

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA



Agenda and Reports
for the meeting of
THE COUNTY COUNCIL
to be held on
14 JULY 2015

7 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

(Pages 1
- 14)

(1) The Leader of the Council or the appropriate Member of the Cabinet or the Chairman of a Committee to answer any questions on any matter relating to the powers and duties of the County Council, or which affects the county.

(Note: Notice of questions in respect of the above item on the agenda must be given in writing, preferably by e-mail, to Anne Gowing in Democratic Services by 12 noon on Wednesday 8 July 2015).

(2) Cabinet Member Briefings on their portfolios

These will be circulated by email to all Members prior to the County Council meeting, together with the Members' questions and responses.

There will be an opportunity for Members to ask questions.

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 14 JULY 2015

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

**MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND
RESIDENT EXPERIENCE**

(1) MR MICHAEL SYDNEY (LINGFIELD) TO ASK:

In 2010, the Chief Executive attended a meeting of the Surrey Hills Wood Fuel Summit at Cranleigh School. At the end of the meeting I, as Chairman, asked the Chief Executive for his comments on what he had heard and what had been discussed.

In the course of a very encouraging response, the Chief Executive stated that from then on "wood fuel would be the default heating element of any new building project undertaken by Surrey County Council, providing there was no business case which prevented this.

I would like to ask:

1. How many new buildings has the County commissioned and completed in the intervening period?
2. How many of these buildings have wood fuel as their heat source?
3. If the number in the answer to question 2 is less than the number in the answer to question 1, what were the business cases which prevented the use of wood fuel?
4. Why in the eight school planning applications currently being considered by the SCC Planning Department on behalf of the County are there no heating installations using wood as the fuel?

Reply:

The responses are in the same order as the questions:

1. There were 4 new buildings:
 - High Ashurst - Main build 2010
 - High Ashurst - Further accommodation block 2011
 - Trinity Oaks - New 1 Form of Entry School, Horley 2014
 - Guildford - New Fire Station 2015
2. High Ashurst - Main build 2010
High Ashurst - Further accommodation block 2011
3. That on completion of the business case analysis there is not a value for money benefit due to a number of site specific challenges. Biomass is not a requirement of the DFE's baseline standards.

Trinity Oaks

- The capital funding by the DFE does not provide for the significantly higher capital cost of Biomass installations, where the revenue benefit is to the school and not SCC.
- This site was severely restricted in terms of fuel storage and access.

Guildford - New Fire Station 2015

- This site was severely restricted in terms of fuel storage and access, which negated the ability to install a Biomass system storage and access.
4. Firstly all applications / proposals are considered based against a business case before a decision is made.

There are in fact 14 applications being considered these are as follows:

- **2 new schools:** The capital funding by the DFE does not provide for the significantly higher capital cost of Biomass installations, where the revenue benefit is to the school and not SCC.
- **4 building extensions:** Two are Academy and Voluntary Aided Schools. In all instances the existing gas installation is being extended and therefore it is not cost affective to install Biomass.
- **6 Small modular units:** All with their own modest self contained heating systems.
- **2 Temporary modular units:** Planning applications to become permanent and all have their own modest self contained heating systems.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(2) MR DAVID IVISON (HEATHERSIDE & PARKSIDE) TO ASK:

In congratulating the Leader on his election as Conservative Group Leader of the Local Government Association (LGA), will he use his new position (along with the supportive Labour Councillors) to assist our national Conservative Government to speedily approve the unanimous and unequivocal recommendations of the Airport Commission to maintain the international important hub status of Heathrow Airport with the construction of a third runway?

While recognising the overwhelming support for a third runway at Heathrow from British business, international airlines, UK regional airports a significant number of supporters in both the Gatwick and Heathrow areas - and even support from the Labour Party, will we as Surrey County Council now have the early opportunity, as primary economic and employment beneficiaries of the long-overdue Airport Commission proposals, be given an early debate to revise our present equivocal position 'on the fence' and vote to support our Conservative Government in their decision-making later in the year?

Such endorsement by us of the recommended Heathrow option will not only assist the Government (at long last) to make a decision, it will also enable us to concentrate and focus on our long-held reservations over infrastructure and environmental concerns related to the expansion proposals.

Can the Leader indicate an early date for our debate on this vital issue and his undertaking to promote this project with his LGA colleagues?

This long-awaited decision is vital to our County, our Region and our Nation.

Reply:

I welcome the publication of the Airports Commission final report.

The Commission has set out a package of measures which it considers will address the environmental and community impacts of its recommended option for expansion at Heathrow.

We welcome the additional jobs and economic growth that airport expansion could bring to Surrey residents and businesses.

However, many important issues remain unanswered.

We do not know whether the Government will accept all the recommendations set out by the Airports Commission. For example, a ban on scheduled night flights and the introduction of predictable periods of respite.

What does the Airports Commission mean by southern access to Heathrow?

How will surface access improvements on local roads and rail links be funded?

So in my view the position that the Council adopted in July 2013 remains the right position. Expansion at either Heathrow or Gatwick requires the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed

Before backing expansion at Heathrow, the county council needs to be fully satisfied that the infrastructure is in place to make the airport work properly and that everything has been done to mitigate the impact of expansion on local communities.

I am already lobbying Government and the aviation industry, including in my new role as Conservative Group Leader of the Local Government Association, to ensure that these issues are addressed.

I hope that the Government will move as quickly as possible to respond to the recommendations, to end the uncertainty for Surrey communities.

The Government has said that it will respond to the Commission's recommendations before the end of the year. In my view, that is the point at which it would make most sense for this council to hold a further debate on the issue.

MR JOHN FUREY, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

(3) MR DAVID GOODWIN (GUILDFORD SOUTH WEST) TO ASK:

According to the Chief Executive's progress report, 14% of Surrey's highway network is in poor condition and is in need of repair.

After 3 years of investing in the resurfacing of Surrey's roads which has resulted in 3 % improvement from 17% to 14 % amounting to a 1% improvement per year. What plans

are there to continue the road resurfacing programme beyond 2017 when Operation Horizon ends and to speed up the rate of improvement?

Reply:

We are responsible for 4,800kms of roads and the network is always deteriorating. The 14% condition relates to 2014/15 after nearly two years of Operation Horizon. We originally forecast that the Horizon programme would provide an annual improvement in the condition of the network of 1%, although this can be impacted by severe weather or other unexpected events. The higher % improvement actually achieved is due to the acceleration of the programme in the first two years.

Under the Horizon programme, we now have one of the best condition road networks in the South East. Looking forwards, the critical consideration given when determining investment in the network is the outcomes it provides against the Council's priorities, which needs to include all of our assets, including footways, structures and drainage as well as carriageways. We will be carrying out an extensive consultation with Members later in the year on our Asset Management Strategy, and this will be used to help us determine future budgets and the Capital programme beyond 2017.

MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

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

Please can the Council confirm how much money it spends printing and posting committee papers, meeting invites and other documentation to Councillors?

Reply:

The bulk of the printing for Councillors, including committee papers, is carried out by the central Reprographics team at County Hall, and the charge to Democratic Services for the 2014 calendar year was £42,225. This figure includes the cost of printing for Democratic Services which is not directly related to the work of Members, as well as the cost of committee papers circulated to officers involved in meetings, but these costs are not separated out. However, there will be additional Councillor-related printing costs incurred as a result of local printing by Democratic Services and by Councillors at home, as well as printing by other services through Reprographics or locally, but these costs are also not recorded or monitored.

The charge to Democratic Services for printing in Reprographics in 2014 was significantly higher than the previous year as a result of an overall increase in the number of copies and, particularly, an increase in the number of colour copies. The figure fluctuates annually as a result of the number of meetings held and also the nature of the reports presented. Democratic Services has sought to reduce the number of paper copies produced by restricting distribution lists and by improving accessibility to electronic versions and providing Councillors with iPads. There is also a drive to ensure that the reports themselves are shorter and only have necessary attachments, and that colour copying is avoided whenever possible.

All post to Councillors is sent out via Members' Reception, but the cost of this is not recorded separately within the Council's overall postage costs. To give an indication, the cost of sending the agenda for today's meeting by first class post was £2.02, so the cost of sending it to all 81 Councillors would be £163.62. However, the reality is that a

proportion of these agenda would have been collected in person by Councillors already at County Hall, so those postage costs would not have been incurred.

Members' Reception seeks to keep postage costs to a minimum by only sending post to Councillors once a week, unless requested to send documents immediately (for example copies of agenda). They will also hold on to post where the Councillor is expected to be coming to County Hall the following day. Therefore Councillors can play an important part in keeping postage costs to a minimum by ensuring that they call to Members' Reception each time they arrive at and leave County Hall.'

LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

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

Last year the Leader of the Council announced an additional £2m for Children's Services. Can a breakdown be provided showing how this additional funding has been spent?

If the funding has not been spent, can a breakdown be provided showing how the funding will be spent?

Reply:

Team	Post	Total FTE	Total Budget (£000)
Area Teams (Referral, Assessment and Intervention Service)	Senior Family Support Worker	16	480
Administration (Area Teams)	Senior Team Administrator	8	217
Administration (Safeguarding)	Senior Team Administrator	2	54
Care Services (Placement Team)	Placement Officer	1	36
Care Services (Leaving Care Team)	Assistant Team Manager	1	48
Total Allocated		28	835

The £2m will be spent by Children's Services over two years, with £1m being spent in each year. The funding will be spent on additional staffing, with each post being filled for two years. Recruitment is currently underway.

The Referral, Assessment and Intervention Service (RAIS) in each of the four areas will each have four additional Senior Family Support Workers, and there will be additional capacity added to the Administration Teams to support the increasing workload being seen in the Area Teams and the Safeguarding Unit.

In addition, two posts will be added in Countywide Services - a further Placement Officer in the Placement Team and a further Assistant Team Manager in the Care Leaver's Team.

The total annual cost of these additional staff is £835,000.

The remaining funding will be used to cover the post of the Independent Principal Social Worker and Social Work Reform Manager both of whom have key roles to play in driving forward the practice improvement agenda. Additional monies will be used to address and enhance support required to improve work flow and business process and/or further capacity within the RAIS to address additional tasks and a significant increase in caseloads. Ongoing review of the RAIS capacity and structure will form part of the formal improvement process. This will therefore ensure future review and inform realignment of resources, if necessary.

MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

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

What action does Surrey County Council (SCC) take when Japanese Knotweed is reported on its land, especially along the edges of roads?

What action does SCC take when it is reported on any Right of Way that is not in its ownership?

Given that there is no statutory requirement for landowners to remove these plants from their property but it is an offence to allow them to spread to adjacent land, how does SCC prevent this pernicious weed from spreading?

Reply:

The County Council has processes to ensure Japanese Knotweed (and any other poisonous weeds) are dealt with in the most appropriate manner. These differ slightly between the highway, Rights of Way and Estates to reflect the nature and usage of the land.

In ten out of the eleven Surrey Districts, agreements are in place with the District Councils to deal with highway land weed control on our behalf. Tandridge District Council are the exception having chosen not to work with us, hence highway weed control is managed by the County Council in this district. There is a proactive approach with all known problem areas benefiting from twice yearly preventative spray treatments. Stem injection methods of control supplement this when required. If additional reports are made to the Council, they will be investigated and treated as appropriate by either the County Council or the relevant District Council.

Rights of Way do not operate a preventative programme but will treat Japanese knotweed on a reactive basis, with an appropriate treatment, when they identify or are told of an occurrence. They will not enter adjoining private land or property to treat the weed but will notify the landowner.

Estates undertake periodic inspections of land under their control. Through this process (and reports from third parties) they will deal with and treat Knotweed accordingly.

This comprehensive approach minimises the risk of the weed spreading from County land to other areas.

MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER ADULT SOCIAL CARE, WEKKBEING AND INDEPENDENCE

(7) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH & ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK:

In light of the fact that Ofsted's report into Children's Services in Surrey has been recently released finding Surrey to be inadequate in its duty of care, what assurances can be given that where a similar inspection to be taken of Adult Social Care the same finding would not be made, especially with regard to those suffering from mental health issues.

Reply:

Adult social care services are not subject to an inspection regime in the same way as Children's Services, but regulated adult social care services are monitored and inspected by the Care Quality Commission. This applies to all regulated services regardless of what type of organisation delivers them. Surrey County Council currently delivers some adult social care services which are inspected by the Care Quality Commission: Residential homes for older people, people with learning disabilities and reablement. The majority of the council's adult social care services, as with most other councils, are commissioned from external providers.

Surrey Adult Social Care has robust quality assurance processes in place to ensure that the care and support provided to Surrey residents is appropriate and of good quality. Through our partnership agreement with Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, this includes people with mental health issues.

As part of our approach, we are proactive in seeking 'Peer Reviews', which provide independent feedback on our performance. These have included reviews by Hampshire and Buckinghamshire County Councils. Where lessons are learnt we adjust our processes accordingly. We also publish a 'Local Account' of our performance against quality standards, informed by partners and people who use services.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

(8) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL & STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:

With respect to the Prudential RideLondon on Sunday 2 August, what measures will be in place to allow emergency access to and from homes in roads that are closed?

Reply:

The access for the emergency services and other critical services such as health and social care workers has been a critical part of the planning for this event following on from our learning from the Olympic planning.

To ensure access for the emergency services the following arrangements have been made:

- Emergency and Local Access points have been identified across the route. The locations of these have been identified in liaison with the emergency service.
- All crews and officers from the emergency services will be briefed by their organisations and be given details of the route and Emergency and Local Access Points by the event organiser
- To manage any issues that arise during the event there will be officers from Surrey's emergency services working alongside the event organiser at the event control room on the day of the event.

These arrangements have been developed over the last 5 years where we have run this type of event. Every effort is made to ensure that all eventualities are addressed in the planning for the event, but we have built in the flexibility to the event arrangements to ensure that residents will continue to receive the normal levels of emergency response while the event is being delivered.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(9) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:

The Surrey Transport Plan vision and objectives states that it aims to provide an integrated transport system that protects the environment, keeps people healthy and provides for lower carbon transport choices. This is consistent with Surrey County Council's Climate Change Strategy for the Surrey Transport Plan which has an objective to increase the proportion of travel by sustainable modes such as walking and cycling, maintain public transport patronage and increase vehicle occupancy. This is a commitment to increase the percentage of journeys in Surrey that are made by sustainable modes, including buses. However, the Surrey County Council review of bus services appears to be based on a baseline of keeping the same amount of total transport each year by bus across the county – just over 29 million passenger-km journeys each year. Please can you confirm:

- why a baseline that leads to a continual lowering of the proportion of travel in Surrey made by buses was chosen, when the overall commitment is to make travel more environmentally sustainable.
- what progress Surrey County Council is making towards meeting the Surrey County Council target of a 10% reduction in absolute [carbon] emissions by 2020 increasing to 25% reduction by 2035 on 2007 levels of 2,114,000 tonnes (1.9 tonnes per capita), and how bus travel is contributing to this reduction.

Reply:

In light of the current funding pressures faced by the Council, the Local Transport Review has been tasked to deliver a funding arrangement with partners that is more financially sustainable in the long term. There has been no baseline set in terms of lowering the proportion of travel in Surrey by bus, but to make the required savings needed from the review; this has resulted in some service compromises on routes, frequencies, days of operations and changes to timetables.

The overall result of these changes is that an average of 160 passengers could be negatively impacted; some of whom in theory could switch to some form of car

transport. However most of these passengers will still retain access to some form of local transport. Furthermore, some of the changes lead to enhancements. The review also aims to grow the commercial value of the network through investment in capital infrastructure. Both of these measures will encourage an increase in patronage.

Surrey County Council is currently exceeding its target of a 10% reduction in carbon emissions by 2020. The most recently published Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC) data from 2013, indicates a level of 1,849,200 tonnes of carbon emissions, which represents a 12.4% reduction.

At this stage, it is difficult to quantify what contribution bus travel, or any other specific mode of transport, is making to this change. However it is widely thought that the single biggest contributory factor is the increase in vehicle fuel efficiency.

MR JOHN FUREY, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

**(10) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:
2nd question**

I understand that the Greater London Authority and the Welsh Assembly have enhanced powers to take enforcement action against illegal and anti-social activities of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs). Please will this Council agree to lobby Central Government for these powers?

Reply:

We are aware that the Greater London Authority and the Welsh Assembly have been handed powers to enforce lorry weight and width restrictions and issue fines to lorry drivers break the law. The Local Government Association is calling on the Government to give similar powers to councils across the country. A key consideration for the County Council is that any such additional responsibilities should not impose an additional financial burden on the authority.

LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

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

The County Council introduced a number of skillcentres to improve the skills of Surrey's young people. I understand that the skillcentres have been discontinued. What was the reason for this decision and was an evaluation of the skillcentres initiative carried out and if so, what did it conclude?

Reply:

In response to Raising of the Participation Age legislation, Services for Young People has developed a number of commissions aimed at preventing young people from becoming NEET (Not in Employment, Education and Training) and encouraging their participation in education, employment and training. These commissions have been very successful, achieving a 62% reduction in NEET young people between March 2012 and March 2014 and leading to Surrey having the joint lowest NEET percentage

in England in 2013-14. Other authorities are seeking to learn from Surrey's approach, following national coverage in Local Government Association publications. The number of young people currently NEET in Surrey stands at 1.93%. Over the last three years we have supported over 1,600 Surrey young people to begin Apprenticeships through our employer grant. This, combined with other initiatives, has led to a year-on-year growth in the number of young people starting apprenticeships in Surrey over the last four years, in contrast to a trend of decline across the country overall.

The Skills Centre commission is due to end at the end of July 2015. When Education Funding Agency (EFA) funding of the programme started, from August 2013 and coinciding with the introduction of post-16 Programmes of Study, numbers began to drop off. This affected the viability of programmes. In 2013, Surrey County Council introduced the Ready for Work programme: a re-engagement programme for young people who are NEET and require additional support to prepare them for the demands of education, training and employment. Within this model, youth support officers from the Youth Support Service (YSS) deliver learning wrapped up within fun activities which allow for pastoral needs, including barriers to learning, to be addressed alongside developing the employability of young people. The more flexible Ready for Work programme is more suited to the most vulnerable young people and has attracted much higher numbers. There are currently 303 young people participating in the programme across the county.

An evaluation has been carried out for each year of the Skills Centres commission. The most recent evaluation, in May 2014, identified the following strengths, areas for development and recommendations.

Strengths

- 174 young people participated during the first phase of delivery, exceeding the overall target of 170.
- Seven of the eleven boroughs met or exceeded their engagement target.

Areas for Development

- A more flexible delivery model is needed, taking into account the need for roll-on, roll-off provision and different modes of attendance for young people according to their needs.

Recommendations

- Consider development of the Ready for Work model with providers, including using youth centres for Traineeship delivery, in recognition of the large proportion of NEET young people who aspire to enter employment.

In response to the changing context of the 14-19 policy and funding landscape, we are developing alternative solutions to meet local need. In North West Surrey, Services for Young People has a partnership in place with Brooklands College (the Skills Centre provider for one of the boroughs) which allows our staff to deliver education and training provision to young people, with funding and quality assurance provided by the College. This began with the very successful SPLASH (Surrey Partnership Learning Academy Surrey Heath) model in Surrey Heath and has now been expanded to form the LEAP (Learning, Employability and Progression) programme, covering Surrey Heath, Runnymede and Woking. In South East Surrey, a partnership is developing with East Surrey College and discussions are taking place regarding solutions for South West and North East Surrey, the latter of which currently has a European Social Fund

sub-contract to deliver re-engagement and prevention work to young people who are or are at risk of becoming NEET.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

**(12) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL & STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:
2nd question**

The Council is pressing on with the controversial plan to close two fire stations in Spelthorne and replace them with one new one. Why has it been decided that the cost of this project, which will be paid for by Surrey Council tax payers, should not be made public?

Reply:

The report contains information which is exempt from Access to Information by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government act which includes commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies. As we have not yet gone to the market to tender for these works releasing this information would compromise the competitive tender exercise.

Initially the up-front project costs will be funded by the tax payer but this will then lead to a saving to the taxpayer of nearly £900,000 per annum.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

**(13) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:
2nd question**

Now the Airports Commission has published its report, which recommends a third runway at Heathrow, does Surrey County Council feel the Airports Commission's recommendations on addressing environmental issues go far enough?

In particular, does the Cabinet Member agree that Surrey County Council and the UK government should be taking a lead to address climate change, and that the detailed modelling produced by the Commission highlights that expansion of either Heathrow or Gatwick airports is incompatible with an environmentally sustainable future?

Reply:

Our response to the acceptability of the environmental impacts of airport expansion at either Heathrow or Gatwick is focused on those issues with immediate local impacts which require mitigation measures in place, such as surface access, local air pollution and noise. We are currently concerned that the environmental impacts of airport expansion have not been satisfactorily addressed in the Commission's report, and we will expect these issues to be properly addressed. We have held meetings with the airport authorities and a further meeting is planned with Heathrow later this month.

The County Council is taking action to reduce carbon dioxide and other Greenhouse gas emissions from its own operations and other areas within its sphere of influence, such as sustainable local transport, domestic energy efficiency and waste management. Whilst the council clearly recognises the global contribution of aviation

to levels of Greenhouse Gases, the council takes the view that a strategic national approach, led by government, is essential in deciding the acceptability of the overall expansion proposals in respect of emissions and climate change mitigation.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Please can the Council confirm how many Surrey families it is estimated might be impacted by the Government's proposed reduction in the benefit cap from £25,000 to £23,000?

Reply:

Thank you Mr Forster for this timely question.

The previous Coalition Government introduced a £26,000 cap on the total amount of benefits that working age people can receive. This ensured that out of work households no longer received more in benefits than the average wage for working families.

In last week's budget, the Chancellor announced that the benefit cap will be reduced to £20,000 outside London from April 2017.

Residents in receipt of Working Tax Credit, Disability Living Allowance and Personal Independence Payments are automatically excluded from the cap, as are pensioners.

We know that nationally 45% of households affected by the cap have been in London. In Surrey, the County Council and our partners, including District and Borough Councils, social housing landlords and advice bodies have taken a preventative approach to support residents to avoid the cap by providing support into employment and benefit advice.

In 2013/14, 298 households were affected by the benefit cap. Partners through the Surrey-wide welfare reform coordination group are currently compiling up to date figures in light of last week's announcement.

This Council will continue to work as One Team with our partners to support our residents affected by the Government's welfare reforms

MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS. SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

**(15) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:
3rd question**

On 25 June 2015, the new Social Care Services Board considered an agenda item titled, "Ofsted Briefing and Update" which sought to provide the Scrutiny Board with an overview of the findings of the Ofsted report and the timelines for the improvement plans. This included a presentation and series of questions and answers tabled at the meeting.

Please can the Council confirm whether all public (as opposed to 'in private') agenda items tabled at other Council Committees/Boards are required to be published as amended report packs (as is the case for Cabinet reports) on the council website.

In particular, following this meeting please can the Cabinet Member confirm what additional budget and how many additional full-time social workers that Surrey County Council plans to deploy to reduce expenditure on agency staff and the high workload on existing staff, which appears to be a major factor contributing towards the Ofsted report findings.

Reply:

The main response to this question is articulated in the response to question 5. In addition, it is confirmed that public agenda items tabled at Council Committees or Boards are not required to be published as amended report packs. The Council's practice is to publish these papers with the minutes of the meeting.

We are always working towards recruiting permanent staff but still have a heavy reliance on locums due to regional challenges for Qualified Social Workers.

This page is intentionally left blank