

Cabinet-Supplementary Agenda

**Date & time**

Tuesday, 28
September 2021 at
2.00 pm

Place

Council Chamber,
Woodhatch Place, 11
Cockshot Hill, Reigate,
Surrey ,RH2 8EF

Contact

Vicky Hibbert or Huma
Younis
Tel 020 8541 9229 or
07866899016

Chief Executive

Joanna Killian



We're on Twitter:
@SCCdemocracy

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

Cabinet Members: Natalie Bramhall, Clare Curran, Matt Furniss, Marisa Heath, Sinead Mooney, Mark Nuti, Tim Oliver, Becky Rush and Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members: Maureen Attewell, Steve Bax and Kevin Deanus

4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

a Members' Questions

(Pages 1
- 8)

There are nine Member questions. A response from Cabinet is attached.

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

(Pages 9
- 16)

Cabinet to consider the following:

- A. Scrutiny of the procurement of highways' term maintenance contract and the policy on the use of safety cameras in Surrey (Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee). A response from Cabinet is attached.

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive
Monday, 27 September 2021

QUESTIONS, PETITIONS AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS

The Cabinet will consider questions submitted by Members of the Council, members of the public who are electors of the Surrey County Council area and petitions containing 100 or more signatures relating to a matter within its terms of reference, in line with the procedures set out in Surrey County Council's Constitution.

Please note:

1. Members of the public can submit one written question to the meeting. Questions should relate to general policy and not to detail. Questions are asked and answered in public and so cannot relate to "confidential" or "exempt" matters (for example, personal or financial details of an individual – for further advice please contact the committee manager listed on the front page of this agenda).
2. The number of public questions which can be asked at a meeting may not exceed six. Questions which are received after the first six will be held over to the following meeting or dealt with in writing at the Chairman's discretion.
3. Questions will be taken in the order in which they are received.
4. Questions will be asked and answered without discussion. The Chairman or Cabinet Members may decline to answer a question, provide a written reply or nominate another Member to answer the question.
5. Following the initial reply, one supplementary question may be asked by the questioner. The Chairman or Cabinet Members may decline to answer a supplementary question.

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, Surrey County Council 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

CABINET – 28 SEPTEMBER 2021**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Catherine Baart (Earlswood and Reigate South):****Addressing the Climate Funding and Policy Gap**

Surrey County Council has an approved climate change strategy with goals and targets verified and agreed. The strategy and targets have been promoted across Surrey to members, residents and stakeholders. The County Council is now working on a climate change delivery plan which is due for Cabinet approval later this year. The government has recently appointed Michael Gove MP as the new Secretary of State for Housing, Levelling-Up and Communities, which includes Local Government. How will Surrey County Council work with the Mr Gove's department to bridge the funding and policy gaps between the Council's climate strategy and targets and the financial resources and powers available to the Council.

Reply:

Surrey County Council is working across multiple government departments to ensure we are able to meet our climate change strategy goals. We have a very close relationship with Michael Gove and his team as a result of his status as a Surrey member of parliament and in his role as a senior member of the government.

We have also been working with Neil O'Brien over the past few months as part of his role as head of the government's Levelling Up Unit, while Guildford MP Angela Richardson has also been appointed parliamentary private secretary at LUHC. At the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, we are working closely with Secretary of State Kwasi Kwarteng (another Surrey MP) and his team. We are also working closely with the other MPs from Surrey to brief them on the activities of SCC in this area and how they might be able to support us in our dealings with the government.

The Cabinet Office is the lead department for the COP26 Summit in Glasgow, taking place in November and we are working with Alok Sharma and his officials there to see how we can support across a number of areas, including transport, communities and youth empowerment. We have recently been successful in a funding bid to deliver a COP26 Green Zones event focussing on decarbonising transport in a rural county. The event will take place on 10 November.

Finally, we have recently signed up to UK100, a network of local authority leaders committed to making the transition to net zero. All of this work is designed to highlight the positive work that SCC is doing presently and to seek government support in the form of extra funding, new powers and as a potential pilot area around climate change and meeting our net zero ambitions.

Marisa Heath
Cabinet Member for Environment
28 September 2021

Question (2) Catherine Baart (Earlswood and Reigate South):**Expenditure on Procurement Contracts**

For the top 10 most valuable current procurement contracts please provide the starting date, title, directorate, financial value, recipient, location (whether in Surrey) and procurement period.

Reply:

Annex 1 details the top 10 largest contractual arrangement that Surrey County Council has for its third-party expenditure, by Contract Name, Contract Description, Directorate, Supplier Name, Expected Value over contract duration, Start Date, End Date, Post Code (invoice address) and Location. The Hard FM tender contract represents a Framework agreement with numerous contractual entities, across Surrey, East Sussex and Brighton & Hove authorities.

Becky Rush**Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources****28 September 2021****Question (3) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):****Gatwick Airport Public Consultation**

A public consultation on turning Gatwick's stand-by runway into a second runway started on 9th September and runs until 1st December. Surrey County Council is one of the ten councils around the airport that has formally been asked to respond to the consultation. Please can you confirm how the following three aspects will be reflected in the Council's response: the Council's briefing for councillors on the 25th October; the local transport and environmental impacts these plans would have on Surrey's residents; and the Council's declaration of a Climate Emergency in Surrey.

Reply:

The County Council's proposed response will be taken to Cabinet on 30th November. Consultation material has been circulated to the relevant council services including Highways and Transport, Flood and Climate Resilience and Greener Futures for specialist officers to consider the potential impacts of the project on Surrey residents and businesses. Their comments will inform the Council's response. The response will also take account of comments made by members at the briefing session on the 25th October.

Matt Furniss**Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure****28 September 2021****Question (4) Catherine Baart (Earlswood and Reigate South):**

I note that in the Highways Spotlight the number of trees and whips is mentioned. Whips were planted along the new road linking Westvale to A23 near Horley to create a hedge. Unfortunately, these whips were planted in May, which is outside the usual winter planting season and, unsurprisingly, the majority of the whips are now dead. Please explain how quality assurance operates for planting trees and whips along roads by contractors.

Reply:

The whips have not been planted or arranged by the County Council. They were installed by a developer as part of a new highway scheme serving a development. Prior to the area being adopted as public highway the site will be inspected; it will be for the developer to ensure that the conditions of their planning approval are met. Officers were already aware of this and they would expect any failed trees to be replaced.

The County Council's highways team always looks to plant whips in the winter months to give them the best chance of survival.

Matt Furniss
Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure
28 September 2021

Question (5) Catherine Baart (Earlswood and Reigate South):

Please can you tell me how many applications for highway trees have been approved by the county council and then the decision later reversed. How can the process for approving the positioning of highway trees be improved?

Reply:

The County Council introduced a revised policy for tree planting in April 2019. Officers have advised of two locations (in Runnymede) where trees were planted but had to be removed at the request of a statutory undertaker. There are no other sites Officers are aware of.

To improve the level of service, specific training is being undertaken to ensure there is a consistent level of service across the County. For any site not approved, Officers have been asked to provide full reasons in future. The team are currently recruiting a new Environmental Officer post to support this important work and help to speed up the assessment of new planting requests.

Matt Furniss
Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure
28 September 2021

Question (6) Will Forster (Woking South):

Please can the Council confirm what public transport support is available for staff and members travelling to Woodhatch Place?

Reply:

It is our desire, as part of our Greener Futures agenda, to encourage the use of public transport as much as we can, for travelling to and from all our buildings across the county, including Woodhatch Place.

Currently Redhill Train Station is connected to Woodhatch Place by bus routes 420, 424, 460 (all hourly) and 430, 435 (every 30 minutes). The bus stops for these routes are between a 4 minute and 12 minute walk from Woodhatch Place. The bus routes pass through and serve residential areas and are all stopping services between Woodhatch and Redhill.

To understand what further provision may be required we will be running a scheme from October to Christmas to collect data on journeys between Redhill Station, Reigate Station and Woodhatch Place. Staff will be able to claim a 75% expense on a taxi journey between these sites whilst providing us with data on frequency and volume. We will be encouraging the shared use of taxis during this scheme.

The data from this scheme will inform how viable an additional public bus service might be, to also serve residents across the Woodhatch, Reigate and Redhill area. We want to make sure that any long-term provision demonstrates value for money, hence we are taking the time now to fully understand likely demand and the options available to us. It should be noted that Members are entitled to a 100% taxi expense already.

For larger events taking place at Woodhatch Place over the coming months we are looking at ad-hoc mini-bus provision on a need basis, provided by one of our not-for-profit transport providers. Again, demand for this service will inform the need for a more sustainable solution.

To support staff and Members to make informed travel planning choices, there is now a personalised travel planning service available, bookable via the intranet. This service identifies the best public travel options between any two sites, considering any accessibility requirements where needed.

Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
28 September 2021

Question (7) Will Forster (Woking South):

Surrey County Council has previously agreed to introduce 11 rainbow crossings as a way to celebrate LGBTQ+ communities and the diversity of Surrey. Please can the Council confirm what progress has been made on this undertaking? What locations have been identified, and when will the rainbow crossings be installed?

Reply:

I am pleased to confirm that the first rainbow crossing was installed at Flambard Way in Godalming on 24 September, in advance of, and to compliment the Pride in Surrey Parade.

The County Council has worked closely with Pride in Surrey and Officers have identified ten other potential sites, one within each District. The intention is to install these over the coming year. Discussions are still to be held with the relevant Divisional Members, but once the sites are formally agreed a full list will be circulated to all Members.

Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
28 September 2021

Question (8 & 9) Will Forster (Woking South):

Adult Social Care

What effect will the upcoming deadline for mandatory vaccination against Covid 19 have on the staffing of the Council's care homes?

What will be the knock-on effect on the Council's social care provision if private care homes experience reduced staffing levels due to the vaccination requirement?

Reply:

Adult Social Care have planned very carefully for the change in legislation and have been supported by the council's HR and Legal teams. A small number of staff employed at in-house care homes have been identified who have declined COVID-19 vaccinations.

The council has proactively engaged staff in conversation and as a result some have reconsidered. The council continues to engage with staff who have confirmed their intention not to be vaccinated and, where continuing to decline, supporting them to leave the organisation. Please be reassured that the numbers are small and will not impact on the council's ability to safely operate services.

Staffing challenges have existed throughout the pandemic and the council will continue working closely with all care home providers in Surrey, as it has done throughout the pandemic. Through the use of the Capacity Tracker, a real time system on which providers report a range of service continuity measures including staffing, our collaborative approach with our NHS partners along with Surrey Care Association has allowed us to identify any concerns early so that our support, where needed, can be targeted and proportionate. This approach has ensured that care homes in Surrey, including those operated by the council, have maintained service continuity for all Surrey residents living in care homes throughout the pandemic. While there are some care home staff working for private care home providers that have declined to be vaccinated, private providers have adopted a similar approach to the council and have been proactively working with their care staff for some time to support them to reconsider and where this is not possible leaving their organisations.

Sinead Mooney
Cabinet Member for Adults and Health
28 September 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

Contract Name	Contract Description	Directorate	Supplier Name	Value over contract duration	Start Date	End Date	Supplier ID	Post Code	Location
1 SCC Waste Disposal Project Agreement - 03184332P01v001 (1)	Contract for the disposal of all waste for which the Council is responsible under Section 51 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 as waste disposal authority for the County of Surrey taking into account the Council's environmental objectives.	SCC Environment, Transport & Infrastructure	SUEZ Recycling & Recovery UK Ltd	£1,250,000,000	22/06/1999	19/09/2024	199676	BS22 6WA	50% of spend considered 'Local' - Invoice address outside of Surrey
2 SCC Highways Core Maintenance Contract - (Lot 1).	To provide all reactive and routine maintenance and delivery of projects and minor tasks on the highway network. NB - May Gurney were taken over by Kier Group on 08/07/2013	SCC Environment, Transport & Infrastructure	Kier Highways Ltd	£410,000,000	28/04/2011	26/04/2022	502419	M2 5JB	17% of spend considered 'Local' - Invoice address outside of Surrey
2 SCC - DM - DW Surrey Childrens Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Service for Children & Young People (EWMH)	Surrey Childrens Emotional Wellbeing & Mental Health Services for Children & Young People	SCC Children, Families & Learning	Surrey & Borders Partnership NHS Tr	£240,475,000	01/04/2021	31/03/2028	129458	WF3 1WE	80% of spend considered 'Local' - Invoice address outside of Surrey
4 SCC Agreement relating to the redevelopment of certain residential care homes and provision of facilities management and care services in connection there with for a period not exceeding 25 years	Surrey CC's 25 Year block contract with Care UK for residential and daycare services.	SCC Health, Wellbeing & ASC	Care UK Community Partnerships Ltd	£175,000,000	07/01/2002	06/01/2027	101088	CO4 9QB	73% of spend considered 'Local' - Invoice address outside of Surrey
5 SCC LP Orbis Planned Maintenance Works Framework	Hard FM services	SCC Resources	Effective Innovations Ltd Emcor Facilities Services Ltd European Asbestos Services Fowler Building Contractors Ltd G Baker Roofing Ltd GM MONK LTD G E Building Services Keltbray Ltd Knightsbridge Property Services AJ Taylor Electrical Contractors Lt AMSTECH CONTRACTS LTD Bramber Construction Co Ltd Aspect Contracts Ltd Breyer Group Plc CEI Electrical Ltd Clarke Roofing Southern Limited Colours Decorating Ltd Corrigenda Ltd Cosmur Construction (London) Ltd Ductclean UK Ltd Edgar & Wood Mechanical Services Lt M & J Group, Construction & Roofing Ltd Management & Construction Services Limited Managing Property Maintenance Ltd Niblock (Builders) Ltd P A Group UK Ltd Paine Manwaring Ltd R B Construction Group Ltd Trojan Rose Ltd Walker Construction (UK) Ltd Wessex Commercial Division West End Roofing & Construction Ltd Woods Building Services Ltd	£72,000,000 (Framework Value)	01/07/2019	30/06/2022	503180 500383 502159 501294 503144 502599 501929 146137 503169 502694 501000 502693 500577 500334 501809 502692 502414 501974 502284 184622 503177 502698 500183 501995 501628 503175 502699 502690 502704 500040 501007 502099 503174	BN22 9BN SO53 3YE TW16 7EF RH13 8BS ME20 7BT BN27 2AE KT22 7AH SW18 1EY CR0 0XZ BN2 4AW BN9 0DU BN43 6RE SS14 3DS RM3 8ST SO30 2FY BN23 6PW TN37 6PU PO15 7AF NW6 6NU AL7 1JQ BN41 1UY MK41 0UD GU22 8BF KT17 2LN SE20 8AJ DA2 8EA BN14 8HQ RH15 9NB BN27 4EW TN25 4AB SO23 7QA SO31 4RF CM20 2DP	Various locations - this framework covers Hard FM delivery to Orbis Councils (SCC, ESCC and B&HCC)
6 SCC Contract for the provision of various support services	Contract for the provision of various support services	SCC Health, Wellbeing & ASC	Surrey Choices Ltd	£69,695,989	18/08/2019	31/03/2022	185451	KT12 1RD	Elmbridge
7 SCC Children's Community Health Services	Joint contract with the NHS. Lead commissioner is Guildford and Waverley CCG. SCC services covered include 0-19 Health Child Programme (school nursing and health visiting), OT, physiotherapy, Parent Infant Mental Health	SCC Strategy & Commissioning	Surrey Healthy Children & Families	£69,511,960	01/04/2017	31/03/2022	199256	KT22 7AD	Mole Valley
8 SCC Lease of Phase 1 of the Countryside Estate Surrey to Surrey Wildlife Trust	Contract between Surrey Count Council and SWT. SWT to manage and maintain SCC Countryside sites	SCC Environment, Transport & Infrastructure	Surrey Wildlife Trust	£52,000,000	01/05/2002	31/03/2052	103213	GU24 0JN	Guildford
9 SCC National Contract for the Placement of Children and Young People in Day and Residential Independent and Non-Maintained Special Schools (Revised) note Evergreen = no end date - 05554772P01v001	Contract for the Provision of Services for Learners with Special Education Needs, a Learning Difficulty or a Disability	SCC Children, Families & Learning	Cambain Whinell School Ltd	£44,963,613	04/02/2009	01/04/2099	184705	EN6 1AG	Invoice Address outside of Surrey
10 SCC National Contract for the Placement of Children and Young People in Day and Residential Independent and Non-Maintained Special Schools (Revised) note Evergreen = no end date - 02919225P01v001	V13 - Contract for the Provision of Services for Learners with Special Education Needs, a Learning Difficulty or a Disability	SCC Children, Families & Learning	The Radius Trust	£43,755,664	01/09/2003	01/04/2099	183058	GU5 0LH	Waverley

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL'S SELECT COMMITTEES

SCRUTINY OF:

- PROCUREMENT OF HIGHWAYS' TERM MAINTENANCE CONTRACT
- POLICY ON THE USE OF SAFETY CAMERAS IN SURREY

Date Considered: 16 September 2021

Select Committee: Communities, Environment and Highways

PROCUREMENT OF HIGHWAYS' TERM MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

1. The Select Committee welcomed the report on the Procurement of the Term Maintenance Contract and some of the key features of the new arrangements scheduled to start in April 2022.
2. The questions posed by the Committee to Cabinet Members and officers, together with the report, provided a sound insight into how over the past 12 months, Surrey County Council had overseen an exhaustive, complex procurement process to drive the best outcomes in each of the bidder's tenders. The Select Committee understood that Council had undertaken a Competitive Procedure with Negotiation (CPN) procurement exercise which allowed both the Council and bidders to discuss and develop their proposals in several stages allowing open discussion and negotiation to enable each bidder to eventually put forward their very best submission.
3. The Select Committee noted that the process to finalise the new contractor was to formally conclude soon with a report for the Cabinet at its next meeting to approve the award of the Term Maintenance Contract to the successful bidder and to delegate authority to finalise and enter into Contract with the successful bidder. Confidential information about this process and the name of the successful provider had been shared with the Members of the Select Committee privately before its meeting. The Committee was grateful to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure for this commitment to collaborative working.
4. The Select Committee was reassured to learn that following Cabinet award, the Council would work with the successful contractor's Senior Management Teams to implement their mobilisation plan. Also, a

communication plan would be developed and implemented to advise stakeholders on the award to the successful bidder.

5. This summary report provides recommendations raised by the Select Committee to the Cabinet and requests that its recommendations be taken on board.

Recommendations:

While supporting the contents of the Report and the rigorous process leading to the award of the contract, the Committee:

- i. Urges timely and robust details of the specific improvements Surrey residents will be expecting from this new contract, particularly regarding the reporting of and quality of work on potholes and other highways matters and the overriding importance of 'Right First Time'.
- ii. Seeks early publication of the chosen contractor's commitment to "improve engagement with residents" and improve communication with them on planned works etc. and collaboration more generally. This should also involve elected Divisional members. The Reference Group of Councillors which has been involved throughout the contracting process can play a constructive role in helping shape these.
- iii. Asks that a robust process remains in place for the transition phase and initiated for mobilisation period.
- iv. Suggests that unannounced and random spot checks on a regular basis be considered as part of an effective contractual management process; the contract is easy to understand with strong governance and monitoring provisions for dispute resolution mechanism and in an unlikely termination scenario from Surrey County Council's perspective.
- v. Proposes that more publicity/communication be considered for social value activities and projects undertaken as part of the new partnership.

POLICY ON THE USE OF SAFETY CAMERAS IN SURREY

1. The Select Committee received a report outlining a new policy setting out the criteria and process that would be followed for investment in new safety cameras. Overall, the Select Committee members were very supportive of the scheme and appreciated the information provided to them in the report.
2. The questions posed by the Committee to Cabinet Members and officers, together with the report, provided insight into the key aspects of this update and proposed changes which included average speed, spot speed, red-light and combination cameras. While road casualty

hotspots would remain the top priority, the policy also set out the criteria for the use of safety cameras at other locations where there might not have been such a high level of collisions, but where excess speeds are a concern for the community.

3. In Members' questions, a spotlight was shed on the ability of members to use their divisional highways allocation to request possible introduction of cameras at relevant local 'community concern' sites without unnecessary obstacles. Broader queries were also raised about the new Local Transport Plan and the ease of establishing 20 mph zones and 20-minute communities, enforcement of moving traffic offences and heavy good vehicles.
4. This summary provides recommendations raised by the Select Committee to the Cabinet and requests that these be considered by the Cabinet in arriving at their decision at their meeting.

Recommendations:

The Select Committee supports the proposed revisions and specifically endorses the creation of the "community concern" sites that may become eligible for cameras but cautions that:

- i. Any unrealistic expectations among residents are not raised about new average speed cameras.
- ii. In exploring alternative options before the use of cameras in "community concern" areas, these options themselves do not become a reason (costs etc.) resulting in no decision is ever reached.
- iii. Members should be able to request, wherever appropriate, spot cameras for a community concern site using their respective divisional highways allocation and other sources without unnecessary constraints.
- iv. A roadmap of the process and prioritisation of requests – existing and new – be put in place and communicated accordingly to all relevant stakeholders.

John O'Reilly
Chairman of the Community, Environment & Highways Select
Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET - 28 SEPTEMBER 2021**CABINET RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE COMMUNITIES, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS SELECT COMMITTEE****A. PROCUREMENT OF HIGHWAYS' TERM MAINTENANCE CONTRACT****Recommendations:**

While supporting the contents of the Report and the rigorous process leading to the award of the contract, the Committee:

- i. Urges timely and robust details of the specific improvements Surrey residents will be expecting from this new contract, particularly regarding the reporting of and quality of work on potholes and other highways matters and the overriding importance of 'Right First Time'.
- ii. Seeks early publication of the chosen contractor's commitment to "improve engagement with residents" and improve communication with them on planned works etc. and collaboration more generally. This should also involve elected Divisional members. The Reference Group of Councillors which has been involved throughout the contracting process can play a constructive role in helping shape these.
- iii. Asks that a robust process remains in place for the transition phase and initiated for mobilisation period.
- iv. Suggests that unannounced and random spot checks on a regular basis be considered as part of an effective contractual management process; the contract is easy to understand with strong governance and monitoring provisions for dispute resolution mechanism and in an unlikely termination scenario from Surrey County Council's perspective.
- v. Proposes that more publicity/communication be considered for social value activities and projects undertaken as part of the new partnership.

John O'Reilly

Chairman of the Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee

Cabinet Response:

Cabinet is grateful for the Select Committee's consideration of the Procurement of the Highway's Contract and welcome their recommendations. I can respond to each numbered recommendation as follows.

- i. We are also keen to share details of the improvements Residents can expect to see from the new contract and will ensure this happens at the earliest opportunity. This is likely to be addressed in various stages over the coming months as the formalities of the new contract are finalised and the communications plan is developed in more detail.
- ii. We remain committed to improving engagement with Residents and Members on highway activities. Over recent years we made several improvements in this area such as introducing a dedicated Works Communication Team to provide timely

information about schemes and engage directly with residents. We have also improved the website reporting function for highway issues and regularly promote our activities and share information on schemes via social media. We now can build further on this with the start of a new contract. Officers would welcome the opportunity to work with the Reference Group to discuss how best to achieve this recommendation.

- iii. We can confirm that detailed plans will be in place to manage the transition and mobilisation period. This will be supported by a robust governance structure and Officers can update the Reference Group throughout the period as necessary.
- iv. Monitoring the performance of the current contract has been vital to ensuring the successful delivery of our highway services. We have demonstrated that we can work effectively within the contractual mechanisms to challenge and make improvements where needed. We currently already have dedicated resources carrying out a compliance role across the contract, which is also supported by our technical Materials Laboratory function. We will build on these strengths in the new contract and continue to utilise a range of management mechanisms, including random quality checks. The revised governance structure will support all parties to ensure the contract is operating effectively and respond to any performance issues in a timely and appropriate manner.
- v. As described above, we have been increasing our publicity and communication activity in Highways over recent years. Information about the new social value activities and projects will be included as part of the overall improved communications activity when the contract starts.

Matt Furniss
Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure
28 September 2021

B. POLICY ON THE USE OF SAFETY CAMERAS IN SURREY

Recommendations:

The Select Committee supports the proposed revisions and specifically endorses the creation of the “community concern” sites that may become eligible for cameras but cautions that:

- i. Any unrealistic expectations among residents are not raised about new average speed cameras.
- ii. In exploring alternative options before the use of cameras in “community concern” areas, these options themselves do not become a reason (costs etc.) resulting in no decision is ever reached.
- iii. Members should be able to request, wherever appropriate, spot cameras for a community concern site using their respective divisional highways allocation and other sources without unnecessary constraints.
- iv. A roadmap of the process and prioritisation of requests – existing and new – be put in place and communicated accordingly to all relevant stakeholders.

John O'Reilly
Chairman of the Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee

Cabinet Response:

Cabinet is grateful to the select committee for their comments. Taking each numbered recommendation in turn:

- i. We would agree that it will be important to communicate the new policy and criteria to Members and residents to help ensure that expectations are not raised unnecessarily. A public facing summary of the policy will be provided on the county council's website and a briefing will be provided to Members that will clearly explain the circumstances when cameras will or will not be allowed. Within this it will be important to advise of the typical costs and funding required to implement new safety camera sites.
- ii. An important principle in the use of safety cameras is that they will only be used as a last resort after safety engineering measures have been considered first. This is a principle strongly supported by Surrey Police. The county council work closely with Surrey Police to develop speed management plans for every Borough and District in Surrey. These list the sites where speeding is a problem and the action that will be taken by the Police and the county council to address these concerns. There are currently hundreds of sites on the speed management plans, and clearly there would not be the resources to deliver nor the capacity to administer safety cameras at every such site. Therefore, safety cameras will only be considered when there is no engineering alternative to tackle the identified problem. It is far better use of public money to solve speeding problems with engineering measures wherever possible without the need to process offences and prosecute court cases enduringly. This approach also helps retain public support for safety cameras rather than them being seen incorrectly as a revenue raising tool.
- iii. We would support Members being able to use the Local/Joint Committee highway capital allocation for implementing spot speed cameras at community concern sites. The only constraints within the policy are ones to ensure that cameras are targeted at sites where speeding is confirmed, and where alternative engineering solutions are not viable (for the reasons described above). There may be other technical limitations depending on the physical characteristics and layout of the site and the availability of a power supply, which officers will be able to advise upon.
- iv. We would agree that it will be important to set out the process whereby requests for new safety camera sites will be assessed, prioritised and communicated to stakeholders and residents. We would envisage that this will be included within the public facing summary of the policy on the county council's website and within the briefing to Members. The process will be overseen by the Surrey Safer Roads Partnership Board.

Matt Furniss
Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure
28 September 2021

This page is intentionally left blank