at point of sale. This allows services to be provided promptly and when needed.

Last year we spent £1.1m via these cards, and 376 are currently with authorised users. There are a number of controls in place to minimise the risk of abuse of these cards. These are set out in [Procurement Standing Orders](#), and explained further in supplementary [Rules and Guidance](#) published on S-Net.

1. Cards are only issued to users with the approval of the budget holder involved, and, for higher credit levels, the Head of Service.
2. All users are required to sign up to the rules and guidance, and must complete e-learning to ensure their understanding.
3. Each month, users are required to reconcile their on-line statement and assign budgetary codes. Budget holders are required to approve usage.
4. A list of categories for which cards may not be used is included in [Procurement Standing Orders](#), and reinforced via e-learning.
5. Card allocation and usage is monitored within the Shared Services Centre, and reports are run on a monthly basis. A sample of transactions is followed up with card-holders each month to gain assurance that the usage was appropriate and followed policy. The results of this reporting are recorded for annual internal audit, who also reviewed the use of purchasing cards in August 2010. This found no evidence of inappropriate use of the cards, and this review will be repeated this year.

The policy is kept under regular review and the outcome of reporting is discussed with the relevant managers.

We will shortly be publishing details of spend on purchase cards over £500 as part of our commitment to transparency. The first of these will be for April-June 2011, now that the technology is in place to support publication of this data.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE 2012 GAMES

(8) MR IAN BEARDSMORE (SUNBURY COMMON AND ASHFORD COMMON) TO ASK:

Please would the Cabinet Member state how many 2012 Olympic tickets Surrey County Council applied for (if any) and how many were successfully obtained? Please could they also state the total amount the tickets obtained cost, and what the cost would have been if the Council received all the tickets that it bid for?

Reply:

I can confirm that Surrey County Council has not applied for any Olympic tickets for the 2012 Games.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT

(9) MR PETER LAMBELL (REIGATE CENTRAL) TO ASK:

Members were assured that the new highways defect reporting tool would ensure better communication with residents and Members regarding the status of logged defects.

On 23 May 2011, I reported some serious potholes in a road in my Division. I received confirmation that my enquiry had been logged but as of 3 June 2011, I have received no further updates, nor does the tracking tool show any further updates.

Having discussed this directly with the local highways team, I was pleased to discover that the road had been inspected within the required 24 hours and that the road was earmarked for resurfacing.

However I would have hoped that this information would have been logged against my enquiry and communicated to me without the need for further intervention to avoid wasting Members and Highways staff time.

Would the Cabinet member update the Council as to:

- whether the new logging process is working as expected, in particular how the contractors are performing so far against KPIs?
- whether any other Members have reported similar problems?

Reply:

Firstly, thank you for using the new pothole website and I am pleased that your request was acted on so promptly. The new website has now been live for five

weeks and I can confirm that during that time May Gurney have repaired more than 80% of requests within the stipulated 24 hours and more importantly 95% of work has been completed with a permanent "right first time" solution. The KPI target for completing work within 24 hours is 98%, although it was always anticipated that due to the amount of change within the new contract (staff, processes, IT etc) that it would take a minimum of 3 months to achieve the 98% target.

However, there has been a technical problem in updating the website, with it taking several days to close the enquiry on the website and update the resident accordingly. This is due to a delay in implementing the new hand held mobile devices to May Gurney's highway gangs, May Gurney are currently working to resolve the issue and will roll out the mobile devices as soon as possible. Once the roll out is complete the website will receive an immediate notification, following the repair to the pothole.

I do apologise to the Councillor regarding the delay in receiving the automatic update, however, officers are confident the solution will be resolved in the near future.

I would also like to take this opportunity to highlight that in the 6 weeks since the new contracts started May Gurney has:

- received over 1,370 emergency calls into the new control hub at Merrow
- completed 730 2 hour emergency jobs, 97% on time
- 84 pre patching schemes
- improved 55 roads through surface dressing
- cleaned the gullies in 775 roads
- repaired over 3,150 potholes

DEPUTY LEADER

(10) MR COLIN TAYLOR (EPSOM AND EWELL SOUTH WEST) TO ASK:

I understand that it has been stated in the local press that £3.4m was spent by council staff last year on mileage reimbursement and that this was a 32% increase on the amount spent the previous year.

1. What analysis has been done to determine the cause of this?
2. A car rental company is claiming that they could help reduce such costs whilst also reducing carbon emissions.
3. What steps is the council taking to reduce this type of expenditure in the current year?

Reply:

Question 1

We moved from an old system to a new system between 2008/09 and 2009/10 as the old system was inequitable, complex and did not reflect price rises in the costs of staff using their own cars on council business. The system is not based allowances but based on reimbursement of costs incurred.

Last year (2010-11) the cost of mileage reimbursement was virtually identical to the previous year (2009-10) with mileage costs in the region of £3.4m. The increase from 2008-09 (approx. £2.6m) to 2009-10 (approx. £3.4m) was largely as a result of two factors:

Harmonisation Onto Surrey Pay Terms

Costs of reimbursing for business mileage increased following a review in 2008. The Surrey Mileage reimbursement rates prior to the 2008 review, had remained unchanged since 2002 despite significant increase in the cost of fuel/motoring over that period. Following the review, the former Personnel and Appointment's Committee, now the People Performance and Development Committee, agreed to bring the rates for Teaching Staff and non-contractual users (previously 28p per mile) into line with other county council contractual users (40p per mile) with effect from 1st October 2008. This was to harmonise this group of staff onto Surrey mileage terms. This also served to minimize an equal pay risk.

Since that time, the re-imbursement rates for both contractual and non-contractual users have remained at 40p per mile, (up to 10,000 miles per year and 25p above 10,000 miles per year). These were the rates employers were allowed to reimburse as tax-free by HM Revenue & Customs. This is because these reimbursed the costs of motoring without providing a profit to the recipient.

Cessation Of The Old Car Lease Scheme

The old system included a car lease scheme that was run down over a 10 year period as it was costly and administratively complex. In 2001, the cost to the county council of providing 700 lease cars was in the region of £2.6 million a year. The closure of the scheme in 2007, resulted in an immediate saving of £450,000 and since that time the county council has saved on the costs of running such a scheme. Staff who used to have a subsidised lease car received mileage reimbursement of 13p per mile. As lease cars came to an end, staff moved on to use their own cars and were reimbursed at the standard Surrey Mileage reimbursement rate of 40p per mile to compensate them for the wear and tear to their own vehicles. The increase in mileage costs partly represents the difference between the 13p and the 40p.

Question 2

The Council is examining a wide range of ways to reduce costs and carbon emissions, as described in response to question 3 below. Low carbon Car Club cars, provided by Streetcar, are currently available for SCC business use at or near our offices in Kingston, Woking, Reigate and Leatherhead.

We are presently engaged in a re-tendering process. This may increase provision for business use, with a resulting reduction in business mileage by the 'grey fleet' (staff own vehicles) and also provide a valuable service to Surrey residents who are able to join the scheme. Car Clubs are a very effective measure for reducing carbon emissions. Car rental for Council staff can be an economic option. The Council has also procured short-term hire cars through the supplier Automotive Leasing.

Question 3

The council has committed to targets to reduce our business travel costs through implementation of our Corporate Travel Plan. Measures are being implemented to:

- Reduce the need to travel on business – e.g. through improved Conference Call Facilities.
- Work smarter and more flexibly with the roll-out of IT facilities through the Making a Difference Programme (enabling greater working from home, or from local offices, and so reducing the distance travelled).
- Encourage car-sharing whenever possible for business trips (as well as the commute) through use of the journey matching facility surreycarshare.com. Staff are encouraged to car-share through a 5p per mile per passenger travel allowance
- Shift a proportion of car trips to public transport and enable more time spent travelling to be productive time.
- Increase the use of Car Club cars and / or hire cars where this is more economic than grey fleet. A detailed analysis of current business travel is being carried out and further recommendations will be made.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY

(11) MRS JAN MASON (EPSOM AND EWELL WEST) TO ASK:

Would the Cabinet Member please supply the following statistics relating to Epsom Fire Station.

As there are several categories of fires, please supply the statistics for each of the categories broken down to borough base and station ground.

Also, please confirm the area that this station provides cover for - i.e. Banstead Nork and Tattenham in Reigate & Banstead etc.

Reply:

Please find attached the data you requested. As discussed at the Select Committee on Thursday, emergency response within Surrey is (and has to be) managed on a countywide basis. This means that our fire engines are based at certain locations but they provide emergency response cover wherever it is needed and we move them around according to the circumstances prevailing at the time. This means that the fire engines based at Epsom Fire Station are part of the strategic emergency response cover for the county and will be used as such. It also means that the incidents that have occurred in the area won't necessarily have been attended by fire engines from Epsom; fire engines based elsewhere within the county as well as those from other fire and rescue authorities will have attended some of the incidents.

Even though the number of incidents attended in Epsom and Ewell or indeed in Epsom Fire Stations administrative area may seem to be relatively high when compared to other areas in Surrey, in reality the county is a safe place to be. Over the last 5 years the total number of incidents attended in the county has fallen from around 16000 per year to less than 11000 in 2010/11. Specific data for the number of incidents attended relating to Epsom for 2010/11 are shown below:

	Day 7am – 7pm	Night 7pm – 7am
Epsom and Ewell Borough	459	252
Epsom Fire Station administrative area	627	371

As you can see, this means that on average in 2010/11 there about one incident per night and less than two per day in the Epsom Fire Station administrative area.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT:

**(12) MR COLIN TAYLOR (EPSOM AND EWELL SOUTH WEST) TO ASK:
2nd question**

Once again residents in Epsom & Ewell have been surprised to find themselves issued with penalty charge notices (PCNs) for parking on a Bank Holiday assuming that the same rules apply as on Sundays.

According to the relevant signs the residents were mistaken and the PCNs are valid. However residents now fear being ticketed on Christmas Day unless it falls on a Sunday.

One solution might be to change all the signs and the related Traffic Regulation Orders. It would avoid confusion to do this for the whole of the county, not just in one borough.

Would the Cabinet Member agree with me that a better solution would be that boroughs and districts acting as agents for this council are instructed not to enforce weekday restrictions on bank holidays, as used to be general practice until recently?

Reply:

No I'm afraid I wouldn't agree with you.

Nationally, including Surrey, parking restrictions have never excluded Bank Holidays. The times and days of the week displayed on the traffic signs reflect what is in the Traffic Regulation Order and which are enforced. The highway code instructs drivers not to park on yellow lines during the times and on the days shown on the traffic signs.

CABINET MEMBERS FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE 2012 GAMES AND CHANGE & EFFICIENCY

**(13) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:
2ND question**

Moyallen, the owners of the Peacocks Shopping Centre in Woking and Woking Borough Council have previously approached Surrey County Council with an offer to refurbish Woking Library in exchange for building a restaurant in part of the library and moving the entrance from the Town Square onto Gloucester Walk.

Please could the Cabinet Member update the Council on the current plans for Woking Library?

Reply:

Moyallen have entered into dialogue with Surrey County Council about their proposals with Woking Borough Council to modernise the Town Square area of Woking. These proposals include the provision of a restaurant-type facility in the Town Square - facing rotunda area of what is currently the entrance area to Woking Library.

The Library Service has been absolutely firm in its meetings with Moyallen that any proposed changes to its current floorspace must not reduce its public lending area or compromise its ability to deliver a flagship library service in Woking. Additionally the Service has required that any agreement to building work should include a facelift to the library interior in tune with the overall enhancement of Woking Town Square. Funding has not been available within Surrey County Council to carry out a refurbishment to what is the County's

largest library so the opportunity under any development arrangements is an important factor of any agreement. A refurbishment is much needed and whilst there will be some disruption to the users, including periods of temporary closure, the Service will be working hard to minimise this through close working with Moyallen, Estates Planning and Management and Woking Borough Council. Alternative arrangements will be made for users during periods of disruption.

A series of meetings between the Library Service, Estates Planning and Management and their advisors, and the Moyallen representatives have very recently resulted in a draft proposal from Moyallen to the County Council, which Moyallen hopes will meet the requirements of the Library Service. The detail of the draft proposal is now under consideration by County colleagues from both the Library Service and the Estates Planning and Management Division. The proposal does offer an attractive and visible access into the library from Gloucester Walk, along with an improved glazed elevation, which they believe will showcase a new interior. The space allocations do not appear to reduce the lending areas and include for re-vitalisation of the library itself. The library remains integral to the Town Square environment and the provision of a bright, flexible and modern library interior will offer opportunities for not only increased use of the library generally but also improved community use through for example author events, exhibitions and out of hours meetings. The use of ground floor rotunda as a restaurant is considered to be a complimentary use with the adjacent library. The non public library areas are proposed as being located in space above the existing library.

However, the scrutiny of the proposal, both in financial, lease and service terms, is not yet complete and no final recommendations yet made. We will consult Woking Local Committee in the near future.

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHANGE & EFFICIENCY

(14) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK: (3rd question)

Woking Borough Council have previously approached Surrey County Council with a financial offer to build Woking Fire Station on a new site in exchange for the current one.

Please could the Cabinet Member update the Council on Surrey County Council's thoughts on and consideration of this offer.

Reply:

Officers from Estates, Planning and Management have had several meetings with Ray Morgan, Chief Executive at Woking Borough Council last year. Woking Borough Council were interested in the current site for development of their

town centre and the offer was to build a new station for Surrey County Council outside the town.

EPM officers were heavily involved with the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service to ensure that the proposed scheme would meet their operational requirements. Eventually, the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service were satisfied with a proposal, and it was left with Woking Borough Council to draft some Heads of Terms. These terms have not materialised, and I have been advised that there is no longer the urgency from Woking Borough Council to pursue this at this time. As far as the Fire Service are concerned, the current location of the station meets their operational requirements at present. If the proposal is raised again by Woking, we would be more than happy to look at them again.