

COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING – 11 DECEMBER 2012

MINUTES of the Meeting of the County Council held at the County Hall, Kingston upon Thames on Tuesday 11 December 2012 commencing at 10:30am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Mrs Sealy – Chairman
Mr Munro – Vice-Chairman

* Mr Agarwal	Mr Ivison
* Mr Amin	Mrs Kemeny
Mrs Angell	* Mrs King
Mr Barker OBE	Mr Kington
* Mr Beardsmore	Mr Lake
* Mr Bennison	Mr Lambell
Mrs Bowes	Mrs Lay
* Mr Brett-Warburton	Ms Le Gal
Mr Butcher	* Mr MacLeod
Mr Carasco	Mr Mallett MBE
* Mr Chapman	Mrs Marks
Mrs Clack	Mr Marlow
Mrs Coleman	Mr Martin
Mr Cooksey	Mrs Mason
Mr Cooper	Mrs Moseley
Mr Cosser	* Mrs Nichols
Mrs Curran	Mr Norman
* Mr Elias	* Mr Orrick
* Mr Ellwood	* Mr Phelps-Penry
Mr Few	Mr Pitt
Mr Forster	Dr Povey
Mrs Fraser DL	Mr Renshaw
Mr Frost	* Mrs Ross-Tomlin
Mrs Frost	Mrs Saliagopoulos
Mr Fuller	Mr Samuels
Mr Furey	Mrs Searle
Mr Gimson	Mr Skellett CBE
* Mr Goodwin	Mrs Smith
Mr Gosling	Mr Sydney
Dr Grant-Duff	Mr Colin Taylor
Dr Hack	Mr Keith Taylor
Mr Hall	Mr Townsend
Mrs Hammond	Mrs Turner-Stewart
Mr Harmer	Mr Walsh
Mr Harrison	Mrs Watson
Ms Heath	Mrs White
Mr Hickman	Mr Witham
Mrs Hicks	Mr Wood
Mr Hodge	Mr Young

*absent

96/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Agarwal, Mr Bennison, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Chapman, Mr Elias, Mr Ellwood, Mr Goodwin, Mrs King, Mr MacLeod, Mrs Nichols, Mr Orrick and Mrs Ross-Tomlin.

97/12 MINUTES [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 16 October 2012, were submitted, confirmed and signed.

98/12 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- Urgent item – Frances King

RESOLVED:

That Mrs Frances King may continue to be absent from meetings by reason of her ill health, if necessary until May 2013 and looks forward to welcoming her back in due course.

- Remembrance Events – it had been a successful remembrance season with Councillors getting involved in their communities and also with the service at the cathedral.
- She considered that the Olympics and HM Queen's Diamond Jubilee had resulted in this being a fantastic year for Surrey and for public service. In particular, she mentioned her interest in the disability agenda and the recent Royal visit to Moor House School.
- The importance of the preventative agenda and community safety and working together with other organisations.
- Keith Robson from Surrey Enterprise Park was the lunchtime speaker today.
- That the Chairman's Christmas reception had been successful and that the Members Christmas lunch was on 13 December 2012.

99/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

100/12 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

The Leader made a statement. A detailed copy of his statement is attached as Appendix A.

Members were invited to make comments and ask questions.

101/12 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROGRESS REPORT JULY - DECEMBER 2012
[Item 6]

The Leader introduced the Surrey County Council Progress Report – June - December 2012, the seventh of the Chief Executive's six monthly reports to Members and welcomed the latest report and its findings. He was pleased to report the continued strong progress.

The report had been discussed with the Chief Executive at a recent Members' seminar where the debate had focused on the number of extraordinary events and challenges over the last six months, including the significant task of running a safe and successful Olympics and Paralympics. The report also highlighted a wide range of stories and examples across the council.

Members made the following key points:

- A request for the Leader's plans on the future economic prospects for Surrey.
- That the report illustrated the strength of SCC staff and the political leadership and the scrutiny process.
- That the County Council was effective and worked hard for its residents.
- The importance of investing in early intervention and prevention in Adult Social Care, which could save money in the long term.
- That 61% of residents felt that they could not influence council decisions.
- The roll out of Broadband would shortly begin in earnest and therefore increased use of video links should reduce the need for business travel across the county.
- The importance of strengthening SCC's capacity and capability to innovate.

After the debate, it was:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Chief Executive be noted.
- (2) That the staff of the Council be thanked for the progress made during the last six months.
- (3) That the support for the direction of travel be confirmed.

102/12 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Notice of 16 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix B.

A number of supplementary questions were asked and a summary of the main points is set out below:

(Q1) Mrs Watson said that there was no room for complacency as she considered was demonstrated in the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning's response and asked her to comment further. The Cabinet Member disagreed and said that the key driver to school improvement were Headteachers and holding them to account. She quoted statistics from the recent OFSTED inspection outcomes of maintained schools inspected between 1 September 2011 to 31 August 2012 and highlighted nationally accredited Surrey schools such as Esher High, George Abbot and South Farnham Schools.

(Q2) Mr Forster requested that the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment ensured that the correct signs and legal processes outlined in his answer were available for the next parking reviews, to be considered at local committees in June. This was agreed.

(Q4) Mrs White requested that the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, who agreed, that the presentation of the Peer Review of partnership arrangements in Children, Schools and Families was circulated to all Members.

(Q8) Mr Kington said that the response had not addressed the issue of additional funding and asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment whether he would agree to use part of the £0.5m underspend in the Environment and Infrastructure Directorate to fund his request. The Cabinet Member declined to give this undertaking but agreed to bring this issue to the attention of highways officers and then respond with a timescale for the work, outside the meeting.

(Also, Q8) Mr Mallett asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment about the legality of zigzag lines outside schools that no longer existed and whether he could authorise their removal. The Cabinet Member agreed to provide the legal details for him. He also informed him that officers from the parking team were in the process of visiting all Surrey schools and changes would be made after consultation locally.

(Q9) Mr Colin Taylor asked the Chairman of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee for clarification on the timescale for a review of the democratic structures and was advised that it could take place during the first year of the new Administration.

(Q10) Mr Butcher asked the Leader of the Council whether he would welcome an investigation into Members being informed of matters relating to their division. The Leader confirmed that the Cabinet had already agreed a process for communications with Members and cited the work of the Public Value Review and the work being taking forward on the theme – Think Councillor, Think Resident.

(Also Q10) Mrs Frost sympathised with Mr Butcher and welcomed the work being done to improve communications with Members. **Mr Lake** made reference to a protocol concerning Members visiting in other Member divisions.

(Q11) Mrs Watson asked the Leader of the Council for assurance that all options would be considered before a final decision was made about a Magna Carta Visitor Centre. She was advised that the decision taken by the Cabinet was 'in principle' and that officers had been instructed to do further work on this topic and report back to Cabinet.

(Q12) Mr Forster asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, who confirmed, that in future accurate information was provided to Members in response to questions.

(Q13) Mr Colin Taylor requested a list of the 10 Community Partnered Libraries (CPLs) with the timescales for their implementation programme. The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games said that the timescales had changed. She also said that it was her intention to visit all CPLs to help them deliver their goals. Finally, she offered to circulate the revised timescales to Members and to meet with Mr Taylor outside the meeting to discuss any of his concerns.

(Q14) Dr Povey referred to the option, taken up by the newly elected Police Commissioner, to appoint a Deputy Commissioner and asked the Leader of the Council whether he would agree that residents would rather have extra police officers. The Leader responded by stating that it was important that the Police Commissioner made his own decisions.

(Q16) Mr Lambell made reference to a new fire station in Burgh Heath, which was not mentioned in the written response and Mr Wood asked for confirmation about plans to move an extra pump to Epsom. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety informed Members that the consultation had only just started and no decisions had been made. The Chairman of the Communities Select Communities informed Members that this matter would be discussed at his select committee on 16 January 2013.

103/12 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were two local Member statements:

- Mr Young in relation to Highways issues in his local area of Cranleigh and Ewhurst.
- Mr Gimson in relation to a fatal accident on A31 (Hogs Back) close to the villages of Puttenham and Wanborough in his division. (Appendix C)

104/12 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]

ITEM 9(i)

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Mary Angell moved the motion which was:

'Following the recent Ofsted Inspection of SCC's arrangements for the protection of children, this Council:

1. Congratulates the Children's Service on the result of the inspection that children at risk of harm in Surrey are responded to quickly and effectively;
2. Welcomes this result against the backdrop of a tougher inspection regime and an increased level of public concern regarding the safety of vulnerable children;
3. Recognises the Service's good strategic leadership and the hard work of its staff, as acknowledged by the inspection; especially in the context of the ever- rising demands placed upon it;
4. Celebrates the many valued aspects of the Service which impressed the inspectors, particularly in the context of the difficulty of recruiting qualified and experienced social workers;
5. Accepts the need for a continued focus on improved partnership working, both internally and externally, and
6. Urges Members to support the Service by working with it to establish "early-help" for children and communities in Surrey where prevention would be better than cure.'

Mrs Angell began by saying that a brand new methodology had been used by Ofsted and to date four authorities had been inspected under this tougher regime – Surrey had been judged as 'adequate' and the other three, 'inadequate'. She said that the Inspectors had highlighted many good points but acknowledged that there was more work to be done. However, Surrey County Council already had an action plan in place for all the areas identified for improvements and the actions would be completed within three months.

She also referred to the large number of referrals from the Police that had been received by the contact centre. Finally, she said that Ofsted had highlighted a number of strengths, in particular, that Children were safe in Surrey and that the Council showed a real understanding of their needs. Overall, she was proud of the staff that worked in these challenging areas and commended the motion to Members.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr David Hodge.

Mrs Fiona White tabled an amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mrs Watson) which was:

'Insert the following new 1 and 2 after "...for the protection of children, this Council:"

1. Notes that Ofsted judged the overall effectiveness of Surrey County Council's arrangements to be "Adequate",
2. Aspires to improve the service as soon as possible to attain a rating of "Good" as a first step to progressing to "Outstanding",

Renumber existing paragraphs 1 – 6 so that the **Motion as amended reads:**

Following the recent Ofsted Inspection of SCC's arrangements for the protection of children, this Council:

1. Notes that Ofsted judged the overall effectiveness of Surrey County Council's arrangements to be "Adequate",
2. Aspires to improve the service as soon as possible to attain a rating of "Good" as a first step to progressing to "Outstanding",
3. Congratulates the Children's Service on the result of the inspection that children at risk of harm in Surrey are responded to quickly and effectively,
4. Welcomes this result against the backdrop of a tougher inspection regime and an increased level of public concern regarding the safety of vulnerable children,
5. Recognises the Service's good strategic leadership and the hard work of its staff, as acknowledged by the inspection; especially in the context of the ever- rising demands placed upon it,
6. Celebrates the many valued aspects of the Service which impressed the inspectors, particularly in the context of the difficulty of recruiting qualified and experienced social workers,
7. Accepts the need for a continued focus on improved partnership working, both internally and externally, and
8. Urges Members to support the Service by working with it to establish "early-help" for children and communities in Surrey where prevention would be better than cure.

Mrs White made the following points:

- That the original motion had many good points which she did not want to detract from, however, the Ofsted report did list areas for improvement which needed to be resolved before the next inspection.

- She did acknowledge the difficulties of recruiting social workers.
- The amendment was not a criticism of the services but she considered that clear timescales for the action plan were needed.

Ten Members spoke on the amendment, with the following points being made:

- An over reliance on locum staff
- A widespread lack of understanding of social care thresholds and performance management was inconsistent.
- A desire that Members support the need to move from 'adequate' to 'outstanding'.
- A reminder that all Members were corporate parents and the care of children was an important issue.
- A concern for those people not in the system, such as the homeless with babies/small children.
- Congratulations to staff for their achievements.
- A large number of staff, including those in partner organisations, were involved in working constructively with families, often in difficult circumstances.

The amendment was put to the vote, with 14 Members voting for and 40 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore the amendment was lost.

Returning to the original motion, on which a further five Members spoke, making the following points:

- A request to vote on each recommendation separately.
- Improvements can only be achieved by stronger partnership working. There was already a cross party Member steering group set up to develop this.
- Thanks to staff and the Cabinet Member for Children and Families for the achievements to date.
- The increased caseload of social workers was noted. Also, reference was made in relation to locum staff, it was considered preferable to use them to fully meet the needs of the service.
- Budgetary constraints.
- That Ofsted may not award any local authority a 'good' rating due to the 'baby P' effect.
- That this Administration was committed to doing the best it could for the children and the Inspection was only part of it.
- That the Children Services team was highly motivated and staff went the extra mile.
- An invitation for any Member to discuss the report further with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families.

Mrs Marks requested a recorded vote and ten Members stood in support of this request.

The following Members voted in support of the motion:

Mrs Angell, Mr Barker, Mr Butcher, Mrs Clack, Mrs Coleman, Mr Cosser, Mrs Curran, Mr Few, Mrs Fraser, Mr Frost, Mrs Frost, Mr Fuller, Mr Furey, Mr Gimson, Mr Gosling, Dr Grant-Duff, Dr Hack, Mr Hall, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Mr Harrison, Ms Heath, Mr Hickman, Mrs Hicks, Mr Hodge, Mr Ivison, Mrs Kemeny, Mr Kington, Mrs Lay, Ms Le Gal, Mr Mallett, Mrs Marks, Mr Marlow, Mr Martin, Mrs Mason, Mrs Moseley, Mr Munro, Mr Norman, Dr Povey, Mr Renshaw, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Skellett, Mr Sydney, Mr Keith Taylor, Mr Townsend, Mrs Turner-Stewart, Mr Walsh, Mr Witham and Mr Young.

The following Members abstained:

Mr Cooksey, Mr Cooper, Mr Forster, Mr Lambell, Mrs Searle, Mrs Smith, Mr Colin Taylor, Mrs Watson, Mrs White and Mr Wood.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That following the recent Ofsted Inspection of SCC's arrangements for the protection of children, this Council:

1. Congratulates the Children's Service on the result of the inspection that children at risk of harm in Surrey are responded to quickly and effectively;
2. Welcomes this result against the backdrop of a tougher inspection regime and an increased level of public concern regarding the safety of vulnerable children;
3. Recognises the Service's good strategic leadership and the hard work of its staff, as acknowledged by the inspection; especially in the context of the ever- rising demands placed upon it;
4. Celebrates the many valued aspects of the Service which impressed the inspectors, particularly in the context of the difficulty of recruiting qualified and experienced social workers;
5. Accepts the need for a continued focus on improved partnership working, both internally and externally, and
6. Urges Members to support the Service by working with it to establish "early-help" for children and communities in Surrey where prevention would be better than cure.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.50pm and resumed at 2.10pm, with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning except for Mr Barker, Mr Butcher, Mr Carasco, Ms Heath, Mrs Hicks, Mr Lake, Mrs Moseley, Mr Pitt, Mr Samuels, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Walsh, Mr Wood and Mr Young.

ITEM 9(ii)

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Stephen Cooksey moved the motion which was:

‘This Council notes that:

- i) reducing speed limits on roads where appropriate reduces the number and severity of road traffic accidents

and

- ii) only three 20mph speed limit schemes have been implemented in Surrey since May 2006

Council requests the Cabinet to amend the Council’s speed limit policy to make it easier for local committees to introduce 20mph limits, using terminal and repeater signs (rather than physical traffic calming measures), where evidence says they are required and they are supported by local residents.’

In support of this motion, Mr Cooksey said that: (i) the County Council had approved a reduction in speed limits in May 2006 and further research had confirmed that reducing the speed limit from 30 to 20 mph reduced fatalities, (ii) that only three 20 mph speed limits had been introduced since 2006, (iii) over 40 local authorities now had a significant programme for introducing 20mph speed limit, including Kingston which had an extensive network, (iv) insurance premiums were less in 20 mph speed limit areas, (v) there was popular support from residents and many Members would like more 20 mph speed limits introduced, (vi) this motion was a genuine means to improve road safety.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Will Forster who said that new rules and guidance had meant that it was now easier to introduce 20 mph speed limits. He said that there were an increasing number of these schemes throughout the UK and that high traffic speeds made pedestrians unsafe. He believed that local committees should have the discretion to implement the speed limits in their areas if it was the appropriate. He cited the figures for road traffic fatalities and injuries on UK roads.

Key points made during the debate, in which six Members spoke were:

- Roads need to be safe for all road users – pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.
- The current speed limit policy was put in place after debate and agreed at full Council and the power had been delegated by the Leader to local committees.
- Reducing speed limits doesn't always work as people can lose concentration and multi-task when driving at 20mph.
- Localism applies to Surrey and 20mph speed limits were within the remit of the local committee, in consultation with highways officers and police. They also needed the support of local residents.
- To ensure any reduction in speed limit did not heighten the risk for road users.
- A proliferation of signs and traffic calming measures could be confusing.
- The main concern was the speed limits outside schools and the congestion at drop off and pick up times.
- A reference to the large number of 20 mph speed limits in London Boroughs.
- Concern that the 20mph speed limit could not be enforced by local police.
- Casualty reduction had been reduced as a result of car design and also safety awareness such as Safe Drive, Stay Alive campaigns.
- 20mph speed limits could be divisive, contentious and the benefits not proven.

Mrs Fraser requested that 'the question be now put'. Twenty Members stood in support of this request and this request was agreed by the Chairman.

Mr Cooksey responded to the points made in the debate and the motion was put to the vote, with 18 Members voting for and 30 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

ITEM 9(iii)

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Peter Lambell moved the motion which was:

'This Council recognises the importance of providing respite care for families with disabled children to support them in carrying out their caring role.

Council requests that:

- i) the document "Shorts Breaks Statement for parents and carers of disabled children and young people in Surrey, October 2012" be

amended to include clear eligibility criteria to clarify which families are entitled to different forms of respite care

and

- ii) that information provided by Surrey County Council for parents about the availability of respite care services for disabled children, whether provided by the County Council or external providers, is more accessible and comprehensive

and

- iii) geographical coverage of residential respite care should, as far as is reasonable, be equitable to minimise journey times for children and parents.

Council calls on the Cabinet to provide respite care for more Surrey families of disabled children and to review its policy that “no child under 10 years of age should be accessing residential short break provision except in exceptional circumstances.’

Mr Lambell began by stating that his motion had been prompted by the proposed closure of The Beeches respite centre in Surrey, which provided respite for complex cases. He said that this centre provided much needed care and cited the difficulties, including transport issues, that the proposed closure would cause. He mentioned the eligibility criteria and requested that the Cabinet reconsider its policy on respite care for children under 10 years old.

Mrs Hazel Watson formally seconded the motion.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families responded, and made the following points:

- That Surrey County Council had a commitment to support families with disabled children and referred to the funding in last year’s Budget package, which had been protected.
- A reference to Section 17 of the Children’s Act 1989 and confirmation that the Council fully complied with the guidance.
- That every child and their needs was unique and that each child went through a full assessment to ensure that their needs and those of the wider family were understood. It was not possible to have a simple tick list.
- Referring to the geographical coverage of residential respite care, she said that there were 7 facilities, that had all been inspected by Ofsted and these were graded ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’.
- She said that it was easy to request respite care for more Surrey families and disabled children. The number of child protection cases had increased by 47% but she gave an assurance that if any family who had been assessed as needing the support would receive it because the welfare of the child was paramount.

- The provision of respite care for under 10 year olds was good practice not a policy and she believed most children's needs were best met within their family environment with support.
- Finally, she thanked Children's Services officers for their excellent work.

The motion was put to the vote with 9 Members voting for and 33 Members voting against it. There was one absention.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

ITEM 9(iv)

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Fiona White moved the motion which was:

'The UK Living Wage is an hourly rate, reviewed annually, that is calculated nationally (except for London, where the GLA sets a London Living Wage) by the Centre for Research in Social Policy in association with a charity known as 'the Living Wage Foundation'.

The Living Wage ensures low paid workers earn enough to provide for themselves and their families.

Surrey County Council recognises the cost of living has risen significantly in the last few years, without an accompanying national wage increase for employees. This has hit those on the national minimum wage disproportionately.

Council agrees that:

Surrey County Council will commit to ensuring that no county council employee will be paid less than the UK Living Wage, which is currently £7.45 per hour. Those performing work on behalf of the council should likewise ensure that none of their employees are paid less than the living wage and future contracts will reflect this.'

Mrs White defined what is meant by a living wage and made the following points in support of her motion: (i) that the County Council should be paying workers enough to live on, (ii) this made good business sense and would assist with staff retention rates, (iii) the motion didn't request making London's Living Wage, (iv) that the council should pay all contractors enough to live on.

Mr Will Forster formally seconded the motion and reaffirmed the points made by Mrs White.

During the debate in which 4 Members spoke, the following points were made:

- A reference to People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC) where this would be discussed at their next meeting.
- With effect from April 2013, 25,970 out of 26,000 staff would be on the living wage.
- This motion would restrict the ability of the County Council to appoint to apprenticeships and internships.

The motion was put to the vote with 11 Members voting for and 26 Members voting against it. There was one absention.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

ITEM 9(v)

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Hazel Watson moved the motion which was:

‘Council notes that Surrey County Council is a party to the High Court proceedings by Europa Oil and Gas to quash the Planning Inspector’s decision to dismiss the appeal to allow oil and gas exploration at Bury Hill Wood in Coldharbour.

Council instructs the County Council’s officers and legal team to proactively defend the arguments raised by the Planning Inspector including protection of the Green Belt in support of the Planning Inspector and the Treasury Solicitors defence of the Planning Inspector’s decision to dismiss the appeal.’

Mrs Watson provided Members with the background to the 2009 planning application to allow oil and gas exploration at Bury Hill Wood in Coldharbour. She considered that the County Council should support the views of the Planning Inspector and be supportive of local residents.

Mr Stephen Cooksey formally seconded the motion.

The Leader of the Council made a statement in which he stated that the Conservative Group would not be supporting the motion.

The motion was put to the vote with 8 Members voting for and 29 Members voting against it. There were no absentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

105/12 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]

The Leader presented the reports of the Cabinet's meetings held on 23 October and 27 November 2012.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care introduced his statement in relation to the Adult Social Care Local Account which had been included in the agenda. He thanked Adult Social Care staff.

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A School Organisation Plan 2012 – 2021

Members had an opportunity to ask questions and comment on the Plan. It was considered very comprehensive and was well received.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning reminded Members that they had all received a copy of the Plan. She also said that the Chairman of the Education Select Committee had requested that all local committees considered the Plan at their local meetings and advise officers of any refinements or changes required. She thanked officers from the School Commissioning Team for their work. She also agreed to respond to Mrs White outside the meeting in relation to her question on whether the effects of major developments close to but outside the county boundary had been addressed in the Plan.

RESOLVED:

That the School Organisation Plan 2012- 2021 be approved.

B Supporting the Economy through Investment in Transport and Infrastructure 2012 – 2019

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment drew attention to the new funding and financing sources from the Government and how the County Council bid for it. He also said that the County Council had also been successful in attracting £20m of funding through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund and that as schemes go forward, there would be input from the local and select committees.

Members commented on the schemes in their divisions.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the revised list of Surrey County Council Major Schemes, as laid out in Annexes 1 and 2 of the submitted report, be endorsed.
- (2) That the choice of Major Schemes to be progressed in any given year to be taken by the Strategic Director Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.
- (3) That the “New Homes Bonus” funding be used to provide for that proportion of the preparatory work relating to the schemes, which is not recoverable from capital funding. The estimated cost of this for the 2012-15 period is c. £1.2m.
- (4) That the Cabinet be provided with a high-level update on the Major Schemes programme every 2 years, except where significant developments require immediate referral.
- (5) That support continues to be given to Highways Agency (HA) and National Rail (NR) schemes in Surrey as detailed in their programmes, in Annexes 3 and 4 of the submitted report.
- (6) That delegated authority be given to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment to approve changes to the list of schemes where these are individually valued at less than £5 million.

(3) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Public Value Review Programme Closing Report
- One County, One Team – Strengthening the Council’s Approach to Innovation

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 23 October and 27 November 2012 be adopted.

106/12 APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSON [Item 11]

The Vice-Chairman of the Council introduced the report, which was in two parts:

(a) The Recruitment of the Independent Person

This report summarised the outcome of the recruitment process and recommended the following appointment.

RESOLVED:

That Professor Michael Joy OBE be appointed as the Independent Person for Surrey County Council for a period of four years, ending on 11 December 2016

(b) The Interim Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel

Mr Harrison (in the absence of Mr Frost) proposed an amendment to the recommendation of the Independent Remuneration Panel which was to propose that a sentence is added at the end of the current recommendation as follows:

‘Travel expenses should be based on those applicable to Members as laid down in the Guide to Members’ Allowances and Expenses applicable at the time the expense is incurred.’

Members agreed the amendment. Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Independent Person be paid travel expenses only in relation to their work with the Member Conduct Panel, but that this position be reviewed after one year once the workload and responsibility of the role has been established.
- (2) Travel expenses should be based on those applicable to Members as laid down in the Guide to Members’ Allowances and Expenses applicable at the time the expense is incurred.

The Leader of the Council proposed a further amendment to recommendation (1) – to insert £1000 pro-rata so that recommendation (1) now reads:

‘That the Independent Person be paid £1000 pro-rata and travel expenses in relation to their work with the Member Conduct Panel, but that this position be reviewed after one year once the workload and responsibility of the role has been established.’

The majority of Members voted for the amendment but three Members voted against it. Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Independent Person be paid £1000 pro-rata and travel expenses in relation to their work with the Member Conduct Panel, but that this position be reviewed after one year once the workload and responsibility of the role has been established.

- (2) Travel expenses should be based on those applicable to Members as laid down in the Guide to Members' Allowances and Expenses applicable at the time the expense is incurred.

107/12 AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION - FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE [Item 12]

RESOLVED:

That the amendment to the Scheme of Delegation in relation to the Fire and Rescue Service agreed by the Leader be noted.

108/12 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET [Item 13]

No notification had been received from Members wishing to raise a question or make a statement on any of the matters in the minutes, by the deadline.

[Meeting ended at: 4.10pm]

Chairman

County Council Meeting – 11 December 2012

LEADER'S STATEMENT

PUTTING PEOPLE FIRST

- This Administration is committed to putting the people of Surrey **FIRST**;
- Whether creating new and innovative projects that deliver better services to our residents while saving money;
- Or lobbying Government to get a better deal on the various funding we receive – such as the £14.3m we received in transport funding in the summer;
- I know how important libraries are to people;
- And I'm a passionate believer in public libraries being available to all;
- But in the current financial climate we have to look at doing things differently with the resources we have;
- Which is why I'm delighted to see our Community Partnered Libraries up and running, with local people taking control;
- And - for example – changing the opening times to those that suit the community;
- Mrs Angell and I will be visiting New Haw library this week and I would like to thank her for the excellent work she has done for the community of New Haw;
- I know she has worked **REALLY** hard to get this off the ground and I look forward to seeing the CPL model in action;
- And I am sure Members will also be delighted to hear that the library in my own area will be community controlled as of 22 January;
- I'm aware that other Local Authorities are now looking at our CPL model, to see what they can learn from it and if it can be replicated in their areas;
- And Local Government Minister Brandon Lewis recently congratulated us on the success of the model at the County Council Network conference;
- He also congratulated us on the progress our Children and Young People's Service had made;
- And the £280m in savings we have identified in our PVRs;
- Which is all extremely welcome news;
- And I look forward to seeing all 10 of the CPLs continue to flourish;

-
- With winter now well and truly upon us, it is important that we do all we can to minimise disruption for our residents and businesses;
 - We have prepared well ahead to our winter maintenance programme early, in order to ensure we are ready for any adverse weather;
 - We are combining new technology with more traditional methods – including fitting all of our gritting lorries with GPS to track their progress;
 - We have 16,000 tonnes of salt stored at depots across Surrey, which will be replenished throughout the winter;

- And we are working with our partners including District and Borough Councils and farmers across the county, to make sure that all measures are in place to keep levels of disruption to a minimum, if heavy snow arrives;
- We have never been better prepared for winter;
- But in addition to this preparation, I would like to ask people across the County– including all Members who are fit and able SUCH AS MYSELF to help out neighbours who are struggling to clear their paths or driveways;
- Keeping the County moving during adverse weather is also vitally important for our economy;

- And this Administration is continually looking at ways to help our local businesses;
- Which is why we have pledged to spend 60% of Council spending locally by 2017 – in fact we have already reached over 50%;
- We are cutting through red tape by making it easier for small businesses to bid for contracts;
- And we have developed a new ‘procurement portal’, which means businesses bidding for contracts don’t have to input information more than once;
- And we are making sure that we pay our invoices on time;
- As well as this we have been working closely with the FSB, the Surrey Chambers of Commerce;
- And the Deputy Leader has been visiting the headquarters of some of the large international companies based in Surrey;
- Asking what the County Council can do to help those businesses;
- Because those companies not only provide large-scale employment;
- But there is also the knock-on benefit to our small and medium sized businesses – whether that be the local cafe or shop owner in Sunbury near the BP site Or the local garage owner who gets repeat business from those who work for Canon in Reigate;
- If these large businesses remain in Surrey, our smaller businesses will feel the benefit;
- And by Surrey County Council backing Surrey businesses, I believe that we can have a helping hand in re-energising the national economy;
- And helping put the UK back on the road to recovery;

- As Members will be aware, the Public Value Reviews have recently come to an end;
- It is a source of immense personal pride, that we have identified savings which have been crucial for us to help meet our financial targets;
- While also helping us to focus on the things that matter most to our residents;

- And delivering the best possible services and maximum value for money for residents, while delivering £280m in savings;
- All of which we achieved without the use of a SINGLE EXPENSIVE EXTERNAL CONSULTANT;
- Which shows that Surrey County Council can rise to the challenge of this unprecedented economic situation;

- And finally Madam Chairman;
 - In October's Full Council meeting, I briefly discussed our plans for an energy scheme which would cut bills exclusively for Surrey residents;
 - And I am delighted to say that as a nice early Christmas present for our residents and businesses.....our "Switch and Save" scheme is live....**AS OF NOW!!!**
 - Our estimates show that this 'collective switching' scheme could save residents up to £250 per year;
 - What a MASSIVE boost that will give to our residents in these difficult times;
 - And another example of this Administration putting the people of Surrey first;
-
- May I wish all Members, staff and their families, a very happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year;

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
11 December 2012

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 11 DECEMBER 2012

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

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND LEARNING

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

The recent publication by OFSTED of inspection outcomes of maintained schools inspected between 1 September 2011 and 31 August 2012 shows the percentage of pupils attending good or outstanding primary schools. As Surrey only has 67% of its pupils attending good or outstanding Primary Schools, what action is the Cabinet Member taking to raise the standard of education provided to the 33% of primary school pupils in Surrey whose education is either satisfactory (under new criteria *Requires improvement*) or inadequate up to a good or outstanding standard?

Reply:

Education standards in Surrey's 392 schools remain among the best in the country with 27% of schools judged to be outstanding, and 73% judged outstanding or good over the past year. However, Ofsted introduced a more challenging inspection framework in January 2012 which was revised again in September 2012 with increased emphasis on teaching effectiveness and levels of progress attained. We welcome this, and it will play a significant part in our continuing desire to raise educational standards for the benefit of all Surrey children. In response, we are currently undertaking a full review of our School Improvement Strategy with our partners, Babcock 4S, with a view to making a number of changes. In particular we will ensure that our support is targeted in a more effective way in reviewing, supporting and developing the capacity of leadership and governance in schools. This is key to school improvement.

In addition, there is a need to engage earlier, in a more focused manner, with a greater number of schools. It is less costly to work with schools before they significantly decline leading to better value for money. In order to do this we are implementing a more rigorous risk assessment to identify schools that are declining or likely to decline from good and intervene and challenge at an earlier stage.

As a greater proportion of our schools that are either satisfactory (requires improvement) or inadequate serve the areas of greatest deprivation in Surrey, we are reviewing the way our services from different areas

(education, health and social care) work strategically together to ensure best practice to achieve and maintain a good or outstanding inspection standard.

We recognise the need to ensure that we continue to build capacity within Surrey's schools to support our improvement programme. This will involve further development and management of school-to-school support including the use of our Teaching Schools, National and Local Leaders of Education, and our own sponsoring academies to reduce the number of schools judged by Ofsted to be not yet good and I am confident that we have the right plans in place to achieve this aim.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT

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

I am sure all of Council will welcome the recent announcement by the Local Transport Minister, Norman Baker that local authorities have been given greater discretionary enforcement powers regarding vehicles parking on pavements. Inconsiderate parking causes major inconvenience to other residents of the county, especially to users of prams, push-chairs and wheelchairs.

Will the Cabinet Member ensure the discretionary powers now available are used in urban areas and town centres, where appropriate and with the approval of Local Committees, to prevent parking of vehicles on pavements to help address some of these problems?

Reply:

Outside of London vehicles are not normally prohibited from parking on the footway or verge (although it is unlawful to drive on the footway), unless there is a waiting restriction which normally applies from the centre of the carriageway to the highway boundary, i.e. the back of the footway.

In most town centres there are already waiting restrictions that prohibit parking either on the road or footway at various time of the day. These restrictions do however rely on enforcement to be fully effective, and problem areas can be targeted by the district or borough enforcement team.

In 2011, the Department for Transport made it simpler for Local Authorities outside London to either prohibit or formalise parking on the verge or footway by prescribing signs for this purpose to be used with a traffic regulation order. In all cases where these restrictions are in place, new signs would be needed, with larger areas requiring repeater signs to allow satisfactory enforcement. The specific signs are not SCC standard signs, highways and legal services are therefore in the process of agreeing the specific signage requirements.

Footway and verge parking restrictions can be and is increasingly considered as part of the regular borough wide parking review process by Local Committees and the SCC Parking Team. The new legalisation supports this review process, and following final agreement on signage and legal application process, the new option, for restricting footway parking, will be included for local committee consideration in future parking reviews.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(3) MRS DIANA SMITH (KNAPHILL) TO ASK:

How many Surrey County Council employees' remuneration exceeds the £142,500 p.a. paid to the Prime Minister?

Reply:

Two.

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

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

A recent Peer Review of partnership arrangements in Children, Schools and Families has taken place. It is accepted best practice that the outcomes of these reviews are circulated within the Council and especially to Members. Will the Cabinet Member ensure the outcomes of the review are circulated as soon as possible?

Reply:

A Peer Challenge, not a Peer Review, of Partnership Arrangements in Children, Schools and Families took place on the 11 and 12 June 2012. A presentation was agreed with the Peer Challenge Lead which was presented to the Cabinet, Briefing for Chairs of Select Committees, District and Borough Meeting, Corporate Parenting Board, Safeguarding Board and Surrey Alliance. The output from the Peer Challenge informed the self assessment prepared for the Ofsted Inspection that took place between the 10 and 19 September 2012. The presentation is available and can be circulated to Members.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE 2012 GAMES

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

The Adult Learning section of the County Council's website gives no information about services provided in the eastern half of the County by East Surrey College. It does not even point residents in the eastern half of the County to where they may find information on Adult Education services.

Residents in Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead, Epsom & Ewell and Tandridge seeking Adult Education, especially those seeking to improve their qualifications in the present economic climate, could be forgiven for thinking that County Council is not interested in supporting them.

Given the massive reduction in accessible Adult Education services in the eastern half of the County since East Surrey College took over Adult Education services, will the Cabinet Member undertake to conduct a full comparative review of the quantity, quality and accessibility of services in the two halves of the County?

Reply:

There is a link in the adult learning part of the SCC that advises "Courses in Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead and Tandridge are provided by [East Surrey College](http://www1.surreycc.gov.uk/aclcoursefinder/index.asp)", at <http://www1.surreycc.gov.uk/aclcoursefinder/index.asp>. The PVR has identified the need to substantially improve the profile and quality of the Service's web presence and this is a key area of improvement in the Public Value Review report of Arts, Heritage and Adult and Community Learning. The Service is working with IMT and Web Ops to deliver an effective web site for the Adult Learning programme in time for the 2012-13 academic year.

The data provided by the Skills Funding Agency on enrolments in the 2010-11 academic year (the last full year available until March 2013) show that there is little variation in participation levels in the area covered by the East Surrey College contract and the area serviced by the County Council's Adult Learning Service. The details are attached, together with the East Surrey College list of venues for the delivery of Adult Learning (Annex A and Annex B). There will be a further review undertaken when the 2011-12 data is released by the Skills Funding Agency.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT

**(6) MRS CAROLINE NICHOLS (LOWER SUNBURY AND HALLIFORD)
TO ASK:**

In your reply to a written question from Mr Ian Beardsmore, (Cabinet Meeting 27 November 2012), you indicated that SITA expects to continue to develop a combined gasifer and anaerobic digester waste disposal plant at Charlton Lane even though the proposed supplier of the gasification system (Ascot Environmental) has gone into administration.

This project is now more than a year late against Surrey County Council's (SCC) published timetable. Bearing in mind that: (1) a report to Cabinet on 14 March 2011 (World Class Waste Solutions: Amendment to Waste Contract) acknowledged that this is a relatively new technology, and (2) the two reference plants originally used to justify the Charlton Ecopark have been beset with operating difficulties, is consideration now being given by SCC to

the possibility that the proposed Ecopark scheme is incapable of being built and operating safely?

Your reply of 27 November 2012 also stated that a recent visit by SCC and SITA to Sarpsborg, Norway was 'to observe a gasification plant in operation'. What were the findings of this visit? Has the Sarpsborg plant become the new reference plant for due diligence purposes? Is a revised application expected to go to Planning and Regulatory Committee, and if so, when?

Reply:

Both SITA and Surrey County Council are committed to delivering the Eco Park at Charlton Lane. SITA are currently in the process of appointing an Engineering Procurement and Construction (EPC) contractor to build the Eco Park and it is anticipated that work will commence on site early in 2013

The Sarpsborg plant is a reference facility for one of the companies bidding for the EPC contract. The site visit confirmed that the plant was in continuous reliable operation.

Both bidders for the EPC contract have confirmed that their process plant will fit within the Eco Park Planning Permission building footprint and meet the same emissions criteria as permitted under the planning consent and environmental permit. It is however likely that there will be some minor amendments required, for example changes to the internal layout of the building, which will require an application to be made to vary conditions in the existing planning consent.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(7) DR ANDREW POVEY (WAVERLEY EASTERN VILLAGES) TO ASK:

Can the Leader confirm that in Surrey members of UKIP and the Green Party would be able to foster and/or adopt children?

Reply:

I am surprised that Dr Povey appears to be unaware of the County Council policy. When recruiting and assessing foster carers, Surrey works to the Fostering Services: National Minimum Standards, ensuring that Standard 13 is met in relation to our duty towards assessing carers who can meet the needs of looked after children. Further information is available on the County Council's website.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT

(8) MR EBER KINGTON (EPSOM AND EWELL NORTH) TO ASK:

As a result of staff shortages within the Highways Team and priority given to other work waiting restrictions agreed by the Epsom and Ewell Local Committee in January 2012 are still not fully in place as of December 2012 despite many of them being introduced to make local roads safer.

In addition the delay has meant that the next tranche of waiting restrictions, most of which have been requested by our residents, will no longer be considered at the December Meeting of the Local Committee but have been postponed until March 2013.

It is now also been confirmed that yellow zigzag lines across Epsom and Ewell, many of which are outside schools, are unenforceable and never have been but, due to staff workloads, the necessary action to make them legally enforceable will not be put before the Local Committee until March 2013

Does the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment agree with me that delaying the implementation and the legal enforcement of highway safety measures is unacceptable?

Will the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment use part of the £0.5 million underspend on staffing in the Environment and Infrastructure Directorate, reported to the Cabinet on 27 November 2012, to fund additional resources so that the highway issues listed above can be resolved within weeks rather than months?

Reply:

The Epsom and Ewell Local Committee agreed implementation of a very large parking review, including 14 residents parking schemes early in 2012. The signing and lining for all the new restrictions are substantially installed and those that are safety related are being enforced. The SCC Parking Team has been liaising with Epsom and Ewell Borough Council regarding the 'go live' date for the residents parking schemes and it is anticipated that this will be early in the New Year. In addition, the last review included a residents' parking proposal in Ladbroke Road which has proved contentious so will be reported to the Epsom and Ewell Local Committee in December for a decision on the way forward.

It is good practice to let new restrictions settle down before starting a new parking review. In this way the new review can pick up any unanticipated problems from the last.

Given this situation it was considered necessary to postpone the Epsom and Ewell parking review from December to March 2013. The Chairman of the Local Committee was advised of this in mid October.

Schools have had zigzag lines outside them for many years, but only in recent times has new legislation made them enforceable and laid down criteria that they have to meet to be so. For example, there are conditions about the length and position of the lines, and about accompanying signs setting out the times that the restrictions apply.

The SCC parking team are in the process of visiting all Surrey's schools and identifying which already comply with the regulations and those which need amending to make the 'keep clear zones' legally enforceable. This is a task that we have in common with all other local authorities. We are also looking at whether zigzags are needed where they were previously considered unnecessary. As there are 35 schools in Epsom & Ewell alone, this is a considerable task for the whole County.

We work with schools and Surrey Police through initiatives such as Drivesmart and Parksmart to ask all drivers to use common sense and consideration when parking near schools, to help us keep all road users safe.

CHAIRMAN OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

(9) MR COLIN TAYLOR (EPSOM AND EWELL SOUTH WEST) TO ASK:

At Council in 2001, when this Council moved to *Executive Arrangements*, the then Leader Mr Skellett said that this was being imposed by the then Labour government and we would change back as soon as the next Conservative government made that possible.

At Council on 15 June 2010, following a Coalition government announcement, I proposed:

- *This Council notes the Government's decision to allow councils to return to the former more democratic committee system.*
- *This Council agrees to return to the committee system with effect from the next Annual Meeting of the Council following the enactment of the legislation*

On the advice of the then Leader, Dr Povey, members decided:

- *That this motion be referred to the Change & Efficiency Select Committee for consideration. Under Standing Order 12.6 the select committee must report back to the County Council at the earliest possible meeting.*

By the time the Localism Act was published this Select Committee had been wound up.

At Cabinet on 28 February 2012 I asked the current Leader if another Select Committee should consider this motion. In reply Mr Hodge suggested that it be considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, post May 2013.

He said that rather than rush into a change in our democratic structures, we should use the next year to review our current practices, learn from best practice elsewhere and consider how we ensure the Council continues to operate effectively in the future. He encouraged Members to consider and debate the options but leave the decision open for the new Council to consider following the 2013 election.

I understand that the options have been considered and debated within the majority group.

Prior to any proposed change to the democratic structures of this council it has become traditional for the Chairman of the Council to be asked to convene a suitable cross-party working group in consultation with group leaders.

Its brief, as defined by Mr Hodge, would be to review our current practices, learn from best practice elsewhere, consider how to ensure that the Council continues to operate effectively in the future and make specific proposals.

Having a detailed outline available by May 2013 would make it easier for the new Council to consider the pros and cons and take an informed decision on the best way forward.

Does the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider that it would be appropriate in this case for the Chairman of the Council to be asked to convene a suitable cross-party working group, or would he prefer to form such a working group under the aegis of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee?

Reply:

I agree with the Leader's response to the Cabinet question in February, that local government is undergoing a significant period of change and it would be unwise to rush into a change in our democratic structures at the present time. With the County election in 2013, I don't feel it would be appropriate for the current Council to begin a detailed review in the way suggested and this is not on the work programme for the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the next year.

The Leader encouraged Members to consider and debate the options during the next year and as Mr Taylor rightly points out, there have been discussions within the Conservative Group which will no doubt continue. I feel that the political groups are the right place for such a discussion and any decision to be left to the next Council, should it wish to consider a committee system.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(10) MR JOHN V.C. BUTCHER (COBHAM) TO ASK:

As the Leader may recall:

- (a) during Members' questions on his report to the Council meeting on 16 October 2012, a matter relating to an organisation in my division was raised (by a Member for another division), and I told the Leader that a letter about that matter from a member of the Cabinet to that organisation had not been copied to me and that I had first read about that letter in a newspaper, so
- (b) I asked him to take steps to ensure that we members are fully informed of such matters, and
- (c) in response, he stated that he understood my concern and that he and his colleagues were raising with members of the staff the need to make sure they inform Members.

Could the Leader therefore advise the Council:

- (i) what steps had then been taken by him and his Cabinet colleagues, and what steps they have subsequently taken, to ensure that each and every Member is kept properly and promptly informed of all material matters that affect his or her division, as is required by paragraphs 23 to 30 inclusive of the Member/Officer Protocol,
- (ii) what arrangements have been put in hand to monitor the extent to which this requirement is being properly fulfilled, and what steps are being taken to ensure that any lapse (whether or not it is known by the divisional Member) does not recur, and
- (iii) what safeguards are there to enable any Member who discovers that he or she has not been kept so informed, to report the matter for independent investigation, so that, if such a lapse is found to have occurred, that Member will promptly receive a public apology from the Council, to enable him or her to avoid the impression being created in his or her division that he or she is not carrying out his or her duties effectively?

Reply:

At all times, the Council will endeavour to make County Councillors aware of any matter in relation to their Division. I am clear that as an organisation we will benefit if communications are strong amongst us all and this is a key element of my One Team vision. As part of this we will be taking forward some work based on the theme Think Councillor, Think Resident.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

In view of the unpopularity of the Cabinet's decision to spend £5 million toward the cost of a Magna Carta Visitor Centre in Runnymede, the numerous problems identified with the project and the high likelihood that the project will fail, will the Leader of the Council abandon this ill-fated project now to avoid wasting taxpayers' money and officer time on a doomed project?

Will the Leader of the Council consider alternative much lower cost projects which have public support, are beneficial to the local community and have a lower environmental impact, to commemorate the 800th anniversary of the sealing of the Magna Carta?

Reply:

The Cabinet's decision on 27 November 2012 was an open and transparent **in principle decision** subject to a full business case, appropriate planning requirements and the raising of £3m funding by others.

A robust review is currently being conducted by officers who will advise Cabinet Members of progress before any formal decision is agreed to proceed with a Visitors Centre.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT

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

At the last meeting of Council you stated that the new temporary bus services that have replaced Countryliner are cheaper than the previous Countryliner services. However in the September Budget Monitoring Report to Cabinet it states:

"Local bus services are expected to overspend by +£0.3m, primarily due to the need to replace services previously operated by Countryliner".

Will you ensure that in future accurate information is provided to Members in response to questions?

Reply:

Herewith the response, sent on 12 November 2012 at 16.25:

"Dear Will

When Countryliner Sussex Limited went into administration, this affected a total of 10 Surrey bus routes funded by this Council. Our decisive action maintained a near normal service on these bus routes.

You are quite right that the new contractual arrangements with Abellio, Stagecoach and Coaches Excetera have come at an additional cost to this Council compared to the cost when the 10 routes were contracted to Countryliner. The part year effect in 2012/13 is approximately £300,000 and this is the figure in the latest Budget Monitoring Report.

The new contracts will remain in place until this Council, working with bus operators, can put in place long term solutions. Work on this is already under way and the tendering of longer term contracts will take place in spring 2013.

I hope you agree that the contingency and interim contract arrangements with these local bus companies minimised the impact on the travelling public, ensuring that several hundred school and college students who relied on Countryliner services could still get to and from their place of learning, whilst many more of our residents could continue to get to work and go about their daily business. I also believe that this clearly demonstrate that we can work effectively together with the bus industry building on the collaborative working that emerged as part of our hugely successful Surrey Bus Review, with the overall aim of implementing solutions to give certainty to bus users in Surrey.'

A final update is as follows:

Now that contract negotiations have concluded on the 10 replacement contracts, I am able to report that the full year impact of this is £343,500k pa. Officers are now beginning to plan for the long term solutions.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE 2012 GAMES

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

Of the 10 libraries in the Community Partnered Libraries proposals:

- (i) Which libraries have viable volunteer bodies to run them?
- (ii) Which libraries do not have viable volunteer bodies to run them?

It was announced that those libraries that do not have viable volunteer groups to run them will be closed. How long will those libraries unable to provide robust and sustainable independent provision continue to be supported centrally? When will those closures take place?

Reply:

The CPL model is now operating successfully and currently we have three libraries that are now being managed as Community Partnered Libraries;

there are three more who are in the process of signing agreements and transferring and there are a further two where we are having a dialogue regarding their model.

Since the Cabinet decision in July we have devised an implementation programme that has rolled out arrangements where we had been working closely with community based steering groups which had the highest level of preparedness and our implementation team is currently working at full capacity. There are two more communities where there is a Steering Group or other body who have expressed an interest in leading on CPL arrangements. As the roll-out timetable progresses we have to engage with these groups and take them through the arrangements and transfer process to establish their commitment and how the CPL model can be delivered to ensure a secure future for these two libraries.

It is the aim of the Council that we do not close any libraries. If any libraries do not have a partner in place the Library Service will work in these communities to try and establish a viable group so that the library provision can be maintained. It was previously stated that if it becomes clear that a viable group partnership or business plan is not in place for a library and communities are not progressing towards Partnership there would be a report for Cabinet consideration on any libraries in that situation. Timescales regarding the CPL implementation programme have changed since earlier Cabinet Reports on this and Cabinet in July agreed a review/evaluation of CPLs in September 2013.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

**(14) DR ANDREW POVEY (WAVERLEY EASTERN VILLAGES) TO ASK:
(2nd question):**

Does the Leader agree with me that the new Police and Crime Commissioner has made a disappointing start with his statement that there would be no increase in the number of police officers in Surrey?

Reply:

As Dr. Povey will be aware, Police and Crime Commissioners have been in post for less than a month. I am looking forward to working with the new Police and Crime Commissioner and indeed continuing to work with all Surrey Leaders, in matters of community safety. The Chief Executive and I will be meeting the Police and Crime Commissioner this week and again in early January, to discuss the wide range of issues where Surrey Police and Surrey County Council can work in partnership for the benefit of Surrey residents and businesses.

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND LEARNING

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

Given the statutory requirement placed on the County Council to provide nursery places for 2 year olds, can the Cabinet Member confirm that there will be sufficient places to meet this requirement and if so what evidence and surveys have been completed to give such an assurance?

Reply:

Following legislation introduced for the academic year 2012/13, the Early Years and Childcare Service (EYCS) is currently placing 550 2-year olds, having originally targeted 300 for this term in accordance with the DfE's projections. They are now working towards a future target to place 800 children during the Spring term. It is anticipated that the need for places will be spread across a reasonably sized geographic area and EYCS is working with a range of providers to make the necessary placements.

The DfE has estimated that there will be 1,717 2-years olds in Surrey who will be eligible for the free childcare entitlement in 2013/14, rising to 3,000 in 2014/15. EYCS is also using data collected through the Childcare Sufficiency Assessment (CSA) to assist in the planning of free entitlement for 2- year olds. The following action is being taken to access existing and create new places:

- EYCS has increased the capacity within the service to negotiate, place and support providers offering a places for 2-year olds to support the roll out of the programme;
- The hourly rate paid to providers has been increased to better reflect the actual cost of providing a place to £6 per hour from April 2012 to ensure that a high quality place is provided and responds to the impact of higher staff ratio costs. This rate was agreed following consultation with some of the full daycare providers in the county;
- EYCS is developing a package of incentives to encourage providers to register to take 2-year olds and therefore increase the number of places on offer;
- Information sessions will be held in the Spring term in each of the 4 areas across the county for private, independent and voluntary providers to raise the level of awareness of the free entitlement and to encourage registering to offer places;
- EYCS is undertaking a similar process to increase the offer of places by childminders;
- EYCS is also negotiating with Children's Centres that provide childcare to increase the number of places that can be offered to 2-year olds Children's Centres;
- There are plans to consider offering some funding to hold places vacant in the areas of highest need to ensure places are available as children are identified;

•EYCS is also working with Children's Services to improve information sharing about looked after children and Children in Need to offer an appropriate place.

The EYCS has already demonstrated its response to the need to provide places for 2-year olds and has exceeded the target set by the DfE. The childcare market in Surrey has responded very positively to the free entitlement programme for 2-year olds and I am confident that EYCS will deliver the necessary level of places required.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY

(16) MR JOHN ORRICK (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK: (3rd question)

In response to a question from me to Cabinet on 27 November 2012, regarding the decision by West Sussex Fire and Rescue Authority to close Horley Fire Station you stated:

"The preferred option is to relocate a Surrey fire engine to the Horley area. This option is in accordance with the PSP principles and public opinion will be gauged through the forthcoming consultation process, which is due to start in December 2012."

In view of the impact of this decision affecting not only Horley, but also a large section of the southern area of Surrey stretching from Waverley Eastern Villages, through Mole Valley and Reigate & Banstead, to Tandridge, please could the Cabinet Member inform Council when the consultation is due to start and what consultation processes will be used, and reassure Council and residents in the area outlined above that:

1. the consultation will be well publicised, open and accessible,
2. residents in the wider area referred to above will be consulted,
3. views of residents as well as fire service professionals will be fully taken into account in ensuring the quickest possible response times, especially when there are multiple incidents?

Reply:

1. This consultation is running from 10 December 2012 to 1 February 2013 (8 weeks). A comprehensive consultation plan has been established, based upon the good practice developed during the PSP consultation, to target those who are likely to be most affected by the proposals. This include media releases, targeting specific locations (GP surgeries, Post Offices, Care Homes, Council Offices, etc), establishing focus groups, attending public meetings, etc. Before the start of the consultation, we agreed with key stakeholders on how they would like to be kept engaged during the consultation process. All nine protected characteristics, as stipulated in the Equality Act 2010, have been

considered in the consultation plan. We sought advice and support from an external E&D expert and the directorate's Equality and Cohesion Officer. We are using a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methods, as well as a wide mix of communication channels to gather the views of our stakeholders.

2. The consultation is mainly focussed in the Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead boroughs as that is where the primary impact of the proposals are likely to occur. Mole Valley and Tandridge Councillors will be briefed and all Local Committees will be informed of the consultation. The survey is available to all Surrey residents through our website and social media outlets. According to the response modelling undertaken, there will be minimal impact in the Waverley area. Indeed, the relocation of the West Sussex fire engine from Horley to Horsham is more likely to improve the response cover for the southern part of the county.
3. As outlined above, Feedback provided through surveys, direct communication, meeting transcripts, etc will be collated and analysed, using statistical and qualitative analysis methods, to pull out key messages. These will inform the Surrey FRS when drafting the final proposal to be presented to Cabinet on 26 February 2013. We will publish a consultation report on 8 February 2013. Consultation findings will also shape the final Equality Impact Assessment.

ANNEX A

East Surrey College, in partnership with the WEA, has successfully held the contract to deliver part time adult and community learning in the Mid and East Surrey for over 5 years. During this time the provision has grown from strength to strength with over 4000 enrolments last year. This includes meeting or exceeding targets for Hard to Reach, Learners with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities and Volunteers. A key element of the growth has been through a wide range of Saturday courses held in our exceptional campus at Gatton Point which have proved to be particularly popular and attracting learners from a very wide catchment.

Courses are of a variety of lengths – from a few hours to many weeks – and with progression routes to further leisure or funded courses. There are courses that promote employment, career change, starting or building a business. Although increasing numbers has encouraged us to believe our revised offer is meeting the needs of many adults, we are also committed to continually reviewing and improving provision in targeted areas across the mid and east of the county. For example, one of the areas we reviewed provision in last year was in the Dorking and Mid Surrey area resulting in extensive promotion of new courses and new venues, examples of the promotion are shown in thumb prints below. They included area specific guides, advertisements in the local press (e.g. Dorking Challenger) and posters. In addition, guides were displayed in libraries, Mole Valley Council offices, surgeries, local businesses and handed out in the high street and St Martin's Walk.

The aim of this targeted promotion was specifically to raise awareness of the local learning opportunities to the whole community. Over forty courses were planned across seven venues. It was an ambitious plan and despite being based on feedback from members the public from the area not all courses ran due to lack of enrolments. It was noticeable that residents in the area were attracted to the main college venue.

The enrolment pattern and feedback has informed our curriculum plan for part time adult and community provision in 2012/13. Modern Foreign Languages provision has been increased and now includes Mandarin for the first time. There also continues to be a wide range of other courses such as silk painting, upholstery and floristry to bridge, cooking and computing.

East Surrey College list the following venues for the delivery of Adult Learning as at 5/12/12

1. **East Surrey College (ESC)**
Gatton Point, London Road, Redhill, Surrey RH1 2JX
2. **East Surrey College (ESC2)**
Gatton Point South Entrance, Claremont Road, Redhill, Surrey RH1 2JT
3. **Ashcombe School (ASD)**
Ashcombe Road, Dorking, Surrey RH4 1LY
4. **Beacon School (BSB)**
Picquets Way, Banstead, Surrey SM7 1AG
5. **Bourne Hall (BHE)**
Spring Street, Ewell, Surrey KT17 1UF
6. **Centenary Hall (CH)**
Wheelers Lane, Smallfield, Surrey RH6 9PT
7. **Dorking Christian Centre (DCC)**
Church Street, Dorking, Surrey RH4 1DW
8. **Dorking Library (DL)**
St Martin's Walk, Dorking, Surrey RH4 1UX
9. **Ebbisham Centre (ECE)**
6 The Derby Square, Epsom, Surrey KT19 8AG
10. **Epsom Methodist Church (EMC)**
Church Hall, Ashley Road, Epsom, Surrey KT18 5AQ
11. **Ewell Court House (ECH)**
Lakehurst Drive, Ewell, Surrey KT19 0EB
12. **Holmesdale Infant School (HIS)**
Alma Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0BY
13. **Leatherhead Trinity School (LTS)**
Woodvill Road, Leatherhead, Surrey KT22 7BP
14. **Longmead Centre, Epsom (LCE)**
Sefton Road, Epsom, Surrey KT19 9HG
15. **Merstham Community Facility Trust (MCT)**
44 Portland Drive, Merstham, Surrey RH1 3HY
16. **Merstham Village Hall (MVR)**
Station Road North, Redhill, Surrey RH1

17. **Mickleham Village Hall (MVH)**
Dell Close, Mickleham, Dorking, Surrey RH5 6EE
18. **Oxted Community Hall (OCH)**
Church Lane, Oxted, Surrey RH8 0BR
19. **Reigate Community Centre (RCC)**
High Street, Reigate, Surrey RH2 9AE
20. **Reigate Dance Studio (RDS)**
75 Bell Street, Reigate, Surrey RH2 7AN
21. **Soper Hall (SHC)**
Harestone Valley Road, Caterham, Surrey CR3 6HY
22. **St. John's RC Hall (SJC)**
The Avenue, Tadworth, Surrey KT20 5DB
23. **St Joseph's Hall (SJH)**
2 Falkland Grove, Dorking, Surrey RH4 2DL
24. **St Katherine's Church Hall (SKC)**
Church Hill, Merstham, Surrey RH1 3BJ
25. **Stoneleigh Library (SL)**
1 Stoneleigh Broadway, Stoneleigh, Epsom, Surrey KT17 2JA
26. **Tandridge Learning Centre (TLC) /De Stafford School (DSC)**
Burntwood Lane, Caterham, Surrey CR3 5YX
27. **Tandridge TVSC (TVS)**
Tandridge Voluntary Service Council, The Community Hub, 1st Floor
Library Building, 14 Gresham Road, Oxted, RH8 0BQ
28. **The Arc (TAC)**
39 Weston Drive, Caterham, Surrey CR3 5XY
29. **The Kings Church Epsom (TKC)**
Longmead Road, Epsom, Surrey KT19 9BU
30. **The Old Pixham School (OPS)**
Pixham Lane, Dorking, Surrey RH4 1PQ
31. **Warwick School (WSR)**
Noke Drive, Redhill, Surrey RH1 4AD
32. **White Hart Barn Godstone (WHB)**
Bay Path, High Street, Godstone, Surrey RH9 8DT

County Council Meeting – 11 December 2012

STATEMENT BY MEMBER

I wish to inform Members of an incident which occurred on Saturday 1 December on the A31 (Hogs Back) close to the villages of Puttenham and Wanborough in my Division.

At 0335 a police car, which was responding to an emergency call, struck a pedestrian who died on the scene.

The individual who lost his life was Craftsman Joshua Brown of 10 Training Battalion REME based at Bordon. His Commanding Officer said in a tribute that “Joshua was a hard working member of his platoon, always willing to assist in whatever undertaking was required with a smile on his face”

The incident is now being investigated by the Independent Police Complaints Commission.

I am sure that all Members of this Council would wish to join me in offering our heartfelt condolences to the family and friends of Joshua Brown and our sympathy to all those affected by this tragedy.

**Simon Gimson
Local Member for Shalford
11 December 2012**