

Cabinet- Supplementary Agenda



Date & time
Tuesday, 27
October 2020 at
2.00 pm

Place
REMOTE

Contact
Vicky Hibbert or Huma
Younis
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8541 9229 or 020
8213 2725

Chief Executive
Joanna Killian



We're on Twitter:
@SCCdemocracy

vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or
huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Members: Mrs Natalie Bramhall, Mr Mel Few, Mr Matt Furniss, Dr Zully Grant-Duff, Mrs Julie Iles, Mr Colin Kemp, Mrs Mary Lewis, Mrs Sinead Mooney, Mr Tim Oliver and Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members: Miss Alison Griffiths, Mr Edward Hawkins, Miss Marisa Heath, Mr Mark Nuti and Mrs Becky Rush

4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

a Members' Questions

(Pages 1
- 10)

Four Member questions have been received. One question from Mrs Kay Hammond and three questions from Mr Jonathan Essex. A response from Cabinet is attached.

b Public Questions

(Pages
11 - 14)

Three public questions have been received. A response from Cabinet is attached.

5 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

(Pages
15 - 20)

Cabinet to consider the following:

- A. Report of the No Wrong Door Task Group (Cabinet response attached).
- B. Report of the Mental Health Task Group (Cabinet response attached).

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive
Monday, 26 October 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 27 October 2020

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Members Questions**Question (1) Kay Hammond (Horley West, Salfords & Sidlow):**

Please provide:

- The number of children missing education (distinguishing SEND learners from non-SEND learners) in Financial Years 2018/19 and 2019/20;
- The average time taken to arrange alternative education provision for children who were out of education in Financial Years 2018/19 and 2019/20;
- The average time taken to produce final Education Health and Care (EHC) plans and plan reviews with reference to statutory timescales in Financial Years 2018/19 and 2019/20;
- The number of upheld complaints about EHC plans and education provision from both the council and Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman's complaints processes in Financial Years 2018/19 and 2019/20; and
- Information and comment on how the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the above since the conclusion of Financial Year 2019/20.

Reply:

I would like to thank Mrs Hammond for requesting information related to children missing education and children with an education, health and care plan. This provides me with an opportunity to explain how the Council is improving its monitoring and provision for some of our most vulnerable children in Surrey.

Firstly, I should point out that the definitions used by the DfE (Department for Education) to identify and record children missing education (CME) changed in recent years.

Previously the definition included all children who were not on a school roll and included those who were receiving alternative education provision such as individual tuition provided by Access to Education (A2E).

The current DfE definition for CME relates to those pupils **who are not receiving any education and not on a school roll**, for instance, those who have moved into the County and are awaiting a school place.

Children who are receiving tuition and/or attending alternative provision should now be recorded as Educated Otherwise Than at School (EOTAS) and not counted as CME.

The Council's recording until this Academic Year did not reflect this change in DfE definition. That has now been corrected, which means that we are better able to see the true picture of children who are not accessing any education, as well as those who are receiving education but not in a school environment.

As a result of this, our historical data related to children missing education is inflated. However, the data does reflect all children not on a school roll for whom we monitored and targeted support over the course of Academic Years 2018/19 and 2019/20.

Possible reasons for pupils to be out of school				
CME – with no school place	Medical needs	EOTAS	Access to Education (A2E)	Possible CME under investigation

- **The number of children missing education (distinguishing SEND learners from non-SEND learners) in Academic Years 2018/19 and 2019/20.**

As explained, the Council previously recorded all pupils without a registered school place as CME, reflecting earlier DfE definitions.

Figures reflect all pupils who have been logged as awaiting placement at some point during the academic year. The 2019/20 figure is also inflated by the inclusion that year of pupils who had come off roll from independent schools at the end of the academic year and whose next placement was being followed up (approximately 65 pupils).

While our historic data does not differentiate between children missing education and children receiving education while not on a school role, our practice experience is that most of the children recorded as CME were in receipt of alternative education provision.

Pupils awaiting placement during the academic year	2018/19				2019/20			
	Current SEN status	EHCP	SEN Support	None	TOTAL	EHCP	SEN Support	None
Total no. of pupils	250	136	303	689	226	96	540**	862**

**As per the note above, this figure is inflated by approximately 65 pupils

- **The average time taken to arrange alternative education provision for children who were out of education in Academic Years 2018/19 and 2019/20.**

This data is based on an analysis by calendar days rather than school days. This means that, where pupils have been awaiting placement across a holiday period, the days on which schools were closed have been included.

As children may be awaiting placement across two different academic years, the pupil numbers below will not fully align with the data above which counts these pupils in both years in which they were awaiting placement.

Analysed by academic year (AY) in which awaiting placement episode started:

Awaiting placement – AY of start date	Total number of children	Average number of calendar days
AY 2018/19	554	69.6
AY 2019/20	747	64.9

- **The average time taken to produce final Education Health and Care (EHC) plans and plan reviews with reference to statutory timescales in Academic Years 2018/19 and 2019/20.**

EHCPs

As shown in Graph 1 below, EHCP timeliness for the full year to end of August 2019 (the 2018/19 academic year) was 62%.

For the 2019/20 period, 50% of EHCPs (Education Health and Care Plans) were issued on time. However, as the month by month data in Graph 2 shows, this reflects a decline in performance at the start of the academic year followed by a continuous and sustained improvement from April 2020 onwards.

Graph 1: EHCP timeliness over a rolling 12-month period

Percent:



Graph 2: EHCP timeliness by month in which plan was due



Current timeliness for September 2020 is 88%.

Annual reviews

At the end of the 2019/20 Academic Year, 64% of pupils with an EHCP had an up to date annual review, with a further 3% up to date but due within the next month (67%). This is shown in Figure 1 below.

Detailed monitoring of this data was not in place at the end of the 18/19 academic year.

Figure 1: EHCP annual review timeliness – end of August 2020



Performance is currently 65% on time and 4% due in the next month (69%), demonstrating further improvement into the current academic year, as illustrated by Figure 2.

Figure 2: EHCP annual review timeliness – end of September 2020



- ***The number of upheld complaints about EHC plans and education provision from both the council and Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman's complaints processes in Financial Years 2018/19 and 2019/20;***

There were six upheld complaints to the LGSCO in 2018/19 in relation to SEND and four upheld complaints in 2019/20.

The Council also received 106 complaints with regards to practice in the SEND area teams in 2018/19. In 2019/20, this figure was 238. Since April 2020, over the six months, the Council has received 56 complaints related to SEND practice.

We are unable to distinguish which of these complaints specifically relate to EHCPs in those years, however our recording systems have now changed to allow more detailed analysis of the nature of complaints.

- ***Information and comment on how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the above since the conclusion of Financial Year 2019/20.***

COVID – 19 has affected the EHCP process in several ways:

- Increased partnership working across the County resulted in multi-agency risk assessments of all young people who are vulnerable – with an EHCP and/or known to social care;
- A reduction in the number of requests for an EHC Assessments;
- The application of our best endeavours which meant assessments were undertaken virtually and that Annual reviews were carried out using Zoom and Teams;
- Overall, our performance on EHCP timeliness has improved and this improvement has been sustained over August and September 2020;
- We have seen increased levels of anxiety amongst parents and young people and have commissioned support from the voluntary sector KOOTH which provides support to young people and QWELL which provides support to parents;
- In addition, training has been provided to school staff and their services to enable them to support young people who are anxious;
- COVID- 19 has seen staff work in creative ways to deliver services to young people;
- Partnership working between the Council's education and social care teams and schools to ensure our vulnerable young people were encouraged to attend school resulted in the following attendance performance:

<i>Children with an allocated social worker</i>		<i>Children with an EHCP</i>	
<i>SURREY</i>	<i>35%</i>	<i>SURREY</i>	<i>23%</i>
<i>NATIONAL</i>	<i>11%</i>	<i>NATIONAL</i>	<i>16%</i>

Next steps

- Embedding new practice to reflect the revised DfE definition of CME and building new Tableau dashboards to monitor this and all other groups of pupils out of school.
- Ongoing training and support for staff to support these practice changes.
- Analysis of time taken to place pupils based on school days rather than calendar days.
- Stage 1 complaints are returning to the service and staff are being given training on effective complaint management.
- Co-production meetings with parents have been introduced to the EHCP process, the outcome of which is intended to reduce complaints.

Mrs Julie Iles
Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning
27 October 2020

Question (2) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):
--

In line with Surrey County Council's agreed Climate Change Strategy please can you confirm that the Cabinet is committed to requiring all decision making items to be subject to an Environmental Sustainability Assessment, completed by an appropriately qualified officer, to ensure that our climate commitment is mainstreamed into action across all of the council departments.

Reply:

While reports to Cabinet already require the completion of Environmental Sustainability Assessments for investment and programmes which meet certain criteria, the Council is committed to doing more to ensure climate change is embedded within our decision making processes. To that end, the Climate Change Board has been established and is chaired by the Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure, with representation from senior officers across the Council. The purpose of the Board is to embed a more sustainable approach to developing idea, projects and services corporately with a focus on carbon reduction.

The Council is also currently refreshing our Organisation Strategy (2021-2026). This Strategy will inform how we deliver services to align with our 2030 Community Vision. The Strategy focuses on the Council's key priorities, of which Enabling a Greener Future is one. This approach will help to ensure that climate change is considered in all strategic and investment decisions across all council departments.

Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change
27 October 2020

Question (3) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):
--

The refreshed Organisation Strategy proposes one guiding principle, to tackle inequality in Surrey by focusing on 'no-one being left behind'. It encompasses economic and health inequalities along with the protected equality characteristics (of age, disability, race, sexual

4a orientation, sex, gender reassignment, religion or belief (or lack thereof), whether in marriage or civil partnerships or caring responsibilities) which are already included in the council's Equality Impact Assessments.

Please confirm:

- to what extent the effectiveness of the current EIA process will be reviewed and refreshed in line with this new strategy; and

- what the process will be to ensure our decisions reduce health and economic inequalities going forward?

Reply:

Our commitment to making sure we leave no-one behind is not new. It is a central part of the Community Vision for Surrey in 2030 which we worked with residents and partners to develop two years ago. Tackling inequality and ensuring no one is left behind has also been a feature of our Organisation Strategy from previous years. The refreshed Strategy presented to Cabinet today reaffirms our commitment to tackling inequality as the guiding principle for everything we do, as well as setting new equality objectives that include reducing health and economic inequalities.

Many people who choose to call Surrey home are thriving in our towns and villages, but sadly that is not the case for everyone. Inequality is a strong theme that runs through our evidence and insight about the experiences of our residents and communities. Even before the Covid-19 pandemic, we knew there was significant economic disparity between east and west Surrey and inequalities between communities that affect the health, wellbeing and life chances of some of Surrey's residents. The pandemic is likely to have made these inequalities worse, and we are starting to better understand the implications for residents and businesses.

As part of our Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) process, we already consider evidence on differential impacts for people from different socio-economic backgrounds. While this is not defined as a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010, I place just as much importance on knowing how our decisions may affect communities where factors such as deprivation, low incomes or child poverty feature. We will be looking at our process to consider how else we might test the impact any propositions on health and economic inequalities and I would welcome views from Members on how we do this.

In addition to making EIAs as robust as possible, we will be doing more to ensure we have the best possible evidence and insight so we can make better decisions on addressing health and economic inequalities. For example, our Community Impact Assessment work is lifting a lid on the impact of Covid-19 on our communities. We are also working on an outcomes-based performance framework for the Organisation Strategy that will measure our progress towards reducing inequalities across Surrey.

How we use insight and engage with all residents to understand differences in experience is just one way we will tackle inequality. The guiding principle in Organisation Strategy will influence all parts of the council, including:

- how we design the organisation and services to be as inclusive and accessible as possible
- how we support all residents to be more active in their communities and participate in the democratic process

- and how our staff are supported so they can provide a first-class service to anyone in Surrey.

These are the right things to do to develop better services, enable better outcomes and use our resources most effectively.

Mr Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
27 October 2020

Question (4) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):
--

Please confirm what additional resources are currently being provided to ensure that all school children in Surrey are still able to receive cycle proficiency training and confirm that social distancing requirements do not affect our commitment to provide this as a universal provision.

Reply:

Impact on Courses Types and Delivery

Surrey County Council provides several different cycle training courses. Each of these has been subject to a COVID-19 risk assessment (with reference to the national Bikeability Trust COVID-19 guidelines where applicable). For some types of course where social distancing is not possible, the course provision has been suspended. For other types of course the provision has continued but with a reduced number of students to instructors so that social distancing can be managed safely. Schools can request more courses to compensate for this. Consequently, the council is scheduling more courses to train the same number of pupils, subject to cycling instructor availability. A summary of our courses and how the delivery of the course has been affected by COVID-19 is described below in Table 1.

Increasing Instructor Availability

The service currently employs 61 cycling instructors as bank staff with a few on annualised hours contracts. To meet the increased demand for courses the service has recruited an additional 13 cycling instructors since March. In that time six cycling instructors have left. Further recruitment is planned in cohorts to facilitate putting them through the qualification programme.

It does take some time to bring new cycling instructors into full production after they have been taken on as Surrey employees. This is because there is classroom and practical training with further 'on the job' experience within the national framework before reaching full qualification.

The recruitment of additional cycling instructors has been possible due to an additional £200,000 that the council allocated to the cycle training service for this financial year prior to COVID-19. This additional investment had originally been intended to reduce the fees to schools (usually passed onto parents) to assist in expanding the service to reach more pupils throughout the county. We had also hoped to introduce a new "Independent Cycling to Secondary School" course. Instead, for now, the additional funding has been used to mitigate the effects of COVID-19 and the introduction of this new course has been delayed. However, it has been possible to maintain the lower fees, and this has assisted in maintaining the demand for the courses.

Impact on the Number of Courses and Trainees

Table 2 below describes the total number of courses and pupils in the last academic year in the period from September to the end of March (prior to the national lockdown when all cycle training courses were suspended), compared with the number of courses that we have scheduled for same period during the current academic year. The total number of pupils and courses has reduced because we have had to suspend the “Pedals” and “Learn to Ride” courses as it is not possible to ensure social distancing. However, we have increased the number of courses for Bikeability Level 1 and Bikeability Level 2 and this has led to an increase in the number of pupils scheduled to take the Bikeability Level 1 course. Despite an increase in the number of Level 2 courses the pupil numbers have dropped due to a lower number of pupils being allowed to be on each course to ensure social distancing. Consequently, the impact is greater on Level 2 because, being a longer course over five days, it is harder for schools to fit in extra courses and harder for the council to find the additional cycling instructor capacity.

Future Aspirations

A positive impact of COVID-19 is that the reduction in the number of pupils on each course has resulted in higher quality training for the students. For Level 2 courses in particular, this has resulted in there being time for pupils to practice making a journey, for example, to a prospective secondary school, under supervision. This provides pupils with greater confidence to encourage them to continue cycling for everyday journeys after the course. In the long-term therefore, the council aspires to maintain the smaller number of pupils on each course.

There is a commitment from central government in its recent “Gear Change A Bold Vision for Cycling and Walking” document for an increase in the provision of cycle training. The hope and expectation is that this will result in more funding being provided to local authorities to support more cycle training. If this is the case, this will allow us to increase the quantity as well as maintain the benefits of the higher quality courses in the future.

Table 1: The different types of cycle training courses and the outcome of the COVID-19 risk assessments

Course	Description	Length	Maximum trainees pre-COVID-19	Maximum riders under COVID-19 risk assessment
Pedals	Years 1 and 2 basic road safety course in the playground for children on bikes, scooters and foot	1 hour	15 trainees with 2 Instructors	Service suspended – social distancing is not possible on this course
Bikeability Level 1	Year 4 balance and control skills in the playground	3 hours on one day	15 trainees with 2 Instructors	12 trainees with 2 Instructors
Bikeability Level 2	Year 6 cycling on roads with generally moderate traffic flows	7.5 hours over 5 days	8 trainees with 2 instructors	6 trainees with 2 instructors

Course	Description	Length	Maximum trainees pre-COVID-19	Maximum riders under COVID-19 risk assessment
Learn to Ride for under 18s	Any school age, for complete beginners	2 hours	1 trainee per Instructor, maximum number on course depends on space available	Service suspended – social distancing is not possible on this course
Holiday courses at fire stations	Demand has generally been for Level 1 and Level 2	According to course	According to course	Service suspended due to risk of introducing COVID-19 at fire stations
Private training for Surrey residents	All ages, according to the need of the customer	Generally 2.5 hours	Generally one-to-one	Suspended as lone working not permitted
Independent cycling to secondary school	New programme planned for this academic year	2 hours	3 trainees with 1 Instructor	Start delayed due to administrative and Instructor capacity

Table 2: The numbers of cycle training courses and pupils scheduled for the current academic year from September to March, compared with the same period last year

Course	September 2019 to 23 March 2020		September 2020 to 23 March 2021 (as scheduled 21 October 2020)	
	Number of Courses	Total Number of trainees	Number of Courses	Total Number of trainees
Pedals	107	1,420	0	0
Bikeability Level 1	128	1,924	199	2,108
Bikeability Level 2	379	3,234	418	2,456
Learn to Ride	25	64	0	0
Total	639	6,642	617	4,564

Mr Matt Furniss
Cabinet Member for Transport
27 October 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 27 OCTOBER 2020

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions

Question (1): Mr John A Ward

In the light of the confusing and contradictory information emanating from both Surrey CC and the Government over the issue of the potential creation of new Unitary Councils, will the Leader please inform the ratepayers if it is still the Council's policy and intention to proceed with the preparation of a bid for Surrey CC to become a single Surrey Unitary Council by abolition of the 11 Districts & Boroughs, how much has been spent so far in both internal and external costs (whether it continues or not) and an estimate of the future costs of this scheme?

Reply:

As I have said previously and consistently, what is most important, beyond any structural change or governance, is our residents, their priorities and giving them more influence over their own communities. The important work we've done over the last few months will continue to be developed, including giving residents a greater say in the things that matter most to them.

We have received notification from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, that as a consequence of resources across Whitehall and in local government being re-allocated to tackling Covid-19 and on economic recovery, we are not to be invited to submit proposals for devolution and the reform of local government at the present time.

What is important now is that there is an active dialogue between all tiers of local government to look at ways that we can improve the delivery of services to residents and wherever possible remove cost by innovation and transformation without reducing front line services. I hope that the District and Boroughs will share the report they have commissioned from KPMG which sets out a number of steps they can take to reduce costs for example by sharing services either with other District or Boroughs or with the County.

In order to determine the best model of local government for Surrey residents and make sure that any future devolution of power can be secured by our local communities, the Council initially spent £71,000 to undertake a thorough review of alternative scenarios and options. £107,000 has been spent on research and feasibility work to: i) develop a proposal around devolving decisions, responsibilities and resources to Surrey's natural, distinct local communities and more effective community engagement and ii) develop a full Business Case for a single unitary Council. As part of this, £30,000 has been spent on evaluating the financial resilience of local government in Surrey. In order to test residents' views, attitudes and opinions on alternative models of local government for Surrey, a specialist, professional independent research company were commissioned to undertake a statistically representative survey at a cost of £38,000. Much of the information derived from the above work will add significant value to our future work, particularly on local community networks.

Mr Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
27 October 2020



Question (2): Mr John Oliver

The 'Organisation Strategy 2021 – 2026', under 'People and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities', states "We will ... Improve access to the countryside, conserve and protect its biodiversity and work towards making it financially sustainable....".

Could you please let me know how much money is being allocated in the SCC budget to 'conserve and protect its biodiversity' as mentioned in the Strategy and would you please state each of the steps that:

- have been, or are being, put in place;
- are planned for introduction; and
- are being considered for introduction,

to implement the policy of making the countryside estate more financially sustainable, including at those sites where an access agreement is in place, and which organisations or individuals is the Council working with in respect of each of the steps mentioned in response to the first part of this question.

Reply:

As part of Surrey's Climate Change Strategy, which commits Surrey to be a carbon neutral county by 2050, the Council has committed to facilitate the planting of 1.2M trees in the next ten years, with an initial budget of £70,000. Trees are effective carbon traps, as well as providing multiple other benefits. The Council will work with partners, residents and community groups in encouraging planting as well as identifying areas of Surrey County Council (SCC) land, such as closed landfill sites, flood plains and low grade farmland where areas of new woodland can be planted. We have also created a fund for urban and highways tree planting.

Surrey's 1.2M tree agenda is part of a wider piece of work that the Council is currently undertaking. We are working alongside partners to develop a Land Management Framework (LMF), which will advise and inform decisions by land owners on how land and natural capital in the county is used, managed and protected. We recognise that our landscapes represent multiple benefits for residents, including health and social benefits associated with access to nature, clean air and benefits relating to climate change mitigation and adaptation. The landscapes and natural capital also provide biodiversity benefits and strengthens our local economy. With numerous possible competing future land uses, the LMF will enable the identification of land parcels most suited to particular interventions.

SCC owns or manages 10,000 acres of countryside land in its countryside estate. Approximately 6,500 acres of this land is owned by the Council and managed for both conservation and recreational purposes and 3,500 acres is managed for access under Access Agreements with private landowners. Between 2002 and 2020 this was all managed by Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) on SCC's behalf. On March 31st 2020 the Cabinet approved the implementation of a new model for managing this estate which supports its financial sustainability.

Under the new model SWT no longer receive financial support from SCC for carrying out conservation work on the estate but continue to have a lease for areas the council is responsible for conservation and protection of biodiversity. SWT apply for grants to carry out this work and SCC will support this work where possible and appropriate. The property on the estate is now managed by SCC and the rental income is used to finance the majority of the costs of the operational team in the Countryside Service and their work to provide visitor services on the estate. The new model was begun on 1st April 2020 with the legal and contractual changes finalised with SWT on 14th August 2020.

With regards to developing plans to ensure the SCC Countryside Estate is financially sustainable, this is still in early stages and will focus on supporting all residents to access the countryside whatever their background for health, well-being and educational reasons which we see as very essential, especially in view of how important the countryside has been throughout the recent COVID pandemic.

We are also working with our Land and Property Division to devise plans on how we manage our whole estate to provide additional benefits for nature. This work is in its early stages but will look at things like a pollinator action plan. Our biodiversity team is also advising on these plans, so they improve biodiversity both on the SCC estate but also through our services such as highways and flooding, working with partners across Surrey as a whole for example through the River Thames and other Flooding schemes. Initially this investment is mainly staff time but will result in some significant financial investment in natural capital schemes.

Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change
27 October 2020

Question (3): Ms Sally Blake

Surrey County Council committed to facilitate the planting of 1.2 million new trees in the county by 2030 as part of its climate change strategy. More than 100,000 new trees need to be planted each year to meet this target. The first of the new trees was planted on 5 October 2019.

Bearing in mind the tree planting season runs from November to March, and the Covid-19 lockdown did not start until 23 March 2020, please can you advise how this project is progressing?

It would be helpful if your answer could include:

1. how many new trees Surrey County Council has facilitated the planting of in the first year
2. how any shortfall will be made up
3. how the project is being monitored and reported on and how the public can find out details of progress

Reply:

The Council has committed to facilitate the planting of 1.2M new trees over the next ten years. Hedgerow planting is also in scope of this programme. During the 19/20 planting season

4b

approximately 11,000 new trees were planted by the Council and our Borough and District partners, however we are still waiting for some partners, including the Woodland Trust and the Forestry Commission, to provide their tree planting data for Surrey.

In order to increase the number of trees planted we are working to identify suitable sites for woodland planting. Sites that we are considering include closed landfill sites, low grade farmland and areas of wide highway verge, as well as extending existing woodland. We are also incorporating woodland planting within the River Thames Scheme, which is a flood defence scheme which will result in 106 ha of new public open space. The Council is committed that woodland creation will align with the commitments in Surrey's New Tree Strategy, namely that the right tree will be planted in the right place. The Council will not plant trees on our protected landscapes, including heathlands and downlands.

We have also launched a fund for the 20/21 planting season to cover the cost of tree planting in urban areas and along Surrey's highways. We are asking communities to contact their divisional county council members to make site suggestions for where trees can be planted. For more information please contact trees@surreycc.gov.uk

Officers are constantly monitoring where trees are planted in Surrey and we are producing a map of the county which will identify the approximate sites where new trees have been planted. This map will be updated at the end of the current planting season and will be accessible on the Surrey County Council website.

Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change
27 October 2020

CABINET- 27 October 2020

CABINET RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE NO WRONG DOOR TASK GROUP
(Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee)

Recommendations:

The Task Group recommends:

1. that Corporate Parenting not agree to terms of accreditation which will prevent the further development of Surrey County Council's No Wrong Door service.
2. that Corporate Parenting not agree to an accreditation fee which it considers to be disproportionate to the benefits of accreditation.
3. that the development and introduction of a No Wrong Door service in Surrey continue.
4. that Corporate Parenting undertake targeted work to foster a shared culture between No Wrong Door staff at an early stage of the implementation of the model; and develop clear lines of accountability for staff.
5. that Corporate Parenting have regard to the importance of the consistency of No Wrong Door key workers when developing those roles and the job descriptions therefore; and explore ways to promote the retention of key workers and other NWD staff.
6. that consistent support from the No Wrong Door team be emphasised, rather than consistent support from individual No Wrong Door staff members.
7. that designs for No Wrong Door hubs not be finalised until after the service has been operational for at least six months, including operating in shadow form.
8. that Corporate Parenting work with User Voice and Participation to agree a name for Surrey's No Wrong Door service other than 'No Wrong Door', if doing so is compatible with any terms of accreditation agreed with North Yorkshire County Council and will not significantly impair the recruitment of No Wrong Door staff.
9. that the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families report on the development, implementation and impact of the No Wrong Door, with reference to the recommendations of this report and agreed performance measures for the No Wrong Door, to the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee in October 2021, subject to the implementation of the No Wrong Door by April 2021.

Mrs Lesley Steeds
Chairman of the No Wrong Door Task Group

Cabinet Response:

I would like to thank the Task Group for their time and commitment in researching and considering evidence about the No Wrong Door™ model and its potential for implementation in Surrey.

As the Task Group has outlined in its report, it is imperative that Surrey finds alternatives to care for teenagers, who generally experience poorer outcomes than their peers if they become looked after in adolescence. In addition, a shortage of suitable local placements to meet their needs means that many are placed at considerable distance from their family home, in externally commissioned provision, at substantial cost to the council. This is not desirable or sustainable.

The findings of the Task Group are broadly welcomed, and we accept Recommendations 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9 in their entirety.

Recommendations 3 and 4

It is pleasing to note that the Task Group recognised the value of the No Wrong Door model for Surrey and endorsed implementation. We agree that developing a shared culture is key to success of the model and recognise that one of the underpinning foundations of the No Wrong Door model is the adherence to shared principles (in the ten Distinguishers[©] and Core Offer developed by North Yorkshire County Council) and shared practice framework and training for the multi-disciplinary staff team. Team events and learning and development days are planned to assist with building the team culture and solidifying the model of practice for all hub members, including those from a police and health background. It is recognised how fundamental this is to the model.

There will be clear secondment agreements for all staff not employed or managed by Surrey County Council. These will clarify the management and accountability for staff, arrangements for clinical supervision, day to day oversight, and prioritisation of tasks. There will be separate data-sharing agreements to ensure proper data protection arrangements are in place. Children's services have positive experience of such arrangements, as a result of staff seconded from areas such as probation in the Family Safeguarding Service.

Recommendations 5 and 6

We thank the Task Group for their attention to the matter of consistency of staff, recognising the importance of this for young people. The Task Group were particularly interested in recruitment and retention of children's social workers. To clarify, the No Wrong Door keyworker will be a worker from the children's home Hub, who will work alongside the young person's social worker. The staff retention package recently agreed by the People, Performance and Development Committee should help further with the stability of teams.

In response to the Task Group highlighting the potential impact of any difficulty in securing the right staff, we have looked again at recruitment and retention to ensure mitigation for any risks. The children's homes in Surrey have a good record of recruiting and retaining staff and it is not anticipated that this will be a significant problem. Staff turnover in the homes for the past 12 months has been 13.25% (20 staff out of 151), a number of whom retired after many years of service. This is below the national average for the sector.

We recognise and share the concern about the impact on young people of staff leaving, and of making unrealistic promises about consistency of staff and will take this recommendation on board in designing the service and the support from all Hub staff

Recommendation 7

It is anticipated that delivery of the No Wrong Door service will operate in shadow from early 2021 in one of the existing children's residential homes. Eventually the service will move to a purpose-built home in late 2021/22 depending on completion dates.

Whilst outline building design for the new-build hubs has been agreed (to ensure timely planning permission) we note the learning from other authorities regarding the completion of the hubs and will take this into account in our planning and design. This is an example where the support of North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) could be very helpful.

Recommendation 9

The continued support and interest of the Select Committee is welcomed, and we look forward to updating the committee on the implementation and impact of the No Wrong Door model.

Recommendation 8

We welcome the attention paid by the Task Group to consulting with young people as part of their call to evidence. The young people's views about the name of the model and their desire for the service in Surrey to have a different name are noted and we agree with the spirit of this recommendation. A full programme of user consultation and involvement in design of the No Wrong Door model has been discussed with the User Voice Group and will be a key part of implementation. This will include discussions about the name of the service, and any physical hubs/buildings. The 'No Wrong Door' name is now renowned and may attract staff and partners due to its successful history. It is the name of the model, rather than the name of a building or location, and as such young people would not necessarily be aware of the name in their day to day interaction with the Hub and Hub staff. We will fully consult with young people on this and other matters.

I respectfully suggest the Task Group to reconsider recommendations 1 and 2, which I cannot recommend the Cabinet to accept in their current iteration:

Recommendations 1 and 2

We are grateful to the Task Group for the consideration they gave to the matter of accreditation and for looking at this in such detail. We recognise that the tight timescale for the Task Group's work meant that detail from North Yorkshire County Council was not available to them at the time of the call for evidence, or publication of their report.

The Cabinet is well acquainted with the considerable improvements which were needed in Children's Services, following the Ofsted judgement of inadequate in 2018. In this context, I would advise the Cabinet that the No Wrong Door model developed by North Yorkshire County Council is evidence-based, has been positively evaluated and has improved outcomes for children and young people, and delivered financial savings for the multi-agency partners. Ofsted are therefore more likely to have confidence in Surrey's use of an accredited model; we are unlikely to have credibility as an inadequate authority, to develop our own version. Our focus since 2018 has been to adopt evidence-based best practice from other good and outstanding authorities, and this has been a significant difference from previous improvement work.

Nothing in the discussions so far with NYCC indicate that accreditation will prevent Surrey from being innovative or developing the service to meet local need. The ten distinguishers and core offer to young people outlined by North Yorkshire as the foundation of the model are compatible with any future development of the service in Surrey.

Since the Task Group's call to evidence, North Yorkshire has given greater detail about the accreditation offer. It is likely to be a 2-year period of support under a Service Level Agreement, which would include a specified number of days support and quality assurance as well as use of NYCC's trademarked material:

- Planned support for implementation and sustainability of the model including quality assurance activity
- Critical friend role at project boards including sharing of learning experience and journey in NYCC and elsewhere
- Final review closer to the end of the 2-year period including a report and recommendations for continued success

It is of note that almost all the features and design of No Wrong Door developed by NYCC are subject to copyright or trademark. If Surrey were to proceed without accreditation, it is suggested that legal advice is sought as to how the service could be developed along the lines of the No Wrong Door model without infringement of copyright or trademark.

The benefits of accreditation are more than just use of the intellectual property. Accreditation would give first-hand access to North Yorkshire's expertise and advice and would provide a layer of objective quality assurance of the service delivery.

North Yorkshire have indicated that the accreditation fee is likely to be in the region of £50,000 across a two-year period. To put this cost in context, the average cost of an externally commissioned residential placement for a teenager with complex needs is currently £4,374 per week (£227,448 a year), and the current most expensive placement is £8,065 per week (£419,380 per year). During this year we have averaged between 70 and 75 such placements and our total budget for external residential placements is £16.1million.

No Wrong Door has helped to reduce North Yorkshire's looked-after population by 18 per cent in five years and has led to a £2m year-on-year saving. The vast majority of young people (86 per cent) referred to No Wrong Door remained out of the care system and the use of residential placements has fallen by half.

We anticipate being able to make direct savings of at least £682,000 in the first year of operation and to avoid further costs of £1.2 million of children becoming looked after.

North Yorkshire County Council are looking to establish a network of practitioners of the No Wrong Door model, and accreditation would give access to this peer support network beyond the lifetime of the formal accreditation support. It is therefore a recommendation that accreditation is pursued.

Once again, I would like to thank the Chair and Members of the Task Group for their diligent and very helpful enquiry, which has provided some very welcome recommendations and food for thought.

**Reply from Mrs Mary Lewis
Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families
27 October 2020**

CABINET- 27 October 2020

CABINET RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE MENTAL HEALTH TASK GROUP

(Adults and Health Select Committee Select Committee)

Recommendations:

The Task Group recommends that:

1. Surrey County Council conducts a review of the nature and length of contracts currently offered to third sector providers, and that all future contracts are for a minimum of five years
2. Surrey County Council lobbies central government for more funding for mental health to enable further initiatives to achieve early intervention, and that a review is undertaken of third sector funding
3. A solution is found to the problems surrounding the sharing of data and IT infrastructure between the NHS, Surrey County Council and external providers to enable third sector organisations to fully and safely support those in their care, and that Surrey County Council and Surrey Heartlands liaise as a matter of urgency
4. Public Health undertakes an employer-focused mental health campaign in 2021 to help improve employer knowledge about mental health and ensure that Surrey employers are aware of how to access courses and training
5. From 2021, induction-level training in mental health awareness and suicide prevention is provided for all Surrey County Council members of staff and councillors, as well as all affiliated organisations
6. From 2021, frontline members of staff and decision makers from all public and health organisations in Surrey receive training so they use instructions and terminology with service users that are appropriate for those with mental health issues, learning disabilities and autism to ensure that those whose conditions are not immediately obvious are better served
7. From 2021, GPs receive regular training to ensure they understand how to use resources such as Surrey Information Point and Healthy Surrey, so that primary care partners are aware of what mental health services and third sector organisations are available in Surrey, and for these resources to be updated by Surrey County Council on a regular basis so that health partners can access all of the necessary information as easily and quickly as possible
8. Surrey County Council and Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust explore how they can work more closely together to ensure Surrey County Council social workers are involved as early as possible (including at the diagnosis stage) so that those with autism, Asperger's and/or learning disabilities – especially those with complex needs – are fully supported and potential mental health issues are identified

(Please note that details of further recommendations for NHS commissioners and providers can be found in the full Task Group report.)

Mr Nick Darby
Chairman of the Mental Health Task Group

Cabinet Response:

I welcome this report and the recommendations put forward by my colleagues on the Mental Health Task Group. I welcome the opportunity to raise mental health awareness and understanding across the whole system as this will help to address and reduce the inequalities people with mental ill health face. The importance of maintaining good mental health and wellbeing is paramount at this time.

Much of the substance of what has been presented is rightfully based on user feelings. In order to support our teams in continuing to drive forward transformative change, I understand that the Task Group will continue with their good work and explore these feelings further, in order to obtain more specific examples of where the system is potentially letting down some of our most vulnerable residents. This would allow us to better prioritise these areas and ensure best outcomes for all who use our services and I commend the task group's commitment to taking this initial piece of work to the next level.

Additionally, I would welcome further input on whether those who fed into this task group were seeking clinical or general support or whether they were ASC clients (i.e. in need of/in receipt of a package of care and support). Once again, this would also allow us to ensure that where there are service issues or challenges, that this can be dealt with quickly and with the necessary resourcing.

I recognise the integral role of the voluntary sector in the delivery of mental health support and wish to resource the sector fairly. An increase in funding from central government would be welcomed, although I have noted the Section 151 officer's commentary regarding the economic outlook, which means that work will need to be done within existing financial resources.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognise and thank the voluntary sector for their contribution to improving people's outcomes and stepping up rapidly to different service delivery options after the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Implementation of the recommendations will need strong collaborative work with system partners from the NHS, third sector and other key colleagues including departments across the Council such as procurement and Children's services.

Reply from Mrs Sinead Mooney
Cabinet Member for Adults and Public Health
27 October 2020