

COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING - 15 OCTOBER 2013

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 15 October 2013 commencing at 10.30 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

David Munro (Chairman)
Sally Marks (Vice-Chairman)

Mary Angell	David Ivison
W D Barker OBE	Daniel Jenkins
Nikki Barton	George Johnson
Ian Beardsmore	Linda Kemeny
John Beckett	Colin Kemp
Mike Bennison	Eber Kington
Liz Bowes	Rachael I Lake
Natalie Bramhall	Stella Lallement
Mark Brett-Warburton	Yvonna Lay
Ben Carasco	Denise Le Gal
Bill Chapman	Mary Lewis
Helyn Clack	Christian Mahne
Carol Coleman	Ernest Mallett MBE
Stephen Cooksey	Peter Martin
Steve Cossier	Jan Mason
Clare Curran	Marsha Moseley
Graham Ellwood	Tina Mountain
Jonathan Essex	Christopher Norman
Robert Evans	John Orrick
Tim Evans	Adrian Page
Mel Few	Chris Pitt
Will Forster	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
Pat Frost	Denise Saliagopoulos
Denis Fuller	Tony Samuels
John Furey	Pauline Searle
Bob Gardner	Stuart Selleck
Mike Goodman	Nick Skellett CBE
David Goodwin	Michael Sydney
Michael Gosling	Keith Taylor
Zully Grant-Duff	Barbara Thomson
Ken Gulati	Chris Townsend
Tim Hall	Richard Walsh
Kay Hammond	Hazel Watson
David Harmer	Fiona White
Nick Harrison	Richard Wilson
Marisa Heath	Helena Windsor
Peter Hickman	* Keith Witham
Margaret Hicks	Alan Young
David Hodge	Victoria Young
Saj Hussain	

*absent

63/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Witham.

64/13 MINUTES [Item 2]

Mr Essex requested the deletion of the last two bullet points, in relation to Item 9(ii) – the amendment moved by him to the original motion standing in the name of Mr Martin.

The minutes of the County Council held on 16 July 2013, as amended, were submitted, confirmed and signed.

65/13 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- On 18 July, he was proud to attend the summer party at the Runnymede Centre for Surrey's Looked after Children, their carers, foster parents and Surrey staff.
- On 3 September, he had met with the Walton Bridge 'workers'. Also, he was pleased to announce that, at this year's Annual Highway Award Ceremony, Walton Bridge had won the UK Major Project of the Year.
- Congratulations to Linda Kemeny who had recently got married.
- The lunchtime speaker was Simon Morris, Headteacher of Esher High School.

66/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

67/13 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

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

Members were invited to make comments, ask questions and made the following points:

- The resurfacing of many roads across Surrey was welcomed but he was asked what steps were in place to improve Surrey's pavements for pedestrians.
- Praise for the work of the Environment and Transport Select Committee's Winter Service Task Group which was on-going and an excellent example of cross party working.
- Congratulations to Lucie Glenday and her team and also to BT, for achieving 30 September 2013 targets in relation to Superfast Broadband.

68/13 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Notice of 18 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.

(Q2) Mrs White asked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care if he agreed that there had been too many occasions where the Budget agreed for Adult Social Care had not been realistic and then relied on one-off savings to keep the expenditure within budget. The Cabinet Member responded by stating that this year, three Rapid Improvement Events had taken place in the Adult Social Care service and they have made a substantial contribution to the current year's savings and contributed to the overall savings of approximately £105m, which would be achieved by the end of this financial year. He confirmed that a realistic budget had been set for 2013/14 and that the service continued to focus on being efficient.

(Q3) Mr Cooksey asked the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment when the 72 Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) currently out of action would be working. **Mrs Frost** also asked the Cabinet Member what was the length of time, from when a broken sign was reported, to repair it and **Dr Grant-Duff** asked him to comment on how the repairs to VAS were prioritised. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the signs were being repaired but it was the decision of local committees to prioritise them. Referring to the query about the time taken, he said that he would respond outside the meeting.

(Q4) Mr Ellwood was concerned that the new measures were 'voluntary' and sought reassurance from the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment that the new tenants would not be permitted to work outside working hours. The Cabinet Member said that the county was not in a position to influence Guildford Borough Council's decision, however, the county council had consulted with residents and he hoped that good working practices would prevail.

(Q5) Mr Robert Evans referred to the proposal to reduce the number of fire engines in Spelthorne from two to one and asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services what were the positives for his residents. **Mrs Saliagopoulos** said that there was cross border cover available in the Spelthorne area. She also asked the Cabinet Member to confirm that the proposals for fire cover in this area were still out for consultation. The Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services responded and confirmed that the proposals were still out for consultation and local communities had contributed to it. She also stressed the importance of looking at the fire cover for the whole county and that, should the proposals be agreed, the response time would still be within the agreed standard for the whole county. She reiterated the importance of working within budget and that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service had invested heavily in the right equipment for any future changes.

(Q6) Several Members expressed concern about the road closures in place for the cycle race on 4 August. **Mr Barker** mentioned a specific case in his division whereby an ambulance had been stopped from attending an emergency call to an elderly lady. **Mr Beardsmore** expressed concern about the length of time that roads were closed. **Mrs Watson** referred to a resident in her area that needed urgent hospital treatment and asked what action would be taken at future events to ensure health and safety was paramount. **Mrs Frost** asked whether the lessons learnt from the cycle race would be taken into account as part of the Cycling Strategy consultation.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services agreed to investigate details of specific cases mentioned and asked Members to send her details. She said that the cycle race was a new event in which 2000 Surrey residents had taken part. She confirmed that the county council had worked together with the emergency services

to ensure that they were placed appropriately. However, lessons learnt from this year's event would be taken on board and used to improve next year's cycle race.

(Also, Q6) Mr Young asked the Cabinet Member if she was aware that there had been extensive consultation with the parish councils and the Mayor of London's office in relation to the RideLondon Surrey route and **Mr Hodge** asked her how many people had registered for next year's event and from this year's event, how much money had been raised for charity. The Cabinet Member confirmed to Mr Young that she was aware of the consultation and in response to Mr Hodge, she said that approximately £3.5m had been raised for charity and 80,000 people had registered for next year's event.

(Q7) Mrs Watson did not consider that her question had been answered and asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services who at the county council had made the decision that the Prudential RideLondon Surrey classic event would take place in Surrey for 5 years from 2013. **Mr Hall** also considered that any evaluation of the event should be conducted independently and not by the event organisers. He also invited the Cabinet Member to view next year's event in his division. The Cabinet Member said that she would respond to Mrs Watson outside the meeting and that she would raise the point made by Mr Hall with the event organisers. Finally, she said that many Members from all parties had supported the event and it was important to have a balanced view. However, she acknowledged that the County Council needed to work with its partners to minimise disruption.

(Q8) Mr Orrick asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services when the four remaining libraries would become Community Partnered Libraries (CPLs). Mr Hodge also asked the Cabinet Member to comment on the volunteers' role and whether the Council had opened any other libraries. She confirmed that the transfer of the four remaining libraries was 'work in progress'. In response to the other questions, she confirmed that there had been a positive response to the volunteers and that following the establishment of a micro library in Shere, a second one was about to open in Beare Green.

(Q9) Mr Mallett disagreed with some points of the response. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care requested that he put his queries in writing and he would provide a response outside the meeting.

(Q10) Mr Jenkins said that the response had not identified specific measures for improvement and posed his question again to the Cabinet Member for Community Services. **Mrs Bowes** asked the Cabinet Member if she agreed that, as had happened in her division, many residents had celebrated the event and thought it was a positive experience. **Mr Martin** also considered that the extensive press coverage was good publicity and beneficial for Surrey's tourism. **Mr Townsend** asked the Cabinet Member to confirm whether the route for the RideLondon Surrey Cycle event would remain the same in future years. She informed him that consultation was ongoing and would finish at the end of October, however, she was keen to deliver future events safely and to consider the needs of communities and businesses. Finally, she said that it was the event organiser who applied for the route and that those Members whose divisions were on the proposed route were aware of it.

As set out in Standing Orders, question time was limited to 45 minutes. This time limit was reached after question 11 and Members were advised that written responses had been tabled for all questions and if they had any supplementary

questions, they were invited to contact the relevant Cabinet Member outside the meeting.

69/13 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

There were no statements by Members.

70/13 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 8]

ITEM 8(i)

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:

‘National figures announced by the Coalition Government have brought welcome news on the large number of “Troubled Families” being turned around by councils across the country.

Troubled families are those that have problems and cause problems to the community around them, putting high costs on the public sector. Government funding is provided to help turn round troubled families.

The scheme, aims to:

- get children back into school
- reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour
- put adults on a path back to work
- reduce the high costs these families place on the public sector each year.

This is achieved by:

- joining up local services
- dealing with each family’s problems as a whole rather than responding to each problem, or person, separately
- appointing a single key worker to get to grips with the family’s problems and work intensively with them to change their lives for the better for the long term
- using a mix of methods that support families and challenge poor behaviour

Nationally, out of 118,000 families, 14,000 had been turned around by the end of July 2013, a 12% success rate.

Council notes that the Leader announced on his taking office that the County’s children are his number one priority. Council further notes that in Surrey, out of 1,000 families, only 12 had been turned around in the same period, a success rate of only 1.2%.

Council requests the Chairmen of the Adult Social Care and Children & Education Select Committees to convene a joint meeting to scrutinise reports from officers as to why Surrey is underachieving by a factor of 10 below the national average and to make recommendations to Cabinet as to how a rapid turnaround in performance in this crucial area of the Council’s business can be achieved.’

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Lallement.

Mrs White said that:

- She was disappointed with the County Council's performance in turning around such a small number of troubled families and gave the statistics for surrounding counties, which were all better than Surrey County Council.
- The Lib Dems believed in creating a fairer society.
- Children who did not have family support struggled to achieve.
- The impact of 'troubled families' on local communities and their anti-social behaviour was an issue.
- The adults often claimed unemployment benefit and the cost of troubled families mounted up.
- Health issues were sometimes an issue.
- The failure to recognise the issues was letting the troubled families down.
- She was in contact with the family support unit in Guildford.
- The Council should agree to her request for a joint meeting of the Adult Social Care and Children & Education Select Committees to consider these issues so that they could make recommendations to improve the outcomes for these families.

Mrs Angell responded and made the following points:

- That in Surrey, the word 'troubled' was not used, it was called the Family Support Programme.
- The figures quoted by Mrs White were inaccurate and the figure of 12 families mentioned in the motion referred to the number of families involved in the pilot programme. From October 2013, 794 families were on the Surrey programme, which had achieved a 40% success rate to date.
- Senior civil servants had visited the County Council in June and their feedback on the Family Support Programme was that the council was a leading authority in this area.
- Officers working in this area were supporting the national programme.
- The Family Support Programme was subject to rigorous scrutiny - the Children and Education Select Committee had received a report on this programme at its meeting on 19 September 2013.
- A report on Public Service Transformation would be considered by Cabinet on 22 October 2013 – this included the outline business case for Surrey's Family Support Programme.
- She did not agree with the request for a joint meeting of the relevant select committees.

Seven Members spoke on the motion, with the following points being made:

- The programme was being delivered in partnership with Boroughs and Districts.
- Each family on the programme had an individual plan.
- Cross County support was now available for the Family Support Programme.
- It was wrong to play politics with children's lives.
- There was a continued drive to transform public services in Surrey.
- Concern about the accuracy of data used in the original motion.
- Reports on this programme had also been to the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee, as well as to the Children and Families Select Committee and the select committee had supported the progress made and considered that it was a well-delivered programme.

- More help was needed for troubled families in Spelthorne.
- A reference to a letter received from Government, in relation to the Council's partnership work with Boroughs and Districts, and that this 2-tier council had made real progress towards a one team approach.
- That, when challenged, statistics were often misleading and that other counties had turned around more troubled families.
- That the troubled families funding had been made available by the Coalition Government and this Council must put this issue at the top of its agenda.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote with 12 Members voting for it. There were 2 abstentions and the remaining Members voted against it and therefore the motion was lost.

ITEM 8(ii)

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:

1. The County Council appears to be implementing policies on the use of social media and filming in Council, Cabinet, Select Committees and Local Committees even though no policies have been approved by Members. Policies which should be promoting openness and transparency have not been set in an open and transparent way.
2. Legislation [S.I 2012 No. 2089 The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012] and guidance by the DCLG have been issued on the role of social media and filming to promote openness and transparency in decision making.
3. The policies being applied by Surrey County Council place unnecessary obstructions to the use of social media and filming. For example, limiting the use of social media in meetings to breaks in business at the end of items and requiring written applications to film meetings.

Council agrees that:

- a) the use of social media and the filming of meetings shall be permitted at all times, without written permission, in the public part of meetings provided it does not disturb the business of the meeting and there is sufficient space.
- b) it will follow the spirit of recent legislation and guidance in ensuring openness and transparency in decision making and scrutiny of decisions.’

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Forster.

Mrs Watson referred to guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government, in relation to social media and filming in meetings and said that the County Council had an inconsistent approach to the publication of guidance on its committees' agendas. She believed that requests for filming meetings should be an administrative rather than a political decision and that Council policy needed changing. She urged all Members to support her motion.

Ms Le Gal moved an amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mrs Frost), which was to delete points 1-3 and (b) of the original motion and amend (a) as follows (additional words underlined and deletions crossed through):

Council agrees that:

- a) the use of social media and the filming of meetings shall be permitted at all times, ~~without written permission~~ with the Chairman's consent obtained in advance of the meeting, in the public part of meetings provided it does not disturb the business of the meeting and there is sufficient space.

Ms Le Gal made the following points:

- That the County Council was open and transparent which was why her amendment had removed the political points.
- The Chairmen were in charge of meetings and therefore his / her consent was required. This was particularly relevant for local committee meetings because they were held at various venues.
- Committee meetings were meetings held in public and not public meetings.

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

- A request that school governors be asked to replicate this guidance at their meetings, if possible.
- Concern that the Chairman may not be fully in control of the meeting if use of social media, such as Twitter, was permitted.
- The Chairman was in control of the meeting and therefore, it was reasonable to obtain their consent.
- The Chairman was answerable to the public.
- Agreed that social media guidance needed clarification but the amendment went too far in the other direction.
- A request that the Epsom and Ewell Local Committee could determine their own guidance if they wished.
- Removing the words 'without written permission' adhered to the legislation.
- Openness and transparency were important.
- That the amendment was more restrictive than the original motion.

The amendment was put to the vote with 51 Members voting for and 20 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion. Members then voted on the substantive motion, which was agreed and therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That the use of social media and the filming of meetings shall be permitted at all times, with the Chairman's consent obtained in advance of the meeting, in the public part of meetings provided it does not disturb the business of the meeting and there is sufficient space.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.55pm and resumed at 2.15pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mrs Barton,

Mr Ellwood, Mr Fuller, Mr Hall, Dr Grant-Duff, Mrs Hicks, Mrs Lallement, Mrs Lay, Mrs Moseley, Mr Sydney, Mr Young and Mrs Young.

ITEM 8(iii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Robert Evans moved the motion which was:

'This Council opposes moves to erase Stanwell Moor from the map of Surrey'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Jenkins.

Prior to the start of the debate on this motion, the Leader of the Council raised a point of order because he considered that the Council had debated a motion on airports in July and therefore, the council should not debate another motion on this topic within six months. The Chairman informed Members that he had taken advice and the motion had been ruled in order because it was sufficiently different from the motion debated in July.

In support of his motion, Mr Robert Evans, made the following points:

- That at the last Council meeting, he had voted in favour of the motion relating to Heathrow and Gatwick. However, since then the Davies Commission had reported, setting out several proposals for Heathrow, including a south west option which would have a direct impact on 850 homes in Stanwell Moor.
- Concern about the health of residents and that Stanwell would become a 'dead-end' village if this proposal went ahead.
- Further increased traffic movement.
- Consideration of other options such as better use of capacity at Heathrow and re-routing holiday flights to other airports.
- Unlike many European airports, Heathrow was situated in an urban area.
- That the County Council had a responsibility to its residents.

Mr Furey moved an amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mr Martin), which was (additional words underlined and deletions crossed through):

~~'This Council opposes moves to erase Stanwell Moor from the map of Surrey'~~ recognises the concerns of the residents of Stanwell Moor from the map of Surrey about proposals for the expansion of Heathrow and calls on the Davies Commission to end the uncertainty for them as soon as possible.'

Mr Furey reminded Members what had been agreed at the Council meeting in July – that the Council recognised the crucial roles of both airports in Surrey and that this authority would look closely at the impact of any expansion.

He also made the following points:

- Thousands of Surrey residents worked at the airport.
- 58 schemes had been submitted to the Davies Commission and until its interim draft report was published in December 2013, it was impossible to comment on specific proposals.

- If the south west option was included in the proposals, the County Council would be a consultee.
- That he considered that the amendment reflected the concerns of Stanwell Moor residents and he urged the Davies Commission to end the uncertainty as soon as possible.

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

- That the amendment was patronising and insulting.
- Two well attended public meetings had taken place in the area and that an invite to a future public meeting was extended to the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and the Environment.
- Concern that the community would be split.
- The importance of time limitation for noise issues.
- The amendment abdicated responsibility and the Council should be concerned about planning issues for both Heathrow and Gatwick.
- Uncertainty was a big issue.
- Current Council policy supported no further expansion at Heathrow or Gatwick and it was better to wait until the interim report before taking further action.
- The amendment proposed a more measured way to express concern.
- It was preferable for the Davies Commission to end uncertainty and it was hoped that the south west option would not be shortlisted but if it was, there would be several issues to consider, such as the environmental impact, mitigation and compensation options.

The amendment was put to the vote with 43 Members voting for and 19 Members voting against it. There were 2 abstentions.

Therefore, the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion. Members then voted on the substantive motion, which was agreed and therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this Council recognises the concerns of the residents of Stanwell Moor about proposals for the expansion of Heathrow and calls on the Davies Commission to end the uncertainty for them as soon as possible.

ITEM 8(iv)

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

The Chairman advised Members who had asked for guidance about participating in this debate, if they were members of the planning committee, that they could participate fully in the debate and subsequent vote and that this would not preclude them from any future planning decision provided they maintained an open mind when hearing those applications.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Jonathan Essex moved the motion which was:

‘Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking) of Shale Type Rock

Surrey County Council notes that:

1. New sources of energy supply that involve controversial technologies and methods should be subject to careful scrutiny and regulation. One such process is Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking) of shale type rock to release entrapped gas in commercial quantities.
2. Unfortunately there are no specific onshore exploration or extraction regulations for natural gas and the offshore regulations developed in the 1990s are not sufficient to address all the issues that arise from moving the process onshore, such as in the heavily populated and unspoilt environment of Surrey.

In particular, large amounts of water needed for hydraulic fracturing to extract shale gas (as well as the well-documented risk of groundwater contamination as a result of fracking where well integrity has been compromised) would put further pressure on limited water supplies in Surrey, and may put residents and local agriculture at risk;

Surrey County Council shall:

- (i) Review whether any economic benefits for Fracking would not be outweighed by costs to others sectors such as tourism; and
- ii) Call on the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change to introduce Industry Specific regulation of hydraulic fracturing for the UK shale gas industry, as there are still no specific onshore exploration or extraction regulations for natural gas (and the offshore regulations developed in the 1990s are not sufficient to address all the issues that arise from moving the process onshore).’

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Beardsmore.

In support of his motion, Mr Essex made the following points:

- Concern about fracking, both from an engineering point of view and on environmental grounds.
- That the volumes of water needed for hydraulic fracking was huge and pollution was inevitable.
- Reference to the minor earthquake caused by fracking in Lancashire.
- Industrialisation of Surrey’s countryside – with piping across it and additional lorries.
- Licences have been approved for ‘pilot’ exploration in several areas of Surrey.
- This motion asks for the benefits of fracking to be reviewed and better regulation, for this industry, be introduced by Government.
- A greater understanding of the impact so that the Council was more in control of Surrey’s countryside.

Five Members spoke on the motion, with the following points being made:

- Fracking was still in its infancy.
- Acknowledgement that it was of interest to residents and that a 'questions / answers' webpage would be kept up to date.
- The Government was encouraging exploration and that residents should be reassured that this country had some of the most stringent environment and safety regulations in the world, which were monitored by the Health and Safety Executive.
- Policies were in place and the County Council was a Mineral Planning Authority.
- Uncertainty on how much shale gas exists.
- The Department of Environment had published a balanced report on fracking in July.
- Surrey was rich in natural resources and any planning application would be subject to rigorous scrutiny.
- A licence to drill near Egham had been granted.
- This motion requested a review on whether the benefits of fracking outweighed the disadvantages.
- Proper regulation was required.
- This country was known for going forward and exploration.
- Concern re. the water resource required and that there were too many unanswered questions.

The motion was put to the vote with 16 Members voting for and 40 Members voting against it. There were 3 abstentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

71/13 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]

The Leader presented the reports of the Cabinet meetings held on 23 July and 24 September 2013.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

Services for Young People transforms the lives of Surrey Young People – the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning tabled a statement (Appendix C)

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A Revision of Procurement Standing Orders

An amended table 3.1.1, which included a footnote to explain the distinction between Cabinet and Cabinet Member decisions and replaced the table included in the agenda, was tabled.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed changes to Procurement Standing Orders, as amended, be agreed.

(3) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Investment Strategy
- Public Service Transformation
- Surrey Rail Strategy
- Quarterly Report on Decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements:
1 July 2013 – 30 September 2013

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 23 July and 24 September 2013 be adopted.

72/13 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 10]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee introduced the report from the Audit and Governance Committee and highlighted the key points relating to the Risk Management Policy and the Code of Corporate Governance.

A RISK MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT

RESOLVED:

That the Risk Management Policy, as set out in Annex A of the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.

B CODE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

RESOLVED:

That the updated Code of Corporate Governance, as set out in Annex B of the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.

73/13 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2013 / 2014 [Item 11]

Mr Hodge, as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee introduced this committee's report and said that the purpose of the report was to give the committee flexibility to consider salary progression for individual senior members of staff exceptionally. It should be considered in conjunction with the report from the Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development recommending an amendment to the pay policy and the report from the Head of Legal and Democratic Services which set out the necessary changes to the Scheme of Delegation.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the following amendment to the Surrey Pay Policy Statement 2013-2014 be agreed (additional text in italics):

Surrey Pay

The council's total reward strategy is based on the local negotiation of "single status" Surrey Pay terms and conditions of service. This means that the majority of staff are on consistent terms and conditions of services, except for teachers and fire fighters. Pay, including terms and conditions, is reviewed annually with any changes agreed by the PPDC normally made with effect from 1 April. The council recognises two trades unions, the GMB and UNISON, for the purposes of negotiating Surrey Pay. *Salary progression for individual members of staff may be awarded exceptionally during the current period of pay restraint and must be approved by the PPDC for all staff on senior pay or by the appropriate head of service and the Head of HR&OD for staff on salaries below senior pay.*

- (2) That the terms of reference for the People, Performance and Development Committee be amended, to include *"To determine pay progression for individual staff on senior pay in accordance with the Pay Policy Statement."*
- (3) That the scheme of delegation to officers be amended to include the following:

TITLE OF POSTHOLDER	FUNCTIONS DELEGATED
Head of HR &OD with relevant Head of Service	To determine pay progression for individual for individual Officers who are not on senior pay in accordance with the Pay Policy Statement.

74/13 INTERIM REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL [Item 12]

The Leader of the Council informed Members that this recommendation from the Independent Remuneration Panel was for an exceptional one-off payment for Cabinet Associates. He also requested that the word 'each' should be inserted prior to 'Cabinet Associate with immediate effect'

Mrs Watson moved an amendment, which was to add an additional recommendation to that proposed by the Independent Remuneration Panel. This amendment was formally seconded by Mrs White.

The additional recommendation was:

'As the appointment of Cabinet Associates is a redistribution of the workload of the relevant Cabinet Member, a deduction of £5,000 shall be made from the special Responsibility allowance of the relevant Cabinet Member; thus ensuring the Cabinet and Cabinet Associates remain cost neutral in the current period of pay restraint.'

Mrs Watson said that she considered that the creation of Cabinet Associate roles was unnecessary because, in her view, the workload of Cabinet Members had not increased. Also, there were a significant number of Conservative councillors with Special Responsibility Allowances, with Surrey council taxpayers footing the bill.

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

- That the balance of the Cabinet portfolios was unequal.
- Concern about the budget and which budget would fund the immediate payments.
- Merging the two children's select committees from the previous council into one Children and Education Select Committee had given this select committee a very large workload.
- Comparing with other local authorities, the allowances paid to Surrey's Cabinet Members was at the lower end of the spectrum.
- The workload of Cabinet Members was increasing and the role of the Cabinet Associates was to assist the Cabinet Member, it was not a job share.
- Increases proposed by the Independent Remuneration Panel to Members' Allowances over the last few years, had often been rejected.
- Cabinet Members were 'value for money' – they had responsibility for large budgets.
- Concern expressed that these additional posts would increase the cost of Members' Allowances, at a time when some residents were finding it difficult to meet their bills.
- It was the role of select committee chairmen to hold the Cabinet to account.
- That this change increased the overall number of special responsibility posts for Cabinet and Cabinet Associates so that this now exceeds that for scrutiny of the Cabinet for the first time.

Mrs Watson requested a recorded vote on the amendment and 10 Members stood in support of this request.

The following Members voted for the amendment:

Mr Beardsmore, Mr Beckett, Mr Cooksey, Mr Essex, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Forster, Mr Goodwin, Mr Harrison, Mr Hickman, Mr Jenkins, Mr Johnson, Mr Kington, Mrs Mason, Mr Orrick, Mrs Searle, Mrs Selleck, Mr Townsend, Mrs Watson, Mrs White, Mrs Windsor

The following Members voted against the amendment:

Mrs Angell, Ms Bowes, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Carasco, Mrs Clack, Mrs Curran, Mr Tim Evans, Mrs Frost, Mr Furey, Mr Gardner, Mr Goodman, Mr Gulati, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Miss Heath, Mr Hodge, Mr Kemp, Mrs Lake, Ms Le Gal, Mrs Lewis, Mr Mahne, Mr Mallett, Mrs Marks, Mr Martin, Mr Munro, Mr Norman, Mr Page, Mr Pitt, Mrs Saligopoulos, Mr Skellett, Mr Taylor, Ms Thomson, Mr Walsh and Mr Wilson

There were three abstentions:

Mr Barker, Mrs Bramhall and Mrs Coleman

Therefore, the amendment to the recommendation was lost.

Returning to the original recommendation:

Mr Kington spoke and said that the creation of Cabinet Associates was a 'blank cheque' policy because there was no limit specified for the number of Cabinet Associates. He urged Members to vote against the recommendation.

Mrs Frost referred to the final report of the Independent Remuneration Panel, which was scheduled to be considered at the County Council meeting in March 2014 and requested that the Panel reviewed the responsibility allowances for the local committees' Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen in the light of the additional responsibilities now devolved to these committees.

The recommendation was put to the vote with 28 Members voting for and 20 Members voting against it. There were 2 abstentions. Therefore it was:

RESOLVED:

That, without prejudice to any recommendations to be made by the Independent Remuneration Panel in its final report in March 2014, an exceptional one-off payment of £5,000 for the financial year 2013/2014 be made to each Cabinet Associate with immediate effect.

75/13 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE 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: 4.15pm]

Chairman

LEADER SPEECH TO COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 OCTOBER 2013

Chairman, fellow Members

When I look around this Chamber, I don't just see a gathering of County Councillors, I see a selection of men and women who have been elected to represent their Surrey communities.

This week is 'Local Democracy Week' - a good time to look in the mirror and reflect upon our personal effectiveness as representatives of our communities and a good time for County Councillors to champion the needs of our residents and communities.

I believe that the role of Councillors – County Councillors, District and Borough Councillors and indeed Parish Councillors - has never been more vital to local people. The challenges ahead demand greater commitment and energy from us all so it has never been more important to deliver the right results for those we serve.

In the past 5 months this Conservative administration has made great strides in working towards delivering the policies we set out at the election in May:

- We have all seen real progress as Project Horizon works across Surrey improving our roads;
- Once again, we are ready with our winter maintenance programme – all grit bins filled, staff and equipment ready, our farmer support network ready ... and we just hope that the winter will not be too severe!
- We have delivered the equivalent of 7 new large primary schools this September (**2852 places**) – a major achievement of the **ONE TEAM** principle;
- We are already demonstrating that our Ready to Work and our Apprenticeship programmes are on course to achieve real opportunities for Young People in Surrey;
- We completed on time, the first 15,000 homes and businesses connecting them to Superfast Broadband by 30 September, a first important goal of this programme;
- And I am delighted to confirm that we are seeing real progress, in that many more Surrey Schools are now classified as Good or Outstanding;

None of these achievements are down to a single individual but to the **ONE TEAM OF SURREY**. This administration has always recognised the need to be innovative and ready to transform public services for the long term benefit of Surrey Residents.

Chairman, I will present a paper to Cabinet later this month outlining our innovative and transformative work across the public sector that is being led by our Chief Executive and our partners. This isn't about change just for the sake of it. It's change because it is the right thing to do for our residents. This is change that will

mean a better way of doing things. Change that will mean a reduction in costs and change that will mean better services for our residents.

Take the work we are doing with partners on the 'Blue Light' services, for example, if we get this right we can improve the performance of the Police, Fire & Ambulance services. We can improve response times, with the potential to save lives and all of this while cutting out waste and saving the taxpayer money.

Another strand of our transformation agenda is the expansion of our 'Surrey Family Support' work. This is our response to the national Troubled Families debate, which the Prime Minister has made a key priority during this Parliament. A priority I fully support, aimed at tackling some of the biggest problems in our communities by targeted intervention, this programme addresses issues which have lasted generations. Issues which have blighted communities and destroyed lives. Issues which can only be addressed by those in public service working together with families, in a better way. In Surrey, we are working with our partners more efficiently and effectively, as we help these families turn their own lives around.

Chairman, we Conservatives recognise that this work is critical to those families - helping them to turn their lives around, supporting them with advice and encouragement and guiding them towards new and real opportunities.

We recognise the excellent team of officers across public services in Surrey dedicated to succeed in this work. This programme is not about numbers or tick boxes but about changing real lives. I know that I speak for all on this side of the Chamber when I say that we as Conservatives are proud to be a part of a programme, that supports families in turning their own lives around;

Working across the public sector is also reaping rewards in our 'Better Use of Public Sector Assets' workstream. This aims to build on the existing work we have done across the public estate, to make it more efficient and more cost effective and involves working with a whole range of public bodies, including Government Departments, with the ultimate goal of reducing costs whilst generating new funding for the County Council.

There is also a crossover between this work and some of the other programmes of our Public Service Transformation work and the success of the assets workstream will mean success in other areas.

I know that the work we are developing across the public sector in Surrey will mean better results for the people who live, work and do business in the County. It was a welcome boost to receive £750,000 from Government, to help drive forward our innovative transformation work. It is absolutely fantastic that the Government has recognised the good work we're already doing together to transform public services in Surrey.

And Mr Chairman, I would also like to personally thank Brandon Lewis who, in his time as a Minister at DCLG, has understood that Surrey County Council has the capability and ambition to transform public services and produce better outcomes for our residents. A Minister who came from local government and understands local government and sees huge opportunities for transforming public services across England.

And we in Surrey intend to continue to lead the way, I have always been clear that we in the public sector should be seen as **ONE TEAM** working together to save taxpayers' money wherever possible and improving services for our residents but as

I assured Members in my last statement to County Council in July, we will never be complacent. We will continue to listen and learn and welcome those big innovative ideas from residents, Members and officers. Those ideas that will make a real difference to our residents and communities and we will continue to do those things which have served our residents and businesses so well to date.

Chairman, I hope that I can push the Surrey case even further, as part of my new role as the Chairman of the County Councils Network. Of course I was elected in that role to represent the interests of all of the counties in England but I can assure the residents and businesses of Surrey, I will also be continuing to stand up for Surrey at every opportunity because many of the things that concern Surrey such as roads, schools, demand-led services and jobs, are the same concerns of people living in counties across the country.

This Administration wants the Government to give us greater freedoms and real flexibility so that we can promote greater localism in Surrey. We Conservatives in Surrey believe it's about punching our weight, together, as **ONE TEAM** and it's about offering bold and imaginative solutions, making right decisions for the residents and businesses in Surrey, the quality of services and it's about protecting those in who need our help - that's why I got into politics - to help make a difference but no one politician or officer can achieve what **ONE TEAM** can.

Chairman - The residents and businesses in Surrey can have confidence in this Conservative Administration because we are continuing to deliver on our election pledges. We are at the forefront of transforming public services in Surrey and we will remain committed to championing the needs and aspirations to make Surrey a great place to live and work.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
15 October 2013

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 15 OCTOBER 2013

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

DEPUTY LEADER

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

On 24 July 2012 in a response to the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the subject of Superfast Broadband you stated:

- Surrey County Council and its supplier will work closely together over the forthcoming months to finalise the deployment schedule. Detailed information on what to expect when and where will be available in the Autumn.
- It is anticipated that the implementation of this project will be complete by the end of 2014.

Is the detailed information referred to in your answer now available? If yes, is it available in any other format than the postcode search facility on <http://www.superfastsurrey.org.uk> ?

Is the project on target to deliver within the timescale above and to all of the premises originally outlined when the proposal was agreed by Cabinet?

Reply:

I am very pleased to confirm that our supplier is on track to deliver access to superfast fibre broadband services to 84,000 premises in the Surrey intervention area by the end of 2014. The Surrey superfast broadband team recently announced the successful delivery of the first phase of the roll-out programme ending on 30 September 2013. As a result some 15,000 homes and businesses in 19 Surrey towns and villages are now able to place an order for high-speed fibre broadband - something that would not have been possible without Surrey's initiative. This information was contained in a Press Release copied to all Members on 8 October.

In the next two months residents and businesses in the intervention area will receive a letter from the team giving them information about the roll out and details of how and when they will gain access to superfast broadband. Postcards will also be sent to them when they are able to place an order. Alongside this the Superfast Surrey website (www.superfastsurrey.org.uk) has been updated and includes a new postcode checker, an events page and detailed FAQs.

The deployment plan information is contained in the postcode checker on the superfast surrey website. The team do not anticipate publishing any further plan as it can be subject to change due to surveying and engineering difficulties. Any changes that are made to the deployment plan will be automatically updated in the postcode checker. Should Members wish to discuss the roll out plan in any further

detail they should make contact with the Superfast Broadband Programme Director, Lucie Glenday who is located in County Hall.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

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

The Adult Social Care Service has indicated that it intends to achieve £15million in savings this financial year 2013/14 owing to the greater use of 'social capital.'

Social capital is communities playing a greater role in preventing social care needs and/or helping to meet them. Schemes such as time banks, befriending and community navigators are examples of social capital, but it can also be as simple as neighbours helping neighbours.

Does the Cabinet Member consider that the £15m of planned savings is a realistic target given the high level of risks involved?

Reply:

1 2013/14 Budget Background:

- a) It is acknowledged that this budget does carry risks.
- b) Social Capital is now referred to as '*Family, Friends and Community Support*', with a target of £15m included in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) for the current financial year.

2 Current Status:

- a) Social Capital is the main item at risk in the 2013/14 budget. It must be emphasised that this objective represents a radical change in the way that the service has approached assessment. It was anticipated that the savings would flow through in the latter part of the financial year, due, in part, to the phasing of process reviews, the need to generate understanding and change practitioner approaches, and to develop the support available in the community in order to implement the approach in full. Early indications from the September monitoring cycle are that our strategy is beginning to reduce social care costs.
- b) Based on the current run rate, social capital savings were not achieved in the first half of the year because of the need to introduce productivity measures and therefore will be covered by one-off measures. Despite the indications of progress in September, it remains possible that there will be further slippage which would leave a shortfall which adult social care will be expected to cover.
- c) Following the three Rapid Improvement Events currently being implemented, it is expected that the current changes to Adult Social Care's internal process and the roll out of the model office way of working across the County, will free up time for staff to spend with the people who use our services, and be able to more readily identify the use of family, friends and community support.

- d) A report on the progress of the Family, Friends and Community Support Project will be submitted to Adult Social Care Select Committee for their meeting on 24 October.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

(3) MR STEPHEN COOKSEY (DORKING SOUTH AND THE HOLMWOODS) TO ASK:

Please could the Cabinet Member update Members on the current state of Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) signs throughout the county, how many are in use, how many are out of action due to failure, how many are irreparable.

What budgets are available throughout the county for the replacement and repair of VAS signs?

Will the Cabinet Member look at the possibility of standardising the manufacturer in the future to facilitate easier and cheaper repair of VAS signs, much as his predecessor planned standardised parking meters as part of the administration's failed on street parking programme?

Reply:

I would like to thank Mr Cooksey for raising this matter.

Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) are one tool in our speed management tool box. For VAS to be effective in helping motorists recognise their own speed and stick to speed limits, VAS need to be located in the right place and as Mr Cooksey alludes too, properly maintained. The Road Safety Public Value Review in 2011 highlighted the need for a VAS maintenance budget and that responsibility for this should be allocated to a specific team.

Currently an annual budget of £10,000 is allocated to the council's Road Safety Engineering Team for VAS maintenance. This sum is occasionally supplemented by other funds, for example, from money obtained from insurance companies where a VAS has been damaged by a vehicle, or from capital budgets when VAS changes are needed as part of a wider highway improvement scheme.

In Surrey we have 551 VAS. Of these:

479	are working correctly
29	scheduled for repair by the supplier
21	to be re-erected / rectified as part of the street light replacement programme
4	programmed to be wholly replaced
18	are being assessed to determine replacement, repair, removal or repositioning
551	Total

We now have significant experience of VAS reliability, available products and supplier service. New VAS are being purchased from one company – Westcotec - as they have proven to be the most reliable, offer good service maintenance and 6 year warranty.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

(4) MR GRAHAM ELLWOOD (GUILDFORD EAST) TO ASK:

An application to Guildford Borough Council (GBC) for planning permission to extend the opening and closing hours for a new tenant at the Merrow Highways Depot is pending. As a member of Guildford Borough Council's Planning Committee, I must not adopt a pre-determined position but having taken legal advice, I am advised that I may be pre disposed in my views and I am very concerned at the potential for continued adverse environmental damage to my residents' quality of life.

My residents have suffered appalling noise pollution in recent years and any extension to the current working hours will exacerbate these problems.

Given the concerns raised by environmental health, and objections received to this application, I seek the Cabinet Member's firm assurance that no further applications to extend any working hours at the Merrow Depot (especially given emergency permission for Highways exists) will be made in the future.

Reply:

As the main response unit for road emergencies and winter service, Surrey Highways operate a 24 hour/ 7 day a week service from Merrow Depot, this allows Surrey County Council to deliver its statutory duty of ensuring the network is free at all times from obstruction and snow/ice as determined by Surrey County Council's winter management policy.

However, we fully recognise our duty of care to residents and to act as good neighbours, to that end in the past 24 months we have instigated the following voluntary measures:

1. No noisy activity outside core hours of 0700-1900 (Monday - Friday) and 0700-1300 (Saturday) - unless by pre-agreed exception where night/weekend only working is required.
2. Attached noise restraints to all large vehicles (e.g. to inhibit reverse parking sensors).
3. Imposed 20mph speed limit within depot limits.
4. Undertake resident meetings as required to review any further improvements or concerns.
5. Closed on-site recycling facility.

Surrey Highways has no plans to amend the voluntary code above and will continue to work with local residents to identify any further opportunities to improve local

environment. Surrey Highways can also confirm that the licence request from the private company detailed above is not in any way associated with Surrey Highways, and should therefore be treated according to Guildford Borough Council's due planning process and procedure.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(5) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:

The 'mission statement' of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service is 'Making Surrey Safer'. Will the Cabinet Member explain how she feels the proposal to reduce the number of fire engines (e.g. by 50% in Spelthorne) is compatible with this statement?

Reply:

Firstly I would wish to reiterate my commitment to the safety of all Surrey residents and to my role of ensuring that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) is an efficient, effective and high performing Fire and Rescue Service.

The challenge of the fire authority is to provide the best possible service with the resources available. The Chief Fire Officer and his team have developed a long term vision for the Service and identified areas where changes can be made without compromising the safety of the public. These are set out in our Public Safety Plan. The proposals for Spelthorne are part of a package of reform that will enable SFRS to continue to deliver a high quality emergency response within the budget available.

The mission of SFRS, since 2012, is –

“To provide a professional and well supported Fire and Rescue Service which reduces community risk in order to save lives, relieve suffering, protect property and the environment.”

We aim to deliver our mission through four key values. One of which is - “Managing our resources based on risk analysis, matching resources to demand and providing a balanced level of emergency response across Surrey.

It is essential to understand that the emergency response cover provided by SFRS is not based on borough or county boundaries. This means that whilst the proposal is for one fire engine to be based in Spelthorne, the cover for the area will continue to be provided from wherever is most appropriate. SFRS has invested heavily in people and equipment to ensure that it is able to deal with incidents quickly and to the highest professional standards. We have had the foresight to invest in the latest communications equipment which means we can send the nearest and quickest fire appliance to incidents, on arrival they will be equipped with the latest fire engine technology and carry equipment such as the new, market leading, road traffic collision extrication tools. This means that fire engines will continue to respond to incidents in the borough and the predicted response times for Spelthorne remain well within the Surrey Response Standard of one fire engine arriving within ten minutes and the second arriving within fifteen minutes for incidents where life or property is at risk. Our proposal actually sees an improvement in the occasions we will meet our response standard across Surrey.

SFRS will continue to deliver its comprehensive prevention activity in Spelthorne and across Surrey, helping to further reduce emergency calls county-wide. For

example, SFRS educate our communities in fire safety and fit free smoke detection where necessary. We continue to work effectively with partners to improve safety for our most vulnerable residents whilst further driving more efficient ways of working. Other initiatives such as our award-winning Safe Drive Stay Alive, which is now in its 10th year, form part of our prevention programme for road traffic collisions.

SFRS will continue to strive for improvements and efficiencies and may look differently in years to come, but at its heart and embedded into its mission is the safety of Surrey and its residents.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(6) MR BILL BARKER (HORSLEYS) TO ASK:

The Surrey London cycle race on Sunday 4 August has been heralded as a great success. What practical measures did the Cabinet Member for Community Services take to ensure residents had access to emergency services at all times that day while the race went through their village?

Reply:

Based on our learning from the Olympic events, County Council officers and the event organisers worked closely with representatives from Surrey Fire and Rescue, Surrey Police and South East Coast Ambulance Service in preparing for the Prudential London-Surrey 100 and Classic events. All the emergency services were involved in the event arrangements to ensure the continuity of their services. Emergency vehicles were placed in the most appropriate locations across Surrey to allow incidents to be dealt with quickly and safely. As is normal with large events, each emergency service was represented in the event control room to ensure that access to communities along the route was maintained alongside the delivery of the event and that any issues on the day could be addressed in a timely manner.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

Surrey County Council has referred to an annual Prudential RideLondon Surrey Classic event taking place for 5 years starting in 2013 and has also referred to the economic benefit to Surrey of these events. In view of this:

(i) On which date and who at Surrey County Council made the decision that the Prudential RideLondon Surrey classic event would take place in Surrey for 5 years starting in 2013?

and,

(ii) What is the estimated economic benefit to Surrey per annum for holding the event and how is the figure calculated?

Reply:

Cabinet took the decision to support the Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic events. In coming to their decision, they balanced the economic, community

and health benefits to the whole county against the disruption that road closures regrettably cause.

Experience from world class annual sporting events such as the London Marathon has shown that they bring maximum benefit if run over a number of years. The benefits increase year on year in terms of increased business and economic benefit, more money being raised for charity, greater community involvement, a stronger elite field and more spectators and broadcast interest leading to increased economic benefits to the county.

In its inaugural year, the Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 has helped charities raise an extra £3.5 million and raised the profile of the county as hundreds of thousands of people around the world watched live coverage of Surrey.

Specific evaluation is being carried out by the event organisers and this will give us a clearer picture across Surrey. However, the benefits to Surrey of national and international profile will bring increased business and economic benefits not just on the specific days of events but also on a continued basis as tourism increases.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

In a written response to a question from me at the last meeting of Council you stated:

Our imperative has always been to keep the full network of 52 branch libraries open...

However, throughout 2011 your predecessor frequently referred to Community Partnered Libraries (CPLs) as the alternative to closure and those “on the limits of sustainability” would close if a successful CPL structure was not put in place. Which is correct?

Your response at the last meeting of Council goes on to say:

...and by engaging the energy and commitment of the local community for ten community partnered libraries we have been able to achieve this and Surrey continues to have a modern and sustainable library service.

However, the “Community Partnered Libraries Progress Report” to the Communities Select Committee in September states:

1. *Since the Cabinet decision on 24 July 2012, the Library Service has successfully established Community Partnered Libraries at 6 of the 10 nominated libraries: Stoneleigh, Byfleet, New Haw, Tattenhams, Virginia Water and Warlingham.*
2. *Discussions with the remaining four libraries are at varying stages of negotiation and implementation.*

There is a clear contradiction between your response which stated that ten libraries are being run by local communities and the report to the select committee which

states that four community partnered libraries have not been established. Which is correct?

Given the statements by your predecessor that these four libraries would close, and that the detailed reports suggest that some of them are a long way from becoming Community Partnered Libraries, what guarantees can you give for the continued operation of Bagshot, Bramley, Ewell Court and Lingfield libraries?

Reply:

There is no contradiction in statements made concerning the ten community partnered libraries. Transfer of the first six has been successfully achieved and the four others are at various stages of progress towards transfer. The completion of the final four will ensure that Surrey County Council keeps the full network of 52 branch libraries open.

Earlier Cabinet reports on CPLs stated that a decision on closure would be considered only if no suitable partner was found, and the SCC position has always been that we would persevere with repeated endeavour to find community groups to take over. As we have community interest for all the remaining four CPLs, these libraries (Bagshot, Bramley, Ewell Court and Lingfield) will remain open - as CPLs - as part of the Surrey network.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

(9) MR ERNEST MALLETT (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK:

It is clear from the Serious Case Review that both Surrey County Council and the London Borough of Sutton carried out an extensive investigation of the clients of First Care 24 before the raid that closed First Care 24 down. Both authorities identified both the funded and self-funded clients they were responsible for. Surrey made provision for seven of its eight self-funded clients but did not include provision for number eight which was effectively Mrs Foster.

Surrey had a full database on its clients so the level of capability of each client was known.

The care worker assigned to check on Mrs Foster did not get a reply to her phone call but assumed that Mrs Foster had made her own arrangements for care.

Questions are therefore:

- 1) Why was the known self-funder, Mrs Foster, not made provision for prior to the raid when the other seven similar Surrey related residents were provided for?
- 2) Since the Surrey data base showed Mrs Foster was subject to power-attorney by others and was in difficulty to make decisions for herself due to a long list of illnesses, why did the care worker assume she could make decisions for herself?
- 3) There were a total of 49 clients and 48 were accounted for. Why was there not a senior officer made responsible for checking that all 49 clients had been provided for?

Reply:

- 1) The independent report commissioned by the Surrey Safeguarding Board has been published in full and is available on the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board webpages. The circumstances relating to the contact made with Mrs Foster are clearly stated in that report. Mrs Foster was not one of the Surrey residents identified on the original list as is made clear in the report.
- 2) The report sets out clearly the circumstances surrounding the failure to contact Mrs Foster and the reasons for the assumptions made by the worker involved are now subject to disciplinary proceedings.
- 3) The report makes it clear that the senior manager involved was told that all the Surrey residents involved had been contacted and their alternative care arranged.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(10) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK:

The Prudential Ride London-Surrey race is supposed to be good for businesses in Surrey yet after this year's event many businesses on the route reported substantial losses for the day as they were unable to trade due to the extensive road closures.

What measures are being taken, including plans to improve this year's apparent poor consultation with both Surrey's businesses and residents, to ensure they are not adversely affected by this event in 2014 and beyond?

Reply:

We recognise that the Prudential Ride London-Surrey 100 and Classic will only be sustainable in the long-term, if the event organiser can demonstrate that there is an economic benefit to the county, and residents and business are able to feel that the event has been of benefit to them.

As with the London Marathon, the aim is to ensure that the Prudential Ride London-Surrey 100 and Classic provides businesses with the opportunity to benefit from the spectators that the event will bring. I am confident that the route for 2014 will encourage spectators and residents to enjoy the event and experience Surrey's villages and towns in the same way as Walton and Pyrford did this year, so allowing businesses to gain the maximum benefit.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(11) MRS HELENA WINDSOR (GODSTONE) TO ASK:

Can the Leader confirm the payments being paid to Cabinet Associates and from when they started? Also where does the approval for these payments occur in the Budget approved by Council?

Reply:

Cabinet Associates have not received an allowance to date for carrying out this role. The Members' Allowances Scheme is a Council function and therefore any decision regarding Special Responsibility Allowances is a matter for the County Council to consider. Under the regulations, before the Council can amend the Members' Allowances Scheme, it must have regard to the recommendations made in relation to it by an independent remuneration panel (IRP). Given this new role, the IRP has submitted an interim report on Cabinet Associates for the Council to consider at this meeting.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

(12) MR STEPHEN COOKSEY (DORKING SOUTH AND THE HOLMWOODS) TO ASK: (2nd question)

When recently searching the Surrey County Council website for information on wetspots, I found information about Council decisions made in 2007/8 and working group 2008/9.

In January 2013 I was informed that as Surrey County Council has a greatly increased GIS resource, a major overhaul of the Wetspots database was taking place and was expected to be published in early February.

When might the website be updated?

Reply:

The Wetspots webpage has been updated to reference the "major overhaul" to the database in light of the council's new responsibilities as Lead Local Flood Authority for Surrey.

This "major overhaul" has been much more labour intensive than the standard annual update and has resulted in a delay in updating the published list of wetspots on the SCC public website. However, this has resulted in a database that better reflects all types of flooding in Surrey, rather than being focused on highway related flooding.

Whilst this is a live database with multiple updates being applied throughout the year, the wetspot list available from the public website will be updated in early November to ensure that it is consistent with the wetspots data being used to generate the 5-year capital drainage programme.

The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 received royal assent in April 2010, at which time Surrey CC became the Lead Local Flood Authority for Surrey. However, most of the powers and duties related to this role were not enacted until April 2012.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Given the clear failings of the Adult Social Care Service of the County Council highlighted in the Safeguarding Report into the death of Gloria Foster, will the Leader of the Council be holding the Cabinet Member for the service at the time, to account for the failings in policy and process to prevent this from happening again?

Reply:

The independent report commissioned by the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board sets out clear recommendations for Surrey County Council which we will ensure are implemented in full. I am disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition seeks to make political capital out of this tragic case.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

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

Could the Cabinet Member advise whether alternative pothole repair systems, as used by neighbouring authorities, have been investigated and evaluated and whether there are any plans to use these effective systems in Surrey?

Reply:

Innovations in highway materials and processes are seen as vital to driving continuous improvement and development in Surrey Highways. To that end we have created a dedicated Innovations Group to pilot and exploit new highway opportunities. In 2013 the Innovations Group have reviewed alternative solutions for both reactive and planned repair, including:

Rhiopatch - a solution to improve speed of pothole repair

Retread - a solution that negates the need to remove waste material from site

Stabilised Pavement - a solution that offers opportunity to remedy concrete roads

Not all pilots will be adopted as part of the standard repair cycle, as all pilots generally require a minimum of 18 months testing to demonstrate they meet our high quality standards and provide a commercial return.

Surrey Highways is also an active member of the Highway Maintenance Efficiency Programme (HMEP), a national body created by Department of Transport to exploit market innovations, while we also lead on many initiatives on behalf of ADEPT, the national planning and transport body created to represent local highway authorities.

In 2014, Surrey Highways are focussing on innovations in repairing concrete roads, and thus in early 2014, SCC will be holding its first Innovation Day for concrete roads, this event will invite all the leading national and international concrete specialists to present their latest innovations and opportunities to Surrey Highways and the wider SE7 network. Following the Innovations Day a select number of solutions will be taken forward as pilots.

The pilots and joint activities with national bodies therefore ensure that Surrey Highways remain at the forefront of market opportunities and innovations.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(15) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK: (2nd question)

The current consultation on the proposed reorganisation of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service would see Spelthorne borough's service reduced from two fire stations and two fire engine appliances to one station and fire engine appliance; with an inevitable negative impact on the residents of Spelthorne and their safety.

As this is a cost-cutting exercise to an essential life-saving service designed to save the council £1.2 million, to the detriment of residents in Spelthorne, can the council specifically identify the cost of each fire death to Surrey County Council and its residents in terms of the investigations, legal and other processes that the council incurs in such tragic circumstances, considering the increased likelihood of this occurrence should the proposals be implemented?

Reply:

1. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service works very hard to ensure that the communities we serve are safe by providing a high performing service which adds value to those communities. Part of this requires the Service to exercise due diligence with regard to budgets now and in the future. We are acutely aware of the pressures across local government and fully understand that we have a part to play in delivering a balanced budget which will require resources to be rebalanced. This often involves having to make difficult decisions.
2. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has been very proactive in articulating how it would wish to see the provision of fire cover develop over a 10 year period via its 2020 vision and Public Safety Plan. In order to be fully transparent we consulted widely with stakeholders back in 2010-11 in order to ensure that people understood why we needed to transform the fire service in Surrey.
3. With regard to the question that you raise, the Fire Service in Surrey has a legal obligation under the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 to investigate fires to determine their cause. We may be required to attend Crown Court as well as the Coroner's Court to present evidence or be called as expert witnesses. We work closely with the Police and Crown Prosecution Service to meet the very high standards of proof that are required in the Courts today.
4. As part of our annual reporting into Government we do provide returns on fire fatalities and injuries, as well as other performance measures. This does not

include what the cost of fire fatalities are in Surrey. However, the Government does periodically commission reports to update the cost to the UK economy in terms of fire deaths and injuries. Within the returns to the Department for Communities and Local Government there are two main components, fatalities and injuries.

5. The returns with regard to fire fatalities include any fatal casualty which is the direct or indirect result of injuries caused by a fire incident. Even if the fatal casualty dies subsequently, any fatality whose cause is attributed to a fire is included.
6. Since the introduction of the Incident Recording System, non-fatal casualties are recorded as being in one of the following four classes of severity:
 - i. Victim went to hospital, injuries appear to be serious
 - ii. Victim went to hospital, injuries appear to be slight
 - iii. First aid given at scene
 - iv. Precautionary check recommended – this is when an individual, having no obvious injury or distress, is advised to attend hospital or to see a doctor as a precaution.
7. The most recent publication reflecting the economic cost of fire in 2008 was published by the Department for Local Communities and Local Government in 2011 as part of its fire research programme. The total cost of fires in England for 2008 was £8.3bn.
8. The costs of fire are broken down into three separate categories:
 - a. Costs in anticipation. The costs of measures designed to either prevent fires or protective measures to mitigate the damage caused by fires. Key variables that were monetised as part of the costs in anticipation included: total costs of active (e.g. sprinklers) and passive (e.g. fire walls) fire protection in buildings, resource and capital costs of training and fire safety, non-pay related costs, total insurance administration, and
 - b. Costs as a consequence. The costs as a result of fires, including damage to properties, loss of business, and the costs of human injury and death. Key variables that were monetised as part of the costs as a consequence included:
 - i. total cost of fatal and non-fatal casualties
 - ii. total cost of lost business
 - iii. costs of property damage
 - iv. costs to victims, the police, criminal justice system and prison service.
 - c. Costs in response. These costs are a result of reported incidents, which typically include the cost of the Fire and Rescue Service responding to fires, false alarms, etc. Key variables that were monetised as part of the costs in response included:
 - i. Fire and Rescue Service resource costs in response to fire-related incidents, and
 - ii. capital costs in response to fire-related incidents.

9. The values used in this study were £1.375m for the value of a fatality, £155,000 for the value of a serious injury and £12,000 for the value of a slight injury. In terms of the main categories of cost, a comparison between 2006 and 2008 showed that the costs in anticipation and response increased, while the costs as a consequence reduced.
10. The main factors contributing to these changes in the estimates were considered to be:
 - a. The increase in the number of hours spent on community fire safety activities and fire investigations which added to Fire and Rescue Service resource costs. While the fire safety labour cost per hour rose with inflation, the actual number of hours Fire and Rescue Services devoted to fire safety activities increased much more rapidly. This type of activity represents the drive by the Fire and Rescue Service to better fire prevention.

Additional factors contributing to changes in the estimates were:

- b. The decrease in the number of fatal and non-fatal casualties as a result of fires started deliberately – each fatality was estimated at £1.65m and each serious injury estimated to cost around £185,000. The value of a serious injury in 2005 was taken from Department for Transport (2007) Highways Economic Note 1:2005 Valuation of the Benefits of Prevention of Road Accidents and Casualties and uprated using the Retail Price Index to provide a value for a serious injury in 2008.
11. Fire investigations are factored into our normal service provision and each front line manager has the capacity to undertake fire investigations but can call upon specialist fire investigation officers who can undertake more detailed examinations when they are needed. We also have our hydrocarbon dog who can assist in determining whether accelerants have been used. Both of these provide a more efficient investigative capability for the Service.
12. While we cannot determine the actual cost of a fire death to the people of Surrey other than by applying the national cost model we are increasingly involved in working with partners to ensure that fire deaths and injuries do not happen in the first place. That is why our work with Adult Social Care, “Keeping you safe from fire”, is so important to identify those people who are most at risk from fire. We do deliver enhanced fire safety visits and provide additional preventative measures to allow people to remain living independently in the community longer. We will continue to deliver a multi-agency approach to the management fire safety, working with boroughs and districts and other agencies to protect our communities.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

According to the County Council’s Budget Monitoring Report on 24 September 2013 Cabinet agenda it was stated that “Additional Highway costs associated with the Tour of Britain are anticipated (+£0.2m including road closures and diversions)...”

Is Surrey County Council spending £200,000 for a cycling event a good use of Council Taxpayers' money?

Reply:

The Tour of Britain was brought to Surrey in order to deliver health, tourism and economic benefits to the residents and businesses of Surrey. We will shortly receive the independent economic impact report for this year's event.

In the meantime, the 2012 Surrey stage of the Tour of Britain was shown to have had a net £7.2m economic benefit for the county and we can expect similar for 2013. The 2012 event also attracted close to a quarter of a million spectators (highest in the event's history) to the road-sides in Surrey. A two hour live broadcast and one hour highlights programme of the Surrey stage was watched in over a million households in the UK and a further two million across Europe - the impact of this will help to bring visitors to the county over the coming weeks, months and years. On top of this, there are the thousands of positive column inches in newspapers, magazines and associated press all highlighting Surrey's beautiful countryside, towns and villages. When we have received the 2013 Tour of Britain Surrey stage economic and media report, we will make it available.

Given the evidence of the £7.2m economic benefit in 2012, the spend on traffic management represents a good return for the economic health of the county.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

**(17) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:
(4th question)**

In the last 5 years did the council receive all of the third party contributions e.g. from developers relating to developments and did the County Council repay any money to organisations if the County Council did not claim the money by the relevant deadlines, including monies held by the boroughs and districts on behalf of the County Council, and if so how much money was repaid?

Reply:

In the last 5 years the County Council has received all s106 developer contributions that were due to be received, following the triggering of the payment deadlines contained in the associated legal agreements.

As a result of the improved monitoring arrangements, and the close liaison with District and Borough Council monitoring officers, all developer contributions which are due are sought and received.

During the last 5 years the County Council has repaid the following s106 contributions -

- a balance of £7,500, from a larger contribution, resulting from Network Rail failing to give consent for the upgrading of a cycle-way over one of their structures, a pedestrian bridge crossing a railway.
- a balance of £18,806, from a larger contribution for travel vouchers which were not claimed by residents of a new development.

- a balance of £4,000, from a larger contribution for highway improvements which could not be undertaken in the time-frame and an alternative and cheaper scheme was subsequently negotiated with the developer.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

**(18) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:
(5th question)**

The levels of non-care related debt over the period 2009/10 Q4 to 2013/14 Q1 were presented to the June meeting of the Cabinet below.

	2013/14 Q1 £m	2012/13 Q1 £m	2012/13 Q4 £m	2011/12 Q4 £m	2010/11 Q4 £m	2009/10 Q4 £m
Non Care related debt	3.1	3.5	3.8	3.0	3.9	3.6

These figures demonstrate a consistent failure by Surrey County Council to collect non care related debt, despite constant assurances that the problem is being tackled.

Which services do these debts relate to and how have these debts arisen?

What actions are being taken to make a real impact in collecting this debt, which is owed to all Council taxpayers in Surrey?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. A closer look at the non-care debt over the last four years shows a downward trend in the amount overdue. This has to be set against the context of income rising from £128m to £132m over the same period of time. This improvement has been achieved by reviewing all our Billing to Collect processes following a Rapid Improvement Event in October 2010.

The majority of the outstanding debt relates to Health and £2.3m of the total of £3.1m is less than six months old. Senior officers are working closely with colleagues in Health to improve further this process.

CABINET MEMBER STATEMENT

Services for Young People Transforms the Lives of Surrey Young People

Services for Young People and its partners work with some of the most vulnerable young people in the County and have significantly impacted on three key priorities agreed by Cabinet in 2011: one, participation in education, training and employment; two, prevention of offending; and three, delivering more quality youth work locally.

First, the number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) has been halved from 1,080 in April 2009 to 458 at the end of September 2013.

Second, the number of young people entering the criminal justice system has fallen to 149, a 91% reduction over the same four year period.

And thirdly, more than 80% of young people at risk of becoming NEET are participating in their community through Centre Based Youth Work and the Local Prevention Framework or LPF.

These successes follow a comprehensive review and transformation of the service completed in April 2012 saving Surrey council tax payers £4.5 million; 25% of the 2009 budget. The service is now operating at peak efficiency having taken on new responsibilities for Children in Need, homelessness prevention and contracts for young people with special educational needs and disabilities.

Each one of these challenges is formidable, but Services for Young People have tackled and succeeded at all three at the same time.

Services for Young People have not achieved these successes in isolation. The service has worked with Children's Services, Schools, Colleges and the voluntary sector partners. The key to success has been a whole systems approach with a focus on prevention and early intervention.

For example, 8,882 young people, over 80% of those at risk of becoming NEET, have participated in their community through Centre Based Youth Work and the LPF. This is the equivalent to the entire population, age 10-19, in the borough of Epsom & Ewell.

Some of these young people described their experiences saying:

“The people here know how to help”

“They listen to what you have to say and do something about it, they don't just ignore it”

“I never believed I could get a job when I started, but I did it”

In Surrey we know that good quality youth work helps prepare young people to become well rounded adults who participate in society. This is why Services for Young People introduced the National Youth Agency Quality Mark standard in 2012. So far 20 of Surrey's 31 full time youth centres have achieved the Level One award. A vast improvement compared to four centres working at that standard when the Quality Mark was introduced in 2012. Standards will continue to rise as our youth centres work towards Level 2 and the Quality Mark is rolled out to the LPF before the end of the year.

I want to thank you Members for your excellent work through the Local Committees and Youth Task Groups to re-commission the LPF including local needs assessments, local commissioning priorities and evaluations of bids to select the best providers.

Together we have been successful in driving up standards and developing the market to help ensure that all of our young people most at risk receive a quality preventative service.

As a result we have commissioned a preventative framework in which the cost per young person to be engaged has reduced by 68% and the cost per young person to be prevented from becoming NEET has reduced by 34%. This is a testament to all who were involved.

Alongside prevention priorities, the Leader's Ready for Work Programme has made a huge impact on young people's participation by intervening early and providing support, training, employment and clear progression pathways towards full participation. Over 420 young people facing the most significant barriers to participation, who would otherwise be NEET, are now engaging with the programme.

Young people like Adam, which is not his real name, who has a learning disability and suffered from low self esteem. Adam was supported by his Youth Support Officer to attend Addlestone Skills Centre. By setting SMART targets Adam was able to overcome barriers, achieve bite sized goals and work towards a January start at Brooklands College.

The County Council's Leadership on apprenticeships is also creating more local opportunities as Surrey bucks the South East trend. In 2012/13 over 2,300 16-18 year olds participated in an apprenticeship, 30% more than the previous year and double the number compared to similar Local Authorities. Two hundred and fifty of these were created and funded by the Leader's Apprenticeship Programme, increasing to 500 in 2013/14.

The third key aspect to Services for Young People's prevention and early intervention offer is Surrey's approach to youth restorative justice. As a result of the Youth Restorative Intervention more than 5,000 young people have been diverted from the youth justice system and will begin adult life without the burden of a criminal record.

There are 30% fewer of our looked after children entering the criminal justice system and in 2011/12 no looked after child living in Surrey entered the criminal justice system for the first time. The total number of offences committed by young people has also reduced by 55% since 2007/8 and 1000 victims were supported by a restorative process in 2012 alone.

In conclusion, Services for Young People and its partners have significantly impacted on the three key priorities promised as part of the Transformation Project.

Looking to the future the service has taken on new responsibilities for Children in Need and youth homelessness prevention. In these areas the service is already having a significant impact. Services for Young People and its partners have reformed the system that deals with youth homelessness and drastically reduced the number of young people who are homeless by more than 100 since January 2013.

We are ambitious for our young people and acknowledge there is still more to do.

The challenges now are reducing NEET still further to less than 200 out of 40,000 16 to 19 year olds by July 2014, holding at risk young people in participation and securing their progression, reducing the number of young people placed in bed and breakfast accommodation to zero and ensuring continued participation and progression for all Surrey young people, particularly the most vulnerable, in the face of difficult financial times ahead.

Linda Kemeny
Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning
15 October 2013