

**COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**COUNCIL MEETING – 19 MARCH 2013**

**MINUTES** of the Meeting of the County Council held at the County Hall, Kingston upon Thames on Tuesday 19 March 2013 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		Mr Kington
	Mr Barker OBE		Mr Lake
	Mr Beardsmore		Mr Lambell
	Mr Bennison	*	Mrs Lay
	Mrs Bowes		Ms Le Gal
	Mr Brett-Warburton	*	Mr MacLeod
	Mr Butcher		Mr Mallett MBE
	Mr Carasco		Mrs Marks
	Mr Chapman		Mr Marlow
	Mrs Clack		Mr Martin
	Mrs Coleman		Mrs Mason
	Mr Cooksey		Mrs Moseley
*	Mr Cooper	*	Mrs Nichols
	Mr Cosser		Mr Norman
	Mrs Curran		Mr Orrick
*	Mr Elias	*	Mr Phelps-Penry
	Mr Ellwood	*	Mr Pitt
	Mr Few		Dr Povey
	Mr Forster		Mr Renshaw
	Mrs Fraser DL		Mrs Ross-Tomlin
	Mr Frost		Mrs Saliagopoulos
	Mrs Frost		Mr Samuels
	Mr Fuller		Mrs Searle
	Mr Furey		Mr Skellett CBE
	Mr Gimson		Mrs Smith
	Mr Goodwin		Mr Sydney
	Mr Gosling	*	Mr Colin Taylor
*	Dr Grant-Duff		Mr Keith Taylor
	Dr Hack		Mr Townsend
	Mr Hall		Mrs Turner-Stewart
	Mrs Hammond		Mr Walsh
	Mr Harmer		Mrs Watson
	Mr Harrison		Mrs White
	Ms Heath		Mr Witham
	Mr Hickman		Mr Wood
	Mrs Hicks		Mr Young
	Mr Hodge		

\*absent

#### **14/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Cooper, Mr Elias, Dr Grant-Duff, Mrs Lay, Mr MacLeod, Mrs Nichols, Mr Pitt and Mr Colin Taylor.

#### **15/13 MINUTES [Item 2]**

The Minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 12 February 2013, were submitted, confirmed and signed.

#### **16/13 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- That the County Council had been named local authority of the year at the recent Improvement and Efficiency Awards and she presented the award to the Chief Executive.
- That the lunchtime speaker was His Honour Judge Christopher Critchlow DL, Senior Judge at Guildford.
- Finally, she invited Members to visit the Surrey Save Credit Union stand, which would be in the Ashcombe corridor during the lunchtime break.

#### **17/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]**

1. Mr Butcher declared a personal interest relating to item 7 (Statement by Members), and his statement on Cedar Road, Cobham because he was a member of Elmbridge Borough Council's Planning Committee and its relevant sub-committee.
2. Mrs Hammond declared a disclosable interest relation to item 11 (Elected Member Development Strategy) because she was an assessor for South East Employers.

#### **18/13 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, ask questions and made the following points:

- That the contribution to Surrey Save was welcomed.
- That the Leader comment on the Administration's plans for vulnerable communities.

- Whether the County Council would be learning lessons from the demise of the North Yorkshire initiative on Super Fast Broadband
- The commitment and investment from the County Council for Children's Centres.
- The success of the apprenticeship scheme.

#### **19/13 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]**

Notice of six 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) Dr Povey** said that he was disappointed with the reply and asked the Leader of the Council who would be on the review panel, when the outcomes would be published and when Members of this council would have the opportunity to scrutinise it. The Leader said that he had nothing further to add and referred to his tabled answer.

**(Q2) Mr Hall** considered that his question had not been answered and asked the Cabinet Member for Community Safety for consideration of a countywide scheme and its cost. She responded by stating that the authority would look at any new initiatives, including the London travel discount scheme for apprentices and that any proposals would be costed.

**(Q3) Mr Orrick** asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment whether the failure of a sub-base was common amongst other resurfacing failures and whether Surrey Highways were developing a strategy to prevent future issues with the sub-base. The Cabinet Member confirmed that lessons had been learnt and that going forward the design process had been improved.

**(Q4) Mrs Watson** expressed her surprise at the response because she had received a different answer recently. The Cabinet Member for Transport and the Environment responded by stating that it was his intention that no Surrey roads would deteriorate to 'poor' in the next 5 years. The aim was to achieve best practice through improved highways maintenance and the investment from Project Horizon.

**(Q6) Mrs Watson** asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games for the criteria for setting up a micro library, which was given by the Cabinet Member, who also referred to the success of the micro library at Shere, staffed by volunteers. She said that the County Council had not closed any libraries but had opened an additional one.

## 20/13 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

There was one local Member statement from Mr John Butcher relating to Cedar Road, Cobham.

## 21/13 ORIGINAL MOTION [Item 8]

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Ian Beardsmore moved the updated motion, which had been tabled at the meeting, which was:

‘Council notes:

1. Surrey County Council has a proud history as the creator of the Green Belt. The County’s Countryside Estate founded by the Surrey County Council Act of 1931 was the basis of the London County Council’s Green Belt Act of 1938.
2. The Coalition Agreement states:  
  
*We will maintain the Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and other environmental protections, and create a new designation – similar to SSSIs – to protect green areas of particular importance to local communities.*
3. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has signalled that he would support building on Green Belt land.

Council believes:

Surrey’s Green Belt, Countryside Estate, SSSIs and other green spaces are vital, not only for the county’s environment but also for maintaining a “green lung” around London.

Council resolves:

1. To do everything in its power to protect Surrey’s Green Belt.
2. To oppose any moves by government to weaken Green Belt legislation.
3. To make Surrey’s MPs and the County’s Districts and Boroughs aware of this resolution.
4. That any Green Belt development in the County is in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents.

Mr Beardsmore made the following points:

- The background to the founding of the Green Belt
- That it was essential to protect Surrey’s Green Belt

- The need to support the County's Boroughs and Districts in this area because the new Planning Guidelines had put these councils under pressure
- A reference to the number of empty houses in Surrey and also MOD property
- That any 'creep' on Green Belt can never be reversed.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Hazel Watson, who referred to the Green Belt in the metropolitan areas of London. She also said that without the Green Belt, Surrey's unique character would disappear and she pressed for the development of brownfield sites. Finally, she said that any decision on Green Belt land should be made at local level by democratically elected representatives.

Mr John Furey tabled an amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mr Martin) which was:

'Council notes:

1. Surrey County Council has a proud history as the creator of the Green Belt. The County's Countryside Estate founded by the Surrey County Council Act of 1931 was the basis of the London County Council's Green Belt Act of 1938.

2. The Coalition Agreement states:

*'We will maintain the Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and other environmental protections, and create a new designation – similar to SSSIs – to protect green areas of particular importance to local communities.'*

Council believes:

Surrey's Green Belt, Countryside Estate, SSSIs and other green spaces are vital, not only for the county's environment but also for maintaining a "green lung" around London.

Council resolves:

1. To use its power to protect Surrey's Green Belt.
2. To support the National Planning Policy Framework (section 9 – paragraphs 79 to 92) and the Government's policy of protecting the Green Belt.
3. To make Surrey's MPs and the County's Districts and Boroughs aware of this resolution.
4. That any Green Belt development in the County is in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents.'

Mr Furey said that he strongly supported the Green Belt policy and would accept the broad principle of the motion. However, he had proposed three

amendments to it and explained the reasons behind them. He said that most planning applications were decided by Boroughs and Districts and that residents were consulted. He reiterated that Surrey would use its power to protect Surrey's Green Belt.

In seconding the amendment, Mr Martin explained the reasons for deleting the reference to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and for amending point 2 so that it referred to the National Planning Policy Framework which he hoped gave a more positive approach to the wording of the motion.

Mr Beardsmore agreed to accept the amendment and therefore the amendment became the substantive motion.

After a short debated in which 3 Members spoke, it was:

**RESOLVED (unanimously):**

Council notes:

1. Surrey County Council has a proud history as the creator of the Green Belt. The County's Countryside Estate founded by the Surrey County Council Act of 1931 was the basis of the London County Council's Green Belt Act of 1938.

2. The Coalition Agreement states:

*'We will maintain the Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and other environmental protections, and create a new designation – similar to SSSIs – to protect green areas of particular importance to local communities.'*

Council believes:

Surrey's Green Belt, Countryside Estate, SSSIs and other green spaces are vital, not only for the county's environment but also for maintaining a "green lung" around London.

Council resolves:

1. To use its power to protect Surrey's Green Belt.
2. To support the National Planning Policy Framework (section 9 – paragraphs 79 to 92) and the Government's policy of protecting the Green Belt.
3. To make Surrey's MPs and the County's Districts and Boroughs aware of this resolution.
4. That any Green Belt development in the County is in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents.

## 22/13 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]

The Leader presented the reports of the Cabinet meetings held on 5 and 26 February 2013.

### (1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced her statement in relation to the Celebration and Bursary Fund for Surrey's Looked After Children which had been included in the agenda.

### (2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

#### A The Consultation on Surrey's Admission Arrangements for September 2014 for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and Co-ordinated schemes

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning was invited to present the report.

#### RESOLVED:

- (1) A feeder link is introduced for Banstead Community Junior School for children from Banstead Infant School for September 2014, as follows:
  - a) Looked after and previously looked after children
  - b) Exceptional social/medical need
  - c) Children attending Banstead Infant School
  - d) Siblings not admitted under c) above
  - e) Any other children
- (2) The introduction of a feeder link for Reigate Priory for children from Holmesdale and Reigate Parish is deferred until alternative options are considered.
- (3) The admission criteria for Southfield Park are changed so that, for September 2014, children who have Southfield Park Primary School as their nearest school would receive a higher priority when allocating places **outside** the catchment area, as follows:
  - a) Looked after and previously looked after children
  - b) Exceptional social/medical need
  - c) Siblings
  - d) Children living in the defined catchment of the school with priority being given to children living furthest away from the school
  - e) Other children for whom the school is their nearest school

- f) Any other children
- (4) That a feeder link is introduced for St Ann's Heath Junior School for children from Trumps Green Infant School for September 2014, as follows:
- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
  - b) Exceptional social/medical need
  - c) Siblings
  - d) Children attending Trumps Green Infant School
  - e) Children for whom St Ann's Heath Junior School is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
  - f) Any other children
- (5) A reciprocal sibling link between St Ann's Heath Junior School and Trumps Green Infant School is introduced for September 2014 so that the schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.
- (6) A catchment area based on the Parish of Tatsfield and a phased tiered sibling priority based on the catchment is introduced for Tatsfield Primary School for September 2014, as follows:
- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
  - b) Exceptional social/medical need
  - c) Children who will have a sibling on roll at the school at the end of the 2013/14 academic year and that sibling will still be expected to be on roll at the school on the date of the child's admission
  - d) Siblings who live within the catchment area
  - e) Other children who live within the catchment area
  - f) Siblings who live outside the catchment area
  - g) Other children who live outside the catchment area
- (7) Tiered arrangements are introduced for Thames Ditton Junior School for September 2014 so that siblings, children at the feeder school and other children who have the school as their nearest receive priority ahead of those who do not, as follows:
- a) Looked After and previously looked after children
  - b) Exceptional social/medical need
  - c) Children with a sibling attending Thames Ditton Junior School at the time of the child's admission for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
  - d) Children attending Thames Ditton Infant School for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
  - e) Other children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address



- f) Other children with a sibling attending Thames Ditton Junior School at the time of the child's admission for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
  - g) Other children attending Thames Ditton Infant School for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
  - h) Any other children
- (8) The PAN for Thames Ditton Junior School is decreased from 120 to 90 for September 2014.
- (9) That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for all other Community and Voluntary Controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Annex 1 of Appendix 1, of the Cabinet report, which include the following changes:
- a) Banstead Infant to increase its Reception PAN from 80 to 90
  - b) Bell Farm Primary to increase its Reception PAN from 60 to 90
  - c) Bell Farm Primary to decrease its Junior PAN from 120 to 30
  - d) Earlswood Infant to increase its Reception PAN from 90 to 120
  - e) Earlswood Junior to increase its Junior PAN from 90 to 120
  - f) Grovelands Primary to decrease its Reception PAN from 90 to 60
  - g) Salfords Primary to increase its Reception PAN from 45 to 60
  - h) Spelthorne Primary to increase its Reception PAN from 60 to 90
  - i) Trumps Green Infant to increase its Reception from 30 to 60
  - j) West Ewell Infant to increase its Reception PAN from 90 to 120
- (10) The number of preferences permitted under Surrey's Primary Coordinated Scheme is increased from three to four.
- (11) That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2014/15 are agreed as set out in Annex 4 to Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report.
- (12) Surrey's Relevant Area is agreed as set out in Appendix 2 of the Cabinet report.
- (13) That the remaining aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2014, for which no consultation was required, are agreed.

## **B Implementation of the Public Value Review of Community Partnership – Constitutional Changes**

Members welcomed this report, which had been to all local committees for comment and discussion, and looked forward to more decisions being devolved to a local level.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games thanked Members for expressing support for the proposals and recommendations. She invited Mr Kington to discuss options for making

the process more transparent outside the meeting. She also acknowledged the lengthy process of this Public Value Review and thanked the Local Committee Chairmen and the steering group for their input in moving the proposals forward. She also agreed with Mrs White in relation to recommendation (5) and hoped that some funding from Boroughs / Districts would be forthcoming during the next Administration.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the guidance for the allocation of Members Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations be strengthened and the language simplified with the introduction of an updated Financial Framework for these allocations as attached in Annex A of the submitted report.
- (2) That Local Chairmen should be given greater discretion in relation to public participation at formal Local Committee meetings to make these meetings more engaging for residents. (The relevant amendments to Standing Orders are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)
- (3) That Local Committee Vice-Chairmen be given a greater role in Committee business and that consideration be given to Vice-Chairmen taking on a specific role as Highways Spokesperson for their Local Committee.
- (4) That one consistent set of protocols governing public participation in Local Committees is introduced to make processes clearer for residents and more efficient to administer. (The relevant amendments to Standing Orders are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)
- (5) That Local Committees allow equal voting rights for District and Borough Members unless restricted by law. (The relevant amendments are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)
- (6) That each Local Committees decides on whether it wishes to employ the rule of District or Borough Member substitutes or not. (The relevant amendments are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)

**RESOLVED:**

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 5 and 26 February 2013 be adopted.

### **23/13 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2013 - 2014 [Item 10]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report by stating that, in line with the Localism Act, the County Council was required to approve a Pay Policy Statement for publication on the Council's website.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the Pay Policy Statement, Annex A to the submitted report, to be published on Surrey County Council's external website with effect from 1 April 2013.

### **24/13 ELECTED MEMBER DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY [Item 11]**

Mrs Hammond declared a disclosable interest because she was an assessor for South East Employers and left the room for this item.

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency said that an Elected Member Development Strategy had been approved by the County Council in March 2011 and it had been agreed that it would be reviewed every other year.

The Member Development Steering Group had revised the Strategy and had also drafted additional role profiles for inclusion in the strategy.

Members made the following points:

- That the proposed protocol for elected Members attendance at external courses and conferences (Appendix D to the submitted report) could discourage Members from attending them.
- Access to the Members Portal could be easier.
- It was a good report.
- Recognition of the progress made by the County Council in this area.
- Acknowledgement of the excellent officer support.
- That the County Council was engaged in the whole training process. However, there was a need to examine the relevance of training and its Value for Money.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Elected Member Development Strategy, attached at Appendix 1 to the submitted report, be approved.
- (2) That the role profiles for the Surrey County Councillor, the Vice-Chairman of the Planning and Regulatory Committee and the Vice-Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee, as set out in Appendix B of the Strategy, be agreed for publication in the County Council's Constitution.

**25/13 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION (HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD AND HEALTH SCRUTINY) [Item 12]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health introduced the report and said that the Health and Social Care Act 2012 required the County Council to establish a Health and Wellbeing Board from 1 April 2013. He confirmed that the Board would be subject to scrutiny, as detailed in the report.

The Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Committee referred to paragraph 12 of the main report and requested that Appendix 2, paragraph 1.1(b) be amended from 'the provision of such services to those inhabitants' to 'the provision of both private and NHS Services to inhabitants'. This was agreed.

After a short debate, in which Members received clarity on the new processes and procedures, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the new Article 8A Health and Wellbeing Board be adopted as part of the Council's Constitution as attached at Appendix 1, to the submitted report.
- (2) That Article 7 Select Committees be amended to reflect the changes to Health Scrutiny as set out in Appendix 2 (as amended), to the submitted report.
- (3) That the Council delegates responsibility for health scrutiny in Surrey to the Health Scrutiny Committee.
- (4) That the Council delegates power of referral to the Secretary of State to the Health Scrutiny Committee.

**26/13 FORMATION OF A NEW SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PENSION FUND BOARD [Item 13]**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency said that previously the Investment side of Surrey County Council's Pension Fund had been managed separately, without any reference to liabilities, which was not good practice. Following publication of the draft Pension Fund Bill, this report set out the new requirements for each administering authority of a Local Government Pension Scheme to establish and maintain a Pension Fund Board.

In order to comply with statutory regulations, the Surrey Pension Fund required an authoritative decision making platform on which to resolve and implement decisions on (i) asset liability management, (ii) investment best practice, (iii) clear pathway to full funding status.

She commended the report and its recommendations to Members.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Surrey Pension Fund Board be established as a Committee of the County Council in accordance with section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 with all matters delegated to it, as set out in Appendix A to the submitted report, as its terms of reference with effect from 21 May 2013.
2. That the Surrey Pension Fund Board shall also carry out any functions of a Scheme Pension Board that are required by legislation.
3. That the changes to the Audit and Governance Committee's terms of reference, as set out in Appendix B to the submitted report, be approved and included within the Council's Constitution.
4. That the changes to the Chief Finance Officer's, Strategic Finance Manager's (Pension Fund and Treasury) and Pensions Manager's delegated powers, as set out in Appendix C to the submitted report, be approved and included within the Council's Constitution.
5. That the Surrey Pension Fund Board receive committee support from the Council's democratic services team.
6. That the Investment Advisory Group be disbanded with effect from 21 May 2013.
7. That any consequential amendments be made to the Council's Constitution as required.

**27/13 CODE OF BEST PRACTICE IN PLANNING PROCEDURES [Item 14]**

The Chairman of the Planning & Regulatory Committee presented the report and drew Members attention to paragraph 2.2, relating to the role of Planning & Regulatory Committee Members, in the Surrey Code of Best Practice in Planning Procedures.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Code of Best Practice in Planning Procedures be approved and included in the Council's Constitution.

**28/13 AMENDMENT TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION - THE EXERCISE OF EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS [Item 15]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report.

Mrs White requested that the words 'where appropriate' be deleted from paragraph 6, bullet point 3 and this was agreed by the Leader. Mrs Watson requested that 'local Members' be included in paragraph 6, bullet point 2. The Leader of the Council said that he would consider this request outside the meeting.

**RESOLVED (as amended):**

That the amendments agreed by the Leader to the Highways and Youth functions for Local Committees and the related Officer delegations within the Scheme of Delegation be noted.

**29/13 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 16]**

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

**30/13 CHAIRMAN'S CLOSING REMARKS RE. THE COUNCIL TERM [Item ]**

The Chairman closed the meeting by stating that at least 17 Members would be standing down and that therefore this was their last meeting. She hoped that they had enjoyed their time at the County Council and made new friends. She expressed appreciation to the remaining Members and to officers who had helped Members with their work.

[Meeting ended at: 12.50pm]

---

**Chairman**

*County Council meeting – 19 March 2013*

**Leader's Statement**

Madam Chairman

When I became Leader, I made it clear that I would listen and learn. So that the decisions we made, were always in the best interests of the residents and of the businesses of the County.

Since 2009 this Council has been on a journey - a journey towards success. We have forged new partnerships. We have established the One Team approach across the Council. And we have established a One Team approach across the County. We have worked really hard to ensure that we are investing time, investing money and investing resources in the areas that are important to our residents and businesses. All in all we have achieved a great deal in the last 4 years.

We know how important roads are in Surrey so we have invested significant amounts into our roads. At the same time we have worked hard to ensure value for money through an improved Highways contract and as you all know we are investing in record levels of road resurfacing. We listened and we learnt when developing our new, successful winter maintenance programme. This has enabled us to keep the County moving in difficult weather. Our roads are improving – but we won't stop. We will continue to invest in our roads because the County needs that investment.

We have also seen the impact of a growing population and an increase in the birth rate, which is why we have undertaken the largest ever school investment programme in the history of Surrey – creating 12,000 new school places. We will also be investing in raising schools standards in Surrey, as I outlined in my Budget statement last month, ensuring that our children and young people get the best start in life.

Not only have we put money towards shaping the lives of our children and young people, we have also invested substantially in the care of our older citizens, through investment in dementia services, investment in Telecare and investment in Wellbeing centres. We have recognised the challenges of an ageing population and invested money where it is needed. In fact there will be at least one centre in each of our Districts and Boroughs.

As I told this Chamber in my Budget speech last month, this Administration is committed to creating the conditions for sustainable economic growth in the County. That is why we continue to invest in areas which will benefit the economy in the long term, from our investment to ensure that almost 100% of the County has access to superfast broadband coverage; To our recently expanded apprenticeships programme that will benefit not only 500 of our young people, but also our businesses in Surrey; We are taking steps to make sure that Surrey continues to have a strong and competitive economy

and the report to Cabinet of 26 February detailed our plans to continue to support economic growth, building on the work we have already done. We continue to work closely with Government Departments on several projects which will also contribute to growing Surrey's economy. We have plans for joint funding of investment in key strategic infrastructure programmes and of course we will look closely at the announcements in the Chancellor's Budget tomorrow and the impact these will have on Surrey.

But much more can be done. We will take proposals directly to Government for more powers and more funding to be devolved to the council and our partners, to help us make a difference on the ground and to help us to ensure the economic future of our great County, but Madam Chairman, we mustn't forget the vulnerable in our communities. In this increasingly challenging economic climate, I believe that we must do all that we can to help our vulnerable residents, which means working with our colleagues in Districts and Boroughs to make sure our residents have the right support, at the right time, and in the right way.

We know that the recent Welfare Reform programme means that some of our residents will face difficulties and will need extra help, which is why I am delighted to announce that we will be supporting the SurreySave Credit Union with a £50,000 investment. This will help those families who are struggling financially in difficult times and there is also a preventative element to getting a loan through SurreySave.

Residents can take out a loan which will enable them to pay their bills and manage their family budgets without having to get into deep financial difficulty, but of course Surrey Save is also there for those who want to save and have their money put to good use in Surrey.

I am sure all Members in this Chamber will agree that this is a worthwhile investment, because this Administration is committed to helping the vulnerable people of the County during these tough times.

I do hope Members take the opportunity to hear more about this initiative over lunch, as you have already invited them to do.

I have outlined some of our achievements over the last 4 years. I have also outlined how we are continuing to help the vulnerable in our community. But what about the future?

This Conservative Administration has restored this Council to its rightful place, amongst the best in the country. We know that we can meet any challenges with confidence. There is a strong and safe future ahead for Surrey, because we take a long term approach and a pragmatic approach. Working in partnership with others as One Team, for the benefit of Surrey. Public value and a commitment to public service are fundamental to the way we deliver services, putting the residents and businesses of Surrey first in any decision we make.



Members will know that the Public Value Review programme has been a huge source of pride for me. Designed and led by our staff and Members, working with our partners and indeed residents - in a spirit of collaboration. Leading to the delivery of better quality services for the residents of Surrey and identifying savings to date of around £280m and with more to come. The Programme empowered and motivated our staff to bring forward, and realise, their ideas for change.

From community partnered libraries to making better use of our youth centres and from smarter highways commissioning to rethinking our approach to foster carers, there are so many strong examples of One Team working in action, delivered by the PVRs.

I am very proud to say that – in recognition of these practical examples – Surrey County Council was crowned council of the year at the recent Improvement and Efficiency Awards and the County Council was also shortlisted as Council of the Year by the Local Government Chronicle at its Annual Awards. A fantastic achievement and it shows that, by working together, we are stronger and better placed to provide excellent and efficient services to local people.

As demonstrated by projects like the PVRs, Surrey County Council has a proven track record of finding new and innovative ways of delivering services, we are now building on this to develop a systematic approach to innovation within the organisation.

In November last year the Cabinet approved a paper which set out a framework for the Council's innovation approach. This recognised that innovation was the key to strengthening the organisation and vital for the council to face the challenges ahead. To allow us to secure a prosperous future for Surrey and enable us to continue to protect our vulnerable residents.

The One Team approach will be a key part of delivering necessary innovative and imaginative solutions to the key challenges ahead, through working in collaboration with our partners and investing in our staff to give them the skills and tools they need.

At next week's Cabinet meeting I will present updates on the progress we have made in strengthening our approach to innovation and alongside it, I will put forward recommendations for how we will further develop services to ensure they deliver public value for the residents of Surrey. Finding the most effective way of delivering a service is vital if we are to continue to meet the needs of our residents, while at the same time meeting our financial challenges.

This council is doing an outstanding job in providing quality services to our residents but we can never be complacent. We are already working with partners to get the best value for money for Surrey residents, from

contracting with May Gurney on our highway contract, to sharing our procurement service with East Sussex.

From working with our SE7 partners – as we showcased at our recent conference, which the Secretary of State Eric Pickles attended - to working with partners to provide better support for families with multiple and complex needs.

This was recognised by the very recent Local Government Association Peer Challenge of Surrey County Council. The LGA complimented the Council for taking a long term approach to the future and long term benefits are shaping proposals for the delivery of better services for our residents. Looking to deliver services differently, driving improvements to create a dynamic and entrepreneurial environment, generating income to support the delivery of our medium term financial plan and creating opportunities for staff to develop and expand their skills.

This Conservative Administration has delivered on its promises and since I became Leader we have continued to build a strong, stable base for the County Council, ensuring that our finances are secure, while delivering on our commitments to our residents and businesses.

Our long term approach will mean we continue to face the challenges ahead with confidence, focusing on public value and always putting residents first. Over the last 4 years this Conservative administration has created excellent and fruitful partnerships with our District and Borough Councils. We have played an important role in the development of the South East 7 council partnership in delivery better quality and more cost effective services. We have stood up for the long term interests of our residents and we have seen a culture change in this organisation, led by the Chief Executive and our staff have responded magnificently to in rising to the often difficult challenges which we have faced. I am very proud of them and I am confident they are ready for greater challenges in the next 4 years.

We are committed to extending the already innovative work we have undertaken and making innovation a day to day part of the work of the Council and we will continue to look at new ways to generate income and deliver services in ways which benefit our residents. Working with our partners to realise every opportunity available.

As the Local Government Peer Review Group said:

‘Surrey County Council is ready to take off and I look to the future with great confidence, because in Conservative hands, the future of Surrey is safe.’

**David Hodge**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**19 March 2013**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**TUESDAY 19 MARCH 2013**

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

**LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**(1) DR ANDREW POVEY (WAVERLEY EASTERN VILLAGES) TO ASK:**

Can the Leader advise the council when the report into the recent tragic death of Gloria Foster, while under the care of the County Council, will be published and when Members of this council will have a chance to scrutinise it?

**Reply:**

The Police investigation has not yet concluded and SCC officers have cooperated fully with their inquiries.

The Serious Case Review has commenced and is being chaired by an independent person who has commissioned an independent expert to carry out the investigation.

It is not possible to say at this stage when either investigation will be complete.

I can say no more at this stage.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY**

**(2) MR TIM HALL (LEATHERHEAD AND FETCHAM EAST) TO ASK:**

The County Council has a good record on Apprenticeships. I see that the Mayor of London has announced a 30% Travel Discount for Apprentices in London which seems an excellent idea.

Would she consider such a policy for Surrey as we know transport is the biggest issue for many young people in Surrey accessing work and education? And how much it would cost?

**Reply:**

The scheme operated by TfL appears to be something that could make a real difference to younger people, for whom the cost of travel can be a burden to work and education. We will be following the progress of this closely. We also acknowledge the success of the 'Bus for Jobs' pilot which ran in January 2013 providing free travel on much of the nation's bus network for jobseekers.

To help Surrey's younger people access employment we are currently designing a pilot to be tested in Woking, aimed at Jobseekers aged between 18-25 as part of Surrey's Travel SMART programme. Working in conjunction with Woking BC and the Job Centre Plus, we will be providing up to 4 months free travel on the bus network, to job seekers identified by the job centre who could benefit from the scheme by removing the cost barrier of travelling by bus to job interviews. Crucially one month of this support would be provided for people who have found work, but will have a gap in income between losing their job seekers allowance and receiving their first pay packet.

Job Centre Plus staff will also receive training from the Travel SMART team to enable them to provide high quality travel advice to jobseekers who find travel a major barrier to finding work. £12,000 has initially been identified to run the pilot, and this level of funding could benefit up to 140 young jobseekers in Woking. We will analyse the results of the pilot with the view to rolling this out to the rest of the County.

The County Council also supports its own apprentices and younger employees by providing discounts as part of its membership of EASIT (East Area of Surrey Initiatives for Transport). Employees of the Council and any other businesses who are members of EASIT enjoy a 20% discount on Southern Trains and many of the bus routes operating in the east of the County.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT**

**(3) MR JOHN ORRICK (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK:**

I have two roads in my division that were resurfaced in 2012 that are suffering breakdown of the new surface. How many other roads across Surrey have suffered similarly? If it is the fault of the contractor or sub-contractor will the repair be at their cost and will it be just patching or the complete road? What is the expected timeline for a permanent solution?

**Reply:**

In 2012/13 Surrey Highways delivered over 1000 road surfacing schemes, of this programme approximately 30 schemes have been identified as requiring remedial work. Due to the complex nature of highway construction, 3% failure is well within industry standards.

It is important to stress that not all failures are a result of poor workmanship, for example the scheme you refer to (Ninehams Road) has issues due to movement within the clay base which in turn has caused the top surface to peel. The base was not identified as an issue and was thus excluded from the 2012 construction scheme. Going forward Surrey Highways has improved the design process to ensure that all major road schemes have a full base survey completed as part of the scheme design. This will ensure that all potential issues are resolved as part of the scheme design and construction.

All highway schemes also come with a 2 year guarantee. Thus any scheme identified as failing due to poor workmanship, will be repaired at the contractors full expense. The repair must meet the original scheme design, and thus if warranted, Surrey Highways can insist that the full road be re-surfaced at no additional cost to the council.

Officers are continuing to investigate the schemes in your area, and will provide a separate update confirming agreed actions and timescales to resolve the identified issues.

#### **CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT**

##### **(4) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:**

What percentage of Surrey's roads will deteriorate to a standard of poor over the next 5 years?

##### **Reply:**

Our intention is that 0% of Surrey roads will deteriorate to poor during this period through a combination of the new 5 year major maintenance programme and preventative maintenance on the rest of the network.

#### **CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT**

##### **(5) MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK:**

Rydes Hill Road was added to the list of major road maintenance works about three or four years ago. It finally worked its way to the top of the list. Residents were given a number of dates for work to start but it never did and they almost gave up hope. Then, about 18 months ago the contractors moved in and we achieved a really smooth road surface. The residents were delighted. Now that really smooth road surface is beginning to crack up. I have reported the problem to our local Area Highways Manager.

Please would the Cabinet Member let me and my residents know:

- (a) why a road surface which was put down such a short time ago is cracking up already,
- (b) what is going to be done about it,
- (c) who will meet the cost of the repairs as Surrey taxpayers have already paid once?

**Reply:**

- (a) Following an initial investigation the issue is not due to poor workmanship, but as a result of issues with the sub-base, probably caused by a water leak below the road surface, which could not have been foreseen at the time of original works.
- (b) A site meeting has been arranged with Thames Water to agree solution, and we are awaiting the outcome of their own investigations to agree next steps.
- (c) If there is any fault found with the contractor materials or workmanship, then the scheme is covered by the 2 year guarantee and the contractor will repair at no cost to Surrey County Council. Equally where liability is accepted by Thames Water, the council will pursue the 3rd party to fund cost of repairs.

Investigations are continuing and Surrey Highways officers will contact Mrs White separately in April, with an update report and estimated resolution timescale.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE 2012 GAMES**

**(6) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

A number of micro libraries have started appearing across the County.

- (i) What is the minimum number of books that constitutes a micro library?
- (ii) How does a County councillor go about requesting one to be established in their division?
- (iii) How have Members been informed of this?
- (iv) How is the allocation of where micro libraries are located decided?
- (v) How does the service provided by micro libraries in terms of number of books and turnover of books compare to the former mobile library service?

**Reply:**

The development of alternatives to the mobile library service and community led provision are key actions arising from the Libraries Public Value Review.

The alternative services which have been set up by the library service for people unable to access the SCC library network in the usual ways is known collectively as "Library Direct". The targeted options for individuals currently include home book services, e-book services and links to community transport.

Within these alternatives it was recognised that some communities might propose managing collections of books themselves for wider community use, either collections for loan or bookswaps.

The decision to set up such a collection known as a community link is entirely community driven. The development of these collections relies on individual communities coming forward and the library service agreeing with the community that there is suitable accommodation and most importantly sufficient community impetus and support to manage it on a purely voluntary basis within that community.

These arrangements, known as community links within the library service, are sometimes collectively referred to as micro libraries. At present there is one running at Shere, one under development at Beare Green, and SCC is in discussion concerning a community bookswap at Oakwood Village Hall near Ockley. As the name suggests, these small book collections are community driven and form a link to the main library service.

The model is for the library service to provide 500-1000 books depending on what the community are looking for and size of accommodation. These can be supplemented by locally provided books, donations and a book swap if they wish. The library service provides books as above, a request service, set up guidance and arm's length support and a six monthly stock swap.

A mobile library contained around 2100 books.

Community links are not an SCC driven replacement for the mobile service. They are community led - and their strength is in the community enthusiasm and that access for the community is longer than brief weekly or fortnightly stops that were available via the mobile service. Bookswaps similarly provide an access route to books, and both models have been known to generate within their communities reading groups, social events and other positive outcomes from the focus provided by the community link.