

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**TUESDAY 11 OCTOBER 2011**

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

**CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN & LEARNING**

**(1) MR CHRIS TOWNSEND (ASHTREAD) TO ASK:**

Does the Cabinet Member for Children & Learning consider that the response he received from Michael Gove addresses all the points made in his letter to the Prime Minister and considering there was no apology given, does he feel that the criticisms made by the Prime Minister in his Norwich speech are in fact reinforced rather than refuted by Michael Gove's reply?

**Reply:**

The Secretary of State for Education combines the principles of acclamation, selectivity and brevity in his response on behalf of the Prime Minister. I am not sure how fruitful it might be for a fugacious Lead Member to speculate on shades of agreement. Agreement in error is perhaps worse than division for the sake of truth. Surrey's Schools are demonstrably successful and nearly all are improving. The OECD PISA (Programme for International Assessment) ratings for England would be lifted considerably if all of its schools performed as well as those of Surrey. It is not surprising therefore that so many of Surrey's Schools attract parents in ever greater numbers as places of excellence in which to educate their children. I am proud to have been so closely associated with them.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR CHANGE AND EFFICIENCY**

**(2) MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK:**

You are aware of the problems there have been with the former Pond Meadow School site in my Division. In view of the fact of the ongoing problem the site is causing to the community, please would you provide the following information:

- What arrangements are currently in force to prevent further recurrences of theft and vandalism on the site?
- What has been the cost of securing and guarding the site since the school moved onto its present position near Christ's College?
- When do you anticipate this Council will bring forward plans for the future of the site?

- Are there any legal considerations, such as restrictive covenants, which are delaying future plans? If so, would you please advise me of them outside of this meeting?
- In view of its location within Westborough, which is one of the priority places in Surrey and the government's localism agenda, will priority be given to using the site to advance the aims of improving the health and wellbeing within the community?

**Reply:**

Pond Meadow School is subject to regular inspection with daily visits by security contractors following the spate of incidents and thefts. The annual cost of these visits is £3,450. Since the property came into management in early 2009, other costs associated with securing the premises and further on site measures or to clean up after incidents or theft from the site and/or buildings have totalled £16,149.

Future plans for the site have still to be finalised. There is a viability study taking place building on the excellent education provided by Guildford Grove and Kings College. Also, as Mrs White is aware, there was a meeting yesterday which she and Cllr McShane attended on behalf of the Pond Meadow Community Group to discuss Surrey Community Asset Policy generally and specifically how it could apply to Pond Meadow. Whilst all options need to be kept open there is no reason why discussions with interested parties could not be progressed on a non exclusive basis.

The County Council's title to the property is subject to restrictive covenants but at this stage these are not delaying a decision on the future of the site and buildings.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE 2012 GAMES**

**(3) MR PETER LAMBELL (REIGATE CENTRAL) TO ASK:**

The Libraries Public Value Review (PVR) highlights how the Council is preparing for the unwelcome withdrawal of the Mobile Library Service on 30 September. The focus is on how existing users of the service will access books after that date.

However there is no mention of residents who would have used the mobile service in the future. Can the Cabinet Member reassure me that any arrangements that are put in place for existing users will be available to others in the future who become unable to access the core library network?

**Reply:**

In the run up to the closure of the Mobile Library Service on 30 September, the Library Service has been concentrating on contacting current users of the service, collating their choices of alternative services and setting up those

services which include housebound service volunteers, community transport and e-books.

The service is mindful of the need to make provision for Surrey residents who, for one reason or another, cannot access the static Library Service and need services in the future. The service has been working on this in two ways. Firstly, working with Adult Social Care, information on library services is now included when care assessments are being carried out. The next phase of work will be to set up and publicise "Library Direct" which will be the Library Service's umbrella name for all the services it will provide to enable people who cannot use static libraries to access the service, including those alternatives already mentioned, a wide range of virtual services and new services to be developed. This will be widely publicised on the Surrey County Council website, via the Contact Centre and Enquiries Direct, through relevant services and caring organisations, and in the media.

## **LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

### **(4) HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:**

Will the new Leader of the Council take account of the 26,300 Surrey residents who signed the petition opposing on-street parking charges and abandon the unpopular on-street parking charges policy?

#### **Reply:**

Yes.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND HEALTH**

### **(5) COLIN TAYLOR (EPSOM & EWELL SOUTH WEST) TO ASK:**

There have recently been unfortunate events in my Division and elsewhere affecting old people in care homes used by this Council. Such establishments are inspected by the Care Quality Commission and may also be spot checked by Local Involvement Networks.

What steps does this Council take to independently assure itself that the quality of care in these establishments is satisfactory and that the elderly and vulnerable people that we are responsible for will be kept safe and properly cared for?

**Reply:**

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Care Quality Commission**

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) is the independent regulator of health and social care in England. Its responsibility is to make sure that the care people receive meets essential standards of quality and safety. CQC's registration system is designed to make sure that people can expect services to meet essential standards of quality and safety that respect their dignity and promote their rights. It is focused on outcomes rather than systems and processes and places the views and experiences of people who use services at its centre. CQC continuously monitors compliance with essential standards. Its assessors and inspectors frequently review all available information and intelligence it holds about a provider. It seeks information from patients, people who use services and public representative groups. If CQC has concerns that a provider is not meeting essential standards of quality and safety, it works closely with commissioners and others, using its enforcement powers if necessary.

CQC's statutory powers are derived from the Health and Social Care Act 2008. The Act, the Regulations and CQC guidance are part of a wider regulatory framework that includes regulation of professionals such as nurses, doctors and social workers. The framework is designed to ensure that people who use services are protected and receive the care, treatment and support they need.

### **Surrey County Council**

Adult Social Care in Surrey County Council (SCC) is committed to providing excellent services which meets the needs of individuals and which conform to the standards laid by CQC – both for our in-house provision and for care commissioned from independent providers.

Our duty of care, as a Local Authority, as defined by the NHS and Community Care Act 1990, Section 47 (1), is to carry out an assessment of need for community care services where a person appears to be someone for whom community care services could be provided, AND a person's circumstances may need the provision of some community care services. Section 7 (1) of the Local Authority Social Services Act 1970 (updated by the 2010 Guidance 'Prioritising need in the context of *Putting People First: A Whole System Approach to Eligibility for Social Care*'), states that 'the frequency of reviews should be proportionate to the circumstances of the individual but there should be an initial review within three months of help first being provided or major changes made to current support plans. Thereafter, reviews should be scheduled at least annually or more often as is necessary. Councils should also consider conducting reviews when requested to do so by the service user, their carer or service provider'.

Commissioning of care services, whether by a Council or a Primary Care Trust is not a regulated activity.

There are a range of means by which Surrey seeks to assure itself of the quality of care of older people within care homes within Surrey including:

- Individual reviews undertaken by professional SCC practitioners on a regular basis, according to need
- Analysis of information and intelligence from a variety of sources, both internal and external, to inform quality
- The Quality Assurance team visit to homes and care agencies to oversee the care of people using services
- We work in partnership with CQC to ensure compliance with the standards
- The monitoring of contracts

### **INDIVIDUAL REVIEWS UNDERTAKEN BY SCC PRACTITIONERS**

Where Surrey County Council has commissioned a package of care from a provider (whether in-house or an independent sector provider), on behalf of an individual, then the practitioner reviews the care provided to that individual against an agreed care/support plan. This may be a review undertaken by the locality team within six weeks of provision (or earlier, for example, in the case of a transfer of an individual to a new service) or an annual review by the long-term team or In Touch team for more established packages of care. There is an allocated practitioner or team so that the person using the service or their family carer will know who is the appropriate point of contact should they wish to give feedback about the quality of service or highlight a change in the person's needs. Currently, people with Direct Payments are unable to purchase care home provision.

### **ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE FROM OTHER SOURCES**

There is a range of sources of intelligence that inform the monitoring of quality of care within care homes and other services within Surrey. This includes, for example, safeguarding alerts whereby we may receive a concern that suggests that somebody in receipt of community care services may be subject to abuse. Sources of referrals include social care staff (most common), health staff, family members, police, friends and neighbours. The concerns are risk assessed and appropriate interventions then follow in line with Surrey's multi-agency procedures.

Surrey receives information through its complaints and compliments procedures that may be relevant to the quality of care that people receive in either in-house or independent sector services within Surrey.

Care practitioners receive incident forms from care providers relating to individuals funded by Surrey. These are followed up where they give rise to concerns or queries about the handling of the particular incident or in relation to

whether the service continues to meet the person's needs. This may also give rise to a safeguarding referral.

There is work in progress to develop a comprehensive picture about Adult Social Care's 800+ providers. The aim is to ensure available data and intelligence about individual providers is pooled and made accessible to sourcing teams, social care practitioners, commissioning, quality assurance, procurement and finance.

Commissioners, team managers, quality assurance managers and others also participate in various local or Surrey wide forums which provide opportunities for feedback and sharing of information about quality of service from a variety of individuals or groups. Examples include our contacts with the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People, Surrey Action for Carers, our involvement with the Surrey Care Association and the provider network meetings they hold. Postal and sometimes telephone surveys inform quality monitoring.

Area Quality Assurance Focus meetings have been established in four geographical areas in Surrey. These draw together a wide variety of representatives both internal and external who can comment on the quality of services in that area – this includes for example user and carer representation, LINKs, PCT and local councils.

### **QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM ROLE IN MONITORING INDIVIDUAL SERVICES TO OVERSEE PROVISION OF CARE SERVICES**

The Quality Assurance Team within Adult Social Care has recently been established. It consists of a senior manager and four full time equivalent Area Quality Assurance posts. The team's role is to assess and evaluate the quality of adult social care services in Surrey, promoting good practice and high quality care within external service providers and Surrey's own internal practices.

The team has developed and is piloting a tool for monitoring the quality of care provided in care homes. The aim is to develop an outcome focused approach that:

- captures the quality of life issues that are important to people who use services
- is applicable across a range of service types and user groups
- acknowledges good practice
- is compatible with CQC standards

The outcome domains used are drawn from the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT). The ASCOT measure is designed to draw out information about an individual's quality of life from the perspective of their social needs. The aim is to ensure the measure is sensitive to outcomes of social care. The areas covered include:

- Accommodation cleanliness and comfort
- Control over daily life

- Health – treatment, support and equipment to maintain or promote good health
- Dignity
- Food and nutrition
- Occupation – including meaningful activities
- Social participation and involvement
- Safety including safeguarding from abuse
- Management and quality assurance systems

In undertaking a quality monitoring visit, we aim to gather information from as many sources as possible to give us an informed view of the experience of people using the service. This would typically include talking to people who use the services, any relatives present, manager and care staff, other professionals as appropriate and observing care practice. A number of actions may arise from a quality monitoring visit:

- Information about potential breaches of regulations and standards which may then be shared with CQC
- Good practice recommendations
- Acknowledgement of an area of good practice within the service
- Referral for more specialist advice e.g. pharmacist, fire officer, specialist tissue viability nurse
- Referral to SCC internal team e.g. in relation to a safeguarding issue

There may be a variety of triggers for quality monitoring visits including safeguarding concerns, national or media concerns relating to a provider – for example monitoring visits were triggered by the expose of the Winterbourne learning disability services and Southern Cross services to check whether the company's financial difficulties were impacting upon quality. The team's aim is that visits could also be triggered by lower level concerns that suggest potential dips in quality that could be addressed at an early stage.

## **WORKING IN PARTNERSHIP WITH CQC AND OTHER AGENCIES**

Partnership working with other agencies involved in monitoring quality of care is essential to ensure appropriate sharing of intelligence, avoiding duplication and making best use of the various levers available to improve services.

Partnership working with CQC is particularly important in relation to their role in ensuring that the services that they regulate operate in accordance with regulations and standards. A draft memorandum of understanding has been developed to ensure effective sharing of information and joint working within Surrey. Good relationships have been developed with individual inspectors.

The Directorate is externally monitored through the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework, which monitors our statutory reports, which are reported to the Department of Health. These are held by the National Health Service Information Centre, which provides annual benchmarking for comparisons.

There are also more localised initiatives which we have been able to take advantage of to promote improvements in quality of care – an example is the relationship between QA managers in the East of the County and the Community Matrons there who have a particular focus on healthcare in care homes.

## **CONTRACT MANAGEMENT**

All Surrey County Council's providers, whether they are Residential or Independent Living, are subject to detailed due diligence checks. There are routine review meetings with our block contract suppliers of residential care, including on-site visits, so that service quality aspects are assessed as well as commercial elements.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND HEALTH**

### **(6) MR IAN BEARDSMORE (SUNBURY COMMON AND ASHFORD COMMON) TO ASK:**

This Council is currently drawing up the tender for the new homecare contract. You will be aware that, in response to issues raised by the Surrey Coalition for Disabled People and others, the Adult Social Care Select Committee have expressed their concern that in the past, care assistants have not always spent the contracted amount of time in the client's house and that people do not always get the care which is paid for, either by the clients if they are self-funders or by this Council if the visits are part of a care package. Will you confirm that there will be a clause in the new contract requiring the providers to use an electronic monitoring system to ensure that the client and this Council can verify when a care assistant arrives and when they leave? This will help to ensure that people who rely on that care at least get the time that is paid for.

### **Reply:**

The Council is developing plans to introduce technology to reduce administrative overheads related to invoicing and rostering for both the Council and providers as well as to offer a monitoring mechanism to ensure quality control. The business case is still in development, we plan to introduce "in house" electronic monitoring for the Surrey County Council reablement homecare services in 2012. There will be learning from that early adoption of technology that will inform how wider application of the technology needs to roll out.

The business case developed to date demonstrates that developing a countywide system, that delivers an interface with the Surrey County Council IT infrastructure, will have significant cost implications for both the council and providers. Initial indications are cost implications will not be offset by any efficiency gains. That said, the technology continues to develop at pace, and there continues to be the potential to find more cost effective solutions. The reality and practicalities of this, and the agreement to introduce this technology,

and the prioritisation within the Council's IMT strategy, will go through the Council democratic process for approval.

There is a risk within the home based care tender to prescribing or recommending a particular system, only to then find more efficient and effective solutions through the "in house" pilot phase. The risk is that providers, having made significant investment, would not have system compatibility with the Surrey IT infrastructure. This would require the provider to reinvest in systems with the price being reflected within increased cost to the Council for the service.

Through consultation with people who use our services and their carers, there is a growing expectation that quality control mechanisms will manage risks associated with missed or late visits. The wider application of this technology will require us to consult on detailed costed options, to allow us to have informed discussions with people who use the services. We cannot assume at this stage that people will be willing to either absorb cost or adopt this technology in their homes. In the meantime, we will continue to work with providers to jointly learn from pilots and systems in other areas.

Electronic monitoring will be one method that providers may use to demonstrate and deliver quality control, however this will only be effective if the protocols for response are reliable. The most significant improvement required through this tender (a contract period of 2 plus 2 years) will be quality control. Written into the tender will be requirement for providers to demonstrate fail safe, quality control measures, with clear protocols and mechanism for addressing punctuality, reliability, and safety issues when a visit has not taken place. In conjunction with user and carer representation, we will evaluate all forms of monitoring against criteria of:

- Reliability of system
- Protocols for response

Adult Social Care continues to be fully committed to delivering transformation of home based care service to deliver improved quality and cost effectiveness.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT**

### **(7) MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK: (2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

Recently a parking scheme was agreed in my Division and a lot of yellow lines have been painted on the roads. While the scheme was being devised, I raised the issue of marking bus cages on the roads at the request of the local police and community safety wardens because of the difficulty buses were having in pulling into the kerb to allow passengers to alight. Often people were let off the bus in the roadway. As yet, no bus cages have been marked on the road and the difficulties of cars parking at bus stops is still going on. Will the Cabinet Member agree with me that it would have been sensible and more cost effective

for the county and district councils to work together and for all the road markings to have been laid down at the same time? Further, will he say what he will do to rectify the situation and improve safety for bus passengers?

**Reply:**

The intention was for the remarking of the bus stop cages to be carried out at the same time as the implementation of the new parking restrictions in Southway, Guildford. Unfortunately, due to an administrative error this did not happen on this occasion.

Officer relationships between the County Council and Guildford Borough Council are excellent and both authorities work closely together to manage the maintenance and installation of parking restrictions. The bus cages will be refreshed by our contractor at the earliest opportunity.

**LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**(8) HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

Will the new Leader of the Council reverse the unpopular decisions to end the Mobile Library Service and threaten smaller libraries with closure if they are not run by volunteers instead of professional librarians?

**Reply:**

Regarding the mobile library service, in a county with a population of 1.1 million people, and with over 400,000 members of the library service, there are only 3,900 registered users of the mobile service - and active membership of the service is around 2,500 people. The average net cost per issue is £2.13 for the mobile libraries compared with £0.98 at a branch library. This year the service cost well over £400,000 but each year fewer people were using the mobile library service and the cost of providing it increased. In light of this, based on value for money, the Council had to end this service on 30 September. However, the County Council is aware that this is a service that is valued by many people and after a comprehensive questionnaire survey to all users the Library Service is now implementing arrangements to offer users of the service different ways to access the library.

The intention of the County Council is to keep all our library network open because it recognises the importance of libraries within the community. To do this the Public Value Review of Libraries proposed that a number of libraries should move to community partnership. To achieve this the PVR identified libraries based on cost effectiveness - these libraries represent 25% of the branch network but generated just under 8% of all issues, and just over 7% of all visits in 2009/10. The current Public Value Review, using 12 criteria, has independently reached a broadly similar list to previous exercises that have sought to review the library network. This reinforces the view that, without a change of strategic approach to how we deliver these libraries in these

communities, these libraries will consistently find their cost-effectiveness under scrutiny and be at risk of withdrawal.

Given the scale of budget reductions will affect how we deliver services offered to our residents in the future, there was a Cabinet determination that all services should bear their part. The community partnership model, as an alternative to closure of libraries that were identified as not representing the best use of resources for the council, not only achieves budget reductions, but also offers to communities the potential for empowerment and freedom to design a service that is a closer fit to the needs and ideas of the community.

The recommendations of the Library PVR were considered and accepted by Cabinet earlier in the year. In the context of our current budget pressures and having to save £207m from our annual budget we have no alternative but to make difficult decisions about reductions in levels of service and / or the redesign of delivery arrangements for a range of services, including libraries. As a Cabinet we are all very aware of the depth of feeling these difficult decisions evoke.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT**

### **(9) COLIN TAYLOR (EPSOM & EWELL SOUTH WEST) TO ASK: (2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

Recently some of the roads in my Division were resurfaced. This naturally obliterated the white lines, yellow lines, pedestrian crossing markings etc. More than 5 weeks then elapsed before any of these markings were repainted. Six weeks later they are not complete. In addition, conservation area yellow lines have again been painted the wrong colour.

What steps are being taken to improve coordination?

### **Reply:**

Under the new contract, road marking and studs must be replaced within 3 weeks of completing the road resurfacing scheme. However, in early August it was identified that due to the significant size of the 2011/12 works programme there was a resource issue in replacing road markings within the contract timescale. Steps were therefore taken by the highways sub-contractor to double the number of road marking crews and employ an additional five gangs. Subject to funding, the additional gangs will be retained in future years to ensure the issue is not repeated. Upon completion, all schemes are quality assured by a highways engineer prior to payment and any remedial work replaced at contractor's cost. Surrey Highways apologise for any inconvenience the delay in replacing road markings have caused and Mr Taylor can be assured that all efforts are made to ensure all works are coordinated and resourced to the appropriate level.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT**

### **(10) MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK: (3<sup>rd</sup> question)**

Rydes Hill Road in my Division has appeared on the list of major maintenance works last year and this year. Last year the work was not done and the road is still in a terrible condition. The main reason for the poor condition of the road is that previous work was carried out under the wrong weather conditions and the new surface did not adhere properly. I was told that the repairs would be carried out this summer and both I and residents were given a start date of 1 September by Highways Officers. 1 September came and went and, despite the road closure having been advertised in the local press, the work did not start. When I contacted officers for an explanation, I was told it is now programmed for December of this year. I would remind the Cabinet Member that we had a lot of snow in December 2010. Can you assure me that (a) the work will be carried out in December 2011 to a proper standard; (b) that we will not have a snow event in Autumn or early Winter 2011 which will prevent the work being done in December and (c) that the work will still be done in the current financial year if we have bad weather and it cannot be done in December as planned? Will he also apologise to my residents for the fact that their hopes have been raised and then dashed on more than one occasion?

### **Reply:**

This year the County Council has invested significant sums in improving the highway network. The programme includes approximately 450 preventative carriageway treatments and 40 full reconstruction works. Programming this volume of work is logistically challenging. To ensure minimum disruption to highway users, avoid conflict with utility works or special events, programmes of this scale are subject to review and change.

I can confirm that the works will be to a good standard and are planned for completion in December 2011. If it snows, there is the risk they will need to be reprogrammed for later this financial year.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT**

### **(11) HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (3<sup>rd</sup> question)**

Will the Cabinet Member for Transport guarantee that all Priority 1 gritting routes will be adequately gritted this winter to keep Surrey's roads open?

#### **Reply:**

Due to the hard work of the Select Committee, the Highways Team and of May Gurney this year's county-wide winter maintenance programme can be delivered for £700,000 less than last year, with no degradation to levels of service. The Cabinet has reinvested this £700,000 providing opportunity to enhance the services we can deliver to our residents this winter.

The P1 network has been extended by 172km, helping to reach some of our more isolated communities. All Members have been provided electronic copies of their gritting routes, and hard copy packs will be distributed this week. Our website will be continually updated throughout the season so residents have access to the latest information.

I would like to reassure Mrs Watson that the service is fully prepared for winter and is committed to delivering the very best possible levels of service to our residents and highway users.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT**

### **(12) COLIN TAYLOR (EPSOM & EWELL SOUTH WEST) TO ASK: (3<sup>rd</sup> question)**

Members have frequently been assured that in future when a pothole is approved as bad enough to be fixed and another has already started forming next to it, this will also be fixed at the same time without waiting for it to grow big enough to qualify.

During the summer more than a dozen potholes developed close together in my road. Most of these have now been fixed, but generally just one or two at a time, on numerous visits spread over several weeks, leaving the two smallest to grow bigger this winter.

One of my colleagues recently spoke with workers repairing potholes in another road, who complained that they were only allowed to fix potholes that had a white paint mark around them, when they could easily do the others at the same time.

What steps are being taken to overcome the contractual problem about payment for potholes that have not been marked.

**Reply:**

The new highways maintenance contract has significantly improved the way potholes are repaired. The repair response time has been increased for many safety defects and far more potholes are now repaired within 24 hours. The quality of repair has also improved with a permanent patch repair being carried out on the first visit wherever possible.

The new contract has been set-up to achieve an efficient approach to pothole repairs and is paid via a lump sum mechanism. Within the lump sum, the contractor is responsible for fixing all defects that meet the safety intervention criteria of the Highway Safety Inspection matrix. Any other repairs are progressed as minor or major schemes, depending on the nature of the defects. The lump sum arrangement does include the ability to fix new potholes within the vicinity of an 'approved' pothole. However, to qualify for repair the new potholes must meet the requirements of the Highway Safety Inspection matrix and be considered a safety risk. We are working hard to improve the condition of the roads, particularly with the large amount of maintenance work being carried out this year, however, there is a backlog of work to do and any available funding has to be targeted carefully. This is particularly true for pothole repairs whereby those potholes with a safety risk must be prioritised over others.

In addition, the contractual requirement to carry out a patch repair for potholes enables a greater area of repair on the ground and does inevitably lead to multiple defects being repaired together to ensure the repair will last.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT****(13) COLIN TAYLOR (EPSOM & EWELL SOUTH WEST) TO ASK:  
(4th question)**

Some time ago, Members were asked to list the 3 worst roads in their Divisions, for consideration in next season's reconstruction and resurfacing programme. When will the agreed programme of road reconstruction and resurfacing be published?

**Reply:**

The programme for 2012/13 will be published in March 2012.