

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 15 OCTOBER 2013

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

DEPUTY LEADER

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

On 24 July 2012 in a response to the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the subject of Superfast Broadband you stated:

- Surrey County Council and its supplier will work closely together over the forthcoming months to finalise the deployment schedule. Detailed information on what to expect when and where will be available in the Autumn.
- It is anticipated that the implementation of this project will be complete by the end of 2014.

Is the detailed information referred to in your answer now available? If yes, is it available in any other format than the postcode search facility on <http://www.superfastsurrey.org.uk> ?

Is the project on target to deliver within the timescale above and to all of the premises originally outlined when the proposal was agreed by Cabinet?

Reply:

I am very pleased to confirm that our supplier is on track to deliver access to superfast fibre broadband services to 84,000 premises in the Surrey intervention area by the end of 2014. The Surrey superfast broadband team recently announced the successful delivery of the first phase of the roll-out programme ending on 30 September 2013. As a result some 15,000 homes and businesses in 19 Surrey towns and villages are now able to place an order for high-speed fibre broadband - something that would not have been possible without Surrey's initiative. This information was contained in a Press Release copied to all Members on 8 October.

In the next two months residents and businesses in the intervention area will receive a letter from the team giving them information about the roll out and details of how and when they will gain access to superfast broadband. Postcards will also be sent to them when they are able to place an order. Alongside this the Superfast Surrey website (www.superfastsurrey.org.uk) has been updated and includes a new postcode checker, an events page and detailed FAQs.

The deployment plan information is contained in the postcode checker on the

superfast surrey website. The team do not anticipate publishing any further plan as it can be subject to change due to surveying and engineering difficulties. Any changes that are made to the deployment plan will be automatically updated in the postcode checker. Should Members wish to discuss the roll out plan in any further detail they should make contact with the Superfast Broadband Programme Director, Lucie Glenday who is located in County Hall.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

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

The Adult Social Care Service has indicated that it intends to achieve £15million in savings this financial year 2013/14 owing to the greater use of 'social capital.'

Social capital is communities playing a greater role in preventing social care needs and/or helping to meet them. Schemes such as time banks, befriending and community navigators are examples of social capital, but it can also be as simple as neighbours helping neighbours.

Does the Cabinet Member consider that the £15m of planned savings is a realistic target given the high level of risks involved?

Reply:

1 2013/14 Budget Background:

- a) It is acknowledged that this budget does carry risks.
- b) Social Capital is now referred to as '*Family, Friends and Community Support*', with a target of £15m included in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) for the current financial year.

2 Current Status:

- a) Social Capital is the main item at risk in the 2013/14 budget. It must be emphasised that this objective represents a radical change in the way that the service has approached assessment. It was anticipated that the savings would flow through in the latter part of the financial year, due, in part, to the phasing of process reviews, the need to generate understanding and change practitioner approaches, and to develop the support available in the community in order to implement the approach in full. Early indications from the September monitoring cycle are that our strategy is beginning to reduce social care costs.
- b) Based on the current run rate, social capital savings were not achieved in the first half of the year because of the need to introduce productivity measures and therefore will be covered by one-off measures. Despite the indications of progress in September, it remains possible that there will be further slippage which would leave a shortfall which adult social care will be expected to cover.

- c) Following the three Rapid Improvement Events currently being implemented, it is expected that the current changes to Adult Social Care's internal process and the roll out of the model office way of working across the County, will free up time for staff to spend with the people who use our services, and be able to more readily identify the use of family, friends and community support.
- d) A report on the progress of the Family, Friends and Community Support Project will be submitted to Adult Social Care Select Committee for their meeting on 24 October.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

(3) MR STEPHEN COOKSEY (DORKING SOUTH AND THE HOLMWOODS) TO ASK:

Please could the Cabinet Member update Members on the current state of Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) signs throughout the county, how many are in use, how many are out of action due to failure, how many are irreparable.

What budgets are available throughout the county for the replacement and repair of VAS signs?

Will the Cabinet Member look at the possibility of standardising the manufacturer in the future to facilitate easier and cheaper repair of VAS signs, much as his predecessor planned standardised parking meters as part of the administration's failed on street parking programme?

Reply:

I would like to thank Mr Cooksey for raising this matter.

Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) are one tool in our speed management tool box. For VAS to be effective in helping motorist recognise their own speed and stick to speed limits, VAS need to be located in the right place and as Mr Cooksey alludes too, properly maintained. The Road Safety Public Value Review in 2011 highlighted the need for a VAS maintenance budget and that responsibility for this should be allocated to a specific team.

Currently an annual budget of £10,000 is allocated to the council's Road Safety Engineering Team for VAS maintenance. This sum is occasionally supplemented by other funds, for example, from money obtained from insurance companies where a VAS has been damaged by a vehicle, or from capital budgets when VAS changes are needed as part of a wider highway improvement scheme.

In Surrey we have 551 VAS. Of these:

479	are working correctly
29	scheduled for repair by the supplier
21	to be re-erected / rectified as part of the street light replacement programme
4	programmed to be wholly replaced
18	are being assessed to determine replacement, repair, removal or repositioning
551	Total

We now have significant experience of VAS reliability, available products and supplier service. New VAS are being purchased from one company – Westcotec - as they have proven to be the most reliable, offer good service maintenance and 6 year warranty.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

(4) MR GRAHAM ELLWOOD (GUILDFORD EAST) TO ASK:

An application to Guildford Borough Council (GBC) for planning permission to extend the opening and closing hours for a new tenant at the Merrow Highways Depot is pending. As a member of Guildford Borough Council's Planning Committee, I must not adopt a pre-determined position but having taken legal advice, I am advised that I may be pre disposed in my views and I am very concerned at the potential for continued adverse environmental damage to my residents' quality of life.

My residents have suffered appalling noise pollution in recent years and any extension to the current working hours will exacerbate these problems.

Given the concerns raised by environmental health, and objections received to this application, I seek the Cabinet Member's firm assurance that no further applications to extend any working hours at the Merrow Depot (especially given emergency permission for Highways exists) will be made in the future.

Reply:

As the main response unit for road emergencies and winter service, Surrey Highways operate a 24 hour/ 7 day a week service from Merrow Depot, this allows Surrey County Council to deliver its statutory duty of ensuring the network is free at all times from obstruction and snow/ice as determined by Surrey County Council's winter management policy.

However, we fully recognise our duty of care to residents and to act as good

neighbours, to that end in the past 24 months we have instigated the following voluntary measures:

1. No noisy activity outside core hours of 0700-1900 (Monday - Friday) and 0700-1300 (Saturday) - unless by pre-agreed exception where night/weekend only working is required.
2. Attached noise restraints to all large vehicles (e.g. to inhibit reverse parking sensors).
3. Imposed 20mph speed limit within depot limits.
4. Undertake resident meetings as required to review any further improvements or concerns.
5. Closed on-site recycling facility.

Surrey Highways has no plans to amend the voluntary code above and will continue to work with local residents to identify any further opportunities to improve local environment. Surrey Highways can also confirm that the licence request from the private company detailed above is not in any way associated with Surrey Highways, and should therefore be treated according to Guildford Borough Council's due planning process and procedure.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(5) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:

The 'mission statement' of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service is 'Making Surrey Safer'. Will the Cabinet Member explain how she feels the proposal to reduce the number of fire engines (e.g. by 50% in Spelthorne) is compatible with this statement?

Reply:

Firstly I would wish to reiterate my commitment to the safety of all Surrey residents and to my role of ensuring that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) is an efficient, effective and high performing Fire and Rescue Service.

The challenge of the fire authority is to provide the best possible service with the resources available. The Chief Fire Officer and his team have developed a long term vision for the Service and identified areas where changes can be made without compromising the safety of the public. These are set out in our Public Safety Plan. The proposals for Spelthorne are part of a package of reform that will enable SFRS to continue to deliver a high quality emergency response within the budget available.

The mission of SFRS, since 2012, is –

“To provide a professional and well supported Fire and Rescue Service which reduces community risk in order to save lives, relieve suffering, protect property and the environment.”

We aim to deliver our mission through four key values. One of which is -
“Managing our resources based on risk analysis, matching resources to demand and providing a balanced level of emergency response across Surrey.

It is essential to understand that the emergency response cover provided by SFRS is not based on borough or county boundaries. This means that whilst the proposal is for one fire engine to be based in Spelthorne, the cover for the area will continue to be provided from wherever is most appropriate. SFRS has invested heavily in people and equipment to ensure that it is able to deal with incidents quickly and to the highest professional standards. We have had the foresight to invest in the latest communications equipment which means we can send the nearest and quickest fire appliance to incidents, on arrival they will be equipped with the latest fire engine technology and carry equipment such as the new, market leading, road traffic collision extrication tools. This means that fire engines will continue to respond to incidents in the borough and the predicted response times for Spelthorne remain well within the Surrey Response Standard of one fire engine arriving within ten minutes and the second arriving within fifteen minutes for incidents where life or property is at risk. Our proposal actually sees an improvement in the occasions we will meet our response standard across Surrey.

SFRS will continue to deliver its comprehensive prevention activity in Spelthorne and across Surrey, helping to further reduce emergency calls county-wide. For example, SFRS educate our communities in fire safety and fit free smoke detection where necessary. We continue to work effectively with partners to improve safety for our most vulnerable residents whilst further driving more efficient ways of working. Other initiatives such as our award-winning Safe Drive Stay Alive, which is now in its 10th year, form part of our prevention programme for road traffic collisions.

SFRS will continue to strive for improvements and efficiencies and may look differently in years to come, but at its heart and embedded into its mission is the safety of Surrey and its residents.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(6) MR BILL BARKER (HORSLEYS) TO ASK:

The Surrey London cycle race on Sunday 4 August has been heralded as a great success. What practical measures did the Cabinet Member for Community Services take to ensure residents had access to emergency services at all times that day while the race went through their village?

Reply:

Based on our learning from the Olympic events, County Council officers and the event organisers worked closely with representatives from Surrey Fire and Rescue, Surrey Police and South East Coast Ambulance Service in preparing for the Prudential London-Surrey 100 and Classic events. All the emergency services were involved in the event arrangements to ensure the continuity of their services. Emergency vehicles were placed in the most appropriate locations across Surrey to allow incidents to be dealt with quickly and safely. As is normal with large events, each emergency service was represented in the event control room to ensure that access to communities along the route was maintained alongside the delivery of the event and that any issues on the day could be addressed in a timely manner.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

Surrey County Council has referred to an annual Prudential RideLondon Surrey Classic event taking place for 5 years starting in 2013 and has also referred to the economic benefit to Surrey of these events. In view of this:

- (i) On which date and who at Surrey County Council made the decision that the Prudential RideLondon Surrey classic event would take place in Surrey for 5 years starting in 2013?
and,
- (ii) What is the estimated economic benefit to Surrey per annum for holding the event and how is the figure calculated?

Reply:

Cabinet took the decision to support the Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic events. In coming to their decision, they balanced the economic, community and health benefits to the whole county against the disruption that road closures regrettably cause.

Experience from world class annual sporting events such as the London Marathon has shown that they bring maximum benefit if run over a number of years. The benefits increase year on year in terms of increased business and economic benefit, more money being raised for charity, greater community involvement, a stronger elite field and more spectators and broadcast interest leading to increased economic benefits to the county.

In its inaugural year, the Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 has helped charities raise an extra £3.5 million and raised the profile of the county as hundreds of thousands of people around the world watched live coverage of Surrey.

Specific evaluation is being carried out by the event organisers and this will give us a clearer picture across Surrey. However, the benefits to Surrey of national and international profile will bring increased business and economic benefits not just on the specific days of events but also on a continued basis as tourism increases.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

In a written response to a question from me at the last meeting of Council you stated:

Our imperative has always been to keep the full network of 52 branch libraries open...

However, throughout 2011 your predecessor frequently referred to Community Partnered Libraries (CPLs) as the alternative to closure and those “on the limits of sustainability” would close if a successful CPL structure was not put in place. Which is correct?

Your response at the last meeting of Council goes on to say:

...and by engaging the energy and commitment of the local community for ten community partnered libraries we have been able to achieve this and Surrey continues to have a modern and sustainable library service.

However, the “Community Partnered Libraries Progress Report” to the Communities Select Committee in September states:

- 1. Since the Cabinet decision on 24 July 2012, the Library Service has successfully established Community Partnered Libraries at 6 of the 10 nominated libraries: Stoneleigh, Byfleet, New Haw, Tattenhams, Virginia Water and Warlingham.*
- 2. Discussions with the remaining four libraries are at varying stages of negotiation and implementation.*

There is a clear contradiction between your response which stated that ten libraries are being run by local communities and the report to the select committee which states that four community partnered libraries have not been established. Which is correct?

Given the statements by your predecessor that these four libraries would close, and that the detailed reports suggest that some of them are a long way from becoming Community Partnered Libraries, what guarantees can you give for the continued operation of Bagshot, Bramley, Ewell Court and Lingfield libraries?

Reply:

There is no contradiction in statements made concerning the ten community partnered libraries. Transfer of the first six has been successfully achieved and the four others are at various stages of progress towards transfer. The completion of the final four will ensure that Surrey County Council keeps the full network of 52 branch libraries open.

Earlier Cabinet reports on CPLs stated that a decision on closure would be considered only if no suitable partner was found, and the SCC position has always been that we would persevere with repeated endeavour to find community groups to take over. As we have community interest for all the remaining four CPLs, these libraries (Bagshot, Bramley, Ewell Court and Lingfield) will remain open - as CPLs - as part of the Surrey network.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

(9) MR ERNEST MALLET (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK:

It is clear from the Serious Case Review that both Surrey County Council and the London Borough of Sutton carried out an extensive investigation of the clients of First Care 24 before the raid that closed First Care 24 down. Both authorities identified both the funded and self-funded clients they were responsible for. Surrey made provision for seven of its eight self-funded clients but did not include provision for number eight which was effectively Mrs Foster.

Surrey had a full database on its clients so the level of capability of each client was known.

The care worker assigned to check on Mrs Foster did not get a reply to her phone call but assumed that Mrs Foster had made her own arrangements for care.

Questions are therefore:

- 1) Why was the known self-funder, Mrs Foster, not made provision for prior to the raid when the other seven similar Surrey related residents were provided for?
- 2) Since the Surrey data base showed Mrs Foster was subject to power-attorney by others and was in difficulty to make decisions for herself due to a long list of illnesses, why did the care worker assume she could make decisions for herself?
- 3) There were a total of 49 clients and 48 were accounted for. Why was there not a senior officer made responsible for checking that all 49 clients had been provided for?

Reply:

- 1) The independent report commissioned by the Surrey Safeguarding Board has been published in full and is available on the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board webpages. The circumstances relating to the contact made with Mrs Foster are clearly stated in that report. Mrs Foster was not one of the Surrey residents identified on the original list as is made clear in the report.
- 2) The report sets out clearly the circumstances surrounding the failure to contact Mrs Foster and the reasons for the assumptions made by the worker involved are now subject to disciplinary proceedings.
- 3) The report makes it clear that the senior manager involved was told that all the Surrey residents involved had been contacted and their alternative care arranged.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(10) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK:

The Prudential Ride London-Surrey race is supposed to be good for businesses in Surrey yet after this year's event many businesses on the route reported substantial losses for the day as they were unable to trade due to the extensive road closures.

What measures are being taken, including plans to improve this year's apparent poor consultation with both Surrey's businesses and residents, to ensure they are not adversely affected by this event in 2014 and beyond?

Reply:

We recognise that the Prudential Ride London-Surrey 100 and Classic will only be sustainable in the long-term, if the event organiser can demonstrate that there is a economic benefit to the county, and residents and business are able to feel that the event has been of benefit to them.

As with the London Marathon, the aim is to ensure that the Prudential Ride London-Surrey 100 and Classic provides businesses with the opportunity to benefit from the spectators that the event will bring. I am confident that the route for 2014 will encourage spectators and residents to enjoy the event and experience Surrey's villages and towns in the same way as Walton and Pyrford did this year, so allowing businesses to gain the maximum benefit.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(11) MRS HELENA WINDSOR (GODSTONE) TO ASK:

Can the Leader confirm the payments being paid to Cabinet Associates and from when they started? Also where does the approval for these payments occur in the Budget approved by Council?

Reply:

Cabinet Associates have not received an allowance to date for carrying out this role. The Members' Allowances Scheme is a Council function and therefore any decision regarding Special Responsibility Allowances is a matter for the County Council to consider. Under the regulations, before the Council can amend the Members' Allowances Scheme, it must have regard to the recommendations made in relation to it by an independent remuneration panel (IRP). Given this new role, the IRP has submitted an interim report on Cabinet Associates for the Council to consider at this meeting.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

(12) MR STEPHEN COOKSEY (DORKING SOUTH AND THE HOLMWOODS) TO ASK: (2nd question)

When recently searching the Surrey County Council website for information on wetspots, I found information about Council decisions made in 2007/8 and working group 2008/9.

In January 2013 I was informed that as Surrey County Council has a greatly increased GIS resource, a major overhaul of the Wetspots database was taking place and was expected to be published in early February.

When might the website be updated?

Reply:

The Wetspots webpage has been updated to reference the "major overhaul" to the database in light of the council's new responsibilities as Lead Local Flood Authority for Surrey.

This "major overhaul" has been much more labour intensive than the standard annual update and has resulted in a delay in updating the published list of wetspots on the SCC public website. However, this has resulted in a database that better reflects all types of flooding in Surrey, rather than being focused on highway related flooding.

Whilst this is a live database with multiple updates being applied throughout the year, the wetspot list available from the public website will be updated in early

November to ensure that it is consistent with the wetspots data being used to generate the 5-year capital drainage programme.

The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 received royal assent in April 2010, at which time Surrey CC became the Lead Local Flood Authority for Surrey. However, most of the powers and duties related to this role were not enacted until April 2012.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(13) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (2nd question)

Given the clear failings of the Adult Social Care Service of the County Council highlighted in the Safeguarding Report into the death of Gloria Foster, will the Leader of the Council be holding the Cabinet Member for the service at the time, to account for the failings in policy and process to prevent this from happening again?

Reply:

The independent report commissioned by the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board sets out clear recommendations for Surrey County Council which we will ensure are implemented in full. I am disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition seeks to make political capital out of this tragic case.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

(14) MR JOHN ORRICK (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK: (2nd question)

Could the Cabinet Member advise whether alternative pothole repair systems, as used by neighbouring authorities, have been investigated and evaluated and whether there are any plans to use these effective systems in Surrey?

Reply:

Innovations in highway materials and processes are seen as vital to driving continuous improvement and development in Surrey Highways. To that end we have created a dedicated Innovations Group to pilot and exploit new highway opportunities. In 2013 the Innovations Group have reviewed alternative solutions for both reactive and planned repair, including:

Rhiopatch - a solution to improve speed of pothole repair

Retread - a solution that negates the need to remove waste material from site

Stabilised Pavement - a solution that offers opportunity to remedy concrete roads

Not all pilots will be adopted as part of the standard repair cycle, as all pilots generally require a minimum of 18 months testing to demonstrate they meet our high quality standards and provide a commercial return.

Surrey Highways is also an active member of the Highway Maintenance Efficiency Programme (HMEP), a national body created by Department of Transport to exploit market innovations, while we also lead on many initiatives on behalf of ADEPT, the national planning and transport body created to represent local highway authorities.

In 2014, Surrey Highways are focussing on innovations in repairing concrete roads, and thus in early 2014, SCC will be holding its first Innovation Day for concrete roads, this event will invite all the leading national and international concrete specialists to present their latest innovations and opportunities to Surrey Highways and the wider SE7 network. Following the Innovations Day a select number of solutions will be taken forward as pilots.

The pilots and joint activities with national bodies therefore ensure that Surrey Highways remain at the forefront of market opportunities and innovations.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(15) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK: (2nd question)

The current consultation on the proposed reorganisation of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service would see Spelthorne borough's service reduced from two fire stations and two fire engine appliances to one station and fire engine appliance; with an inevitable negative impact on the residents of Spelthorne and their safety.

As this is a cost-cutting exercise to an essential life-saving service designed to save the council £1.2 million, to the detriment of residents in Spelthorne, can the council specifically identify the cost of each fire death to Surrey County Council and its residents in terms of the investigations, legal and other processes that the council incurs in such tragic circumstances, considering the increased likelihood of this occurrence should the proposals be implemented?

Reply:

1. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service works very hard to ensure that the communities we serve are safe by providing a high performing service which adds value to those communities. Part of this requires the Service to exercise due diligence with regard to budgets now and in the future. We are acutely aware of the pressures across local government and fully understand that we have a part to play in delivering a balanced budget

which will require resources to be rebalanced. This often involves having to make difficult decisions.

2. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has been very proactive in articulating how it would wish to see the provision of fire cover develop over a 10 year period via its 2020 vision and Public Safety Plan. In order to be fully transparent we consulted widely with stakeholders back in 2010-11 in order to ensure that people understood why we needed to transform the fire service in Surrey.
3. With regard to the question that you raise, the Fire Service in Surrey has a legal obligation under the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 to investigate fires to determine their cause. We may be required to attend Crown Court as well as the Coroner's Court to present evidence or be called as expert witnesses. We work closely with the Police and Crown Prosecution Service to meet the very high standards of proof that are required in the Courts today.
4. As part of our annual reporting into Government we do provide returns on fire fatalities and injuries, as well as other performance measures. This does not include what the cost of fire fatalities are in Surrey. However, the Government does periodically commission reports to update the cost to the UK economy in terms of fire deaths and injuries. Within the returns to the Department for Communities and Local Government there are two main components, fatalities and injuries.
5. The returns with regard to fire fatalities include any fatal casualty which is the direct or indirect result of injuries caused by a fire incident. Even if the fatal casualty dies subsequently, any fatality whose cause is attributed to a fire is included.
6. Since the introduction of the Incident Recording System, non-fatal casualties are recorded as being in one of the following four classes of severity:
 - i. Victim went to hospital, injuries appear to be serious
 - ii. Victim went to hospital, injuries appear to be slight
 - iii. First aid given at scene
 - iv. Precautionary check recommended – this is when an individual, having no obvious injury or distress, is advised to attend hospital or to see a doctor as a precaution.
7. The most recent publication reflecting the economic cost of fire in 2008 was published by the Department for Local Communities and Local Government in 2011 as part of its fire research programme. The total cost of fires in England for 2008 was £8.3bn.
8. The costs of fire are broken down into three separate categories:

- a. Costs in anticipation. The costs of measures designed to either prevent fires or protective measures to mitigate the damage caused by fires. Key variables that were monetised as part of the costs in anticipation included: total costs of active (e.g. sprinklers) and passive (e.g. fire walls) fire protection in buildings, resource and capital costs of training and fire safety, non-pay related costs, total insurance administration, and
 - b. Costs as a consequence. The costs as a result of fires, including damage to properties, loss of business, and the costs of human injury and death. Key variables that were monetised as part of the costs as a consequence included:
 - i. total cost of fatal and non-fatal casualties
 - ii. total cost of lost business
 - iii. costs of property damage
 - iv. costs to victims, the police, criminal justice system and prison service.
 - c. Costs in response. These costs are a result of reported incidents, which typically include the cost of the Fire and Rescue Service responding to fires, false alarms, etc. Key variables that were monetised as part of the costs in response included:
 - i Fire and Rescue Service resource costs in response to fire-related incidents, and
 - ii capital costs in response to fire-related incidents.
9. The values used in this study were £1.375m for the value of a fatality, £155,000 for the value of a serious injury and £12,000 for the value of a slight injury. In terms of the main categories of cost, a comparison between 2006 and 2008 showed that the costs in anticipation and response increased, while the costs as a consequence reduced.
10. The main factors contributing to these changes in the estimates were considered to be:
- a. The increase in the number of hours spent on community fire safety activities and fire investigations which added to Fire and Rescue Service resource costs. While the fire safety labour cost per hour rose with inflation, the actual number of hours Fire and Rescue Services devoted to fire safety activities increased much more rapidly. This type of activity represents the drive by the Fire and Rescue Service to better fire prevention.

Additional factors contributing to changes in the estimates were:

- b. The decrease in the number of fatal and non-fatal casualties as a result of fires started deliberately – each fatality was estimated at £1.65m and each serious injury estimated to cost around £185,000.

The value of a serious injury in 2005 was taken from Department for Transport (2007) Highways Economic Note 1:2005 Valuation of the Benefits of Prevention of Road Accidents and Casualties and updated using the Retail Price Index to provide a value for a serious injury in 2008.

11. Fire investigations are factored into our normal service provision and each front line manager has the capacity to undertake fire investigations but can call upon specialist fire investigation officers who can undertake more detailed examinations when they are needed. We also have our hydrocarbon dog who can assist in determining whether accelerants have been used. Both of these provide a more efficient investigative capability for the Service.
12. While we cannot determine the actual cost of a fire death to the people of Surrey other than by applying the national cost model we are increasingly involved in working with partners to ensure that fire deaths and injuries do not happen in the first place. That is why our work with Adult Social Care, "Keeping you safe from fire", is so important to identify those people who are most at risk from fire. We do deliver enhanced fire safety visits and provide additional preventative measures to allow people to remain living independently in the community longer. We will continue to deliver a multi-agency approach to the management fire safety, working with boroughs and districts and other agencies to protect our communities.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(16) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (3rd question)

According to the County Council's Budget Monitoring Report on 24 September 2013 Cabinet agenda it was stated that "Additional Highway costs associated with the Tour of Britain are anticipated (+£0.2m including road closures and diversions)..."

Is Surrey County Council spending £200,000 for a cycling event a good use of Council Taxpayers' money?

Reply:

The Tour of Britain was brought to Surrey in order to deliver health, tourism and economic benefits to the residents and businesses of Surrey. We will shortly receive the independent economic impact report for this year's event.

In the meantime, the 2012 Surrey stage of the Tour of Britain was shown to have had a net £7.2m economic benefit for the county and we can expect similar for 2013. The 2012 event also attracted close to a quarter of a million spectators (highest in the event's history) to the road-sides in Surrey. A two hour live broadcast and one hour highlights programme of the Surrey stage was

watched in over a million households in the UK and a further two million across Europe - the impact of this will help to bring visitors to the county over the coming weeks, months and years. On top of this, there are the thousands of positive column inches in newspapers, magazines and associated press all highlighting Surrey's beautiful countryside, towns and villages. When we have received the 2013 Tour of Britain Surrey stage economic and media report, we will make it available.

Given the evidence of the £7.2m economic benefit in 2012, the spend on traffic management represents a good return for the economic health of the county.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

(17) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (4th question)

In the last 5 years did the council receive all of the third party contributions e.g. from developers relating to developments and did the County Council repay any money to organisations if the County Council did not claim the money by the relevant deadlines, including monies held by the boroughs and districts on behalf of the County Council, and if so how much money was repaid?

Reply:

In the last 5 years the County Council has received all s106 developer contributions that were due to be received, following the triggering of the payment deadlines contained in the associated legal agreements.

As a result of the improved monitoring arrangements, and the close liaison with District and Borough Council monitoring officers, all developer contributions which are due are sought and received.

During the last 5 years the County Council has repaid the following s106 contributions -

- a balance of £7,500, from a larger contribution, resulting from Network Rail failing to give consent for the upgrading of a cycle-way over one of their structures, a pedestrian bridge crossing a railway.
- a balance of £18,806, from a larger contribution for travel vouchers which were not claimed by residents of a new development.
- a balance of £4,000, from a larger contribution for highway improvements which could not be undertaken in the time-frame and an alternative and cheaper scheme was subsequently negotiated with the developer.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(18) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (5th question)

The levels of non-care related debt over the period 2009/10 Q4 to 2013/14 Q1 were presented to the June meeting of the Cabinet below.

	2013/14	2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10
	Q1	Q1	Q4	Q4	Q4	Q4
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Non Care related debt	3.1	3.5	3.8	3.0	3.9	3.6

These figures demonstrate a consistent failure by Surrey County Council to collect non care related debt, despite constant assurances that the problem is being tackled.

Which services do these debts relate to and how have these debts arisen?

What actions are being taken to make a real impact in collecting this debt, which is owed to all Council taxpayers in Surrey?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. A closer look at the non-care debt over the last four years shows a downward trend in the amount overdue. This has to be set against the context of income rising from £128m to £132m over the same period of time. This improvement has been achieved by reviewing all our Billing to Collect processes following a Rapid Improvement Event in October 2010.

The majority of the outstanding debt relates to Health and £2.3m of the total of £3.1m is less than six months old. Senior officers are working closely with colleagues in Health to improve further this process.

1.