

CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday 4 February 2014 and will take effect on Friday 14 February 2014 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered.
CALL-IN DEADLINE: 13/2/14.

The following represents a summary of the decisions taken by the Cabinet. It is not intended to represent the formal record of the meeting but to facilitate the call-in process. The formal minutes will be published in due course to replace this decision sheet.

County Members wishing to request a call-in on any of these matters, should contact the Senior Manager for Scrutiny or relevant Democratic Services Officer.

The Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday 4 February 2014 considered the following matters and resolved:

Members' Questions (Item 4a)

Nine questions had been received from Members. The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as **Appendix 1**.

Public Questions (Item 4b)

Three questions had been received from residents. The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as **Appendix 2**.

Petitions (Item 4c)

A petition was received in relation to agenda item 10 – Changes to Fire Deployment in the Borough of Spelthorne. A response was tabled and is attached as **Appendix 3**.

• **REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)**

Recommendations were received from the Adult Social Care Select Committee, Communities Select Committee and Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Responses to the Adult Social Care Select Committee and Communities Select Committee were tabled and are attached as **Appendices 4 and 5** respectively. The report of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee was considered as part of agenda item 7 - Revenue and Capital Budget 2014/15 to 2018/2019.

CHANGES TO FIRE DEPLOYMENT IN THE BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE (Item 10)

- That the amended proposal Option 5 and the commissioning of a new fire station in an appropriate location be agreed subject to a further business case setting out the delivery costs of a new station returning to Cabinet in due course. The new fire station will have two fire engines, one 24 hour whole time and one 24 hour "On-call" and a waterborne rescue capability. This will retain the same number of fire engines in that part of Surrey and supports improvements in the response standard across Surrey.
- That the subsequent closure of Staines and Sunbury fire stations be agreed.

- That the implementation of Option 4 be agreed should the provision of Option 5 and the “On-call” unit not be secured.

Reasons for Decisions

Option 5 supports improvements in the provision of a more equitable level of fire service response in support of the Surrey Response Standard and the Public Safety Plan.

The amended proposal has given due consideration to the concerns of local communities and leaders and surrounding boroughs by listening to their ideas and by involving residents in the decision making process. Their local knowledge combined with the revised response modelling had influenced the design and delivery of future services in Spelthorne.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities Select Committee]

CORPORATE STRATEGY 2014 - 2019 (Item 6)

- That the refreshed version of *Confident in our future*, Corporate Strategy 2014-2019 be endorsed and that it be recommended to the County Council for approval alongside the Revenue and Capital Budget 2014-2019 at its meeting on 11 February 2014.

Reason for decision

By reconfirming a long term vision for the county and setting priorities for the next financial year the refreshed Corporate Strategy provides a clear sense of direction for Council staff and signposts the Council’s approach for residents, businesses and partner organisations. As part of the Council’s Policy Framework (as set out in the Constitution) the Corporate Strategy must be approved by the County Council.

REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2014/15 TO 2018/19 (Item 7)

- That recommendations be made to the Full County Council on 11 February 2014 as follows:

On the revenue and capital budget:

1. Note the Chief Finance Officer’s statutory report on the robustness and sustainability of the budget and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves (Annex 1 of the report submitted).
2. Set the County Council precept for band D council tax at £1,195.83, which represents a 1.99% up-lift.
3. Agree to maintain the council tax rate set above and delegate powers to the Leader and the Chief Finance Officer to finalise detailed budget proposals following receipt of the Final Local Government Financial Settlement.
4. Approve the County Council budget for 2014/15 as £1,644.2m.
5. Agree the capital programme proposals specifically to:
 - fund essential schemes over the five year period (schools and non-

schools) to the value of £760m including ring-fenced grants; and

- make adequate provision in the revenue budget to fund the revenue costs of the capital programme.
6. Require the Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer to establish a mechanism to regularly track and monitor progress on the further development and implementation of robust plans for achieving the efficiencies across the whole MTFP period.
 7. Require Strategic Directors and Senior Officers to maintain robust in year (i.e. 2014/15) budget monitoring procedures that enable Cabinet to monitor the achievement of efficiencies and service reductions through the monthly budget monitoring Cabinet reports, the quarterly Cabinet Member accountability meetings and the monthly scrutiny at the Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committee.
 8. Require a robust business case to be prepared for all revenue invest to save proposals and capital schemes before committing expenditure.

On treasury management and borrowing:

9. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy for 2014/15 and approve that their provisions have immediate effect. This strategy includes:
 - the investment strategy for short term cash balances;
 - the treasury management policy (Appendix B1);
 - the prudential indicators (Appendix B2)
 - the schedule of delegation (Appendix B4);
 - the minimum revenue provision policy (Appendix B7).
- That the medium term financial plan (MTFP) for the financial years 2014-19, be approved including:
 - approval of the Total Schools Budget of £563.1m;
 - reduction of the revenue budget risk contingency for 2014/15 to £5m to mitigate against the risk of non-delivery of service reductions & efficiencies;
 - applying £20.1m from the Budget Equalisation Reserve (including £13.0m contributed by the unused risk contingency from 2013/14) and £5.8m from other reserves to support the 2014/15 budget;
 - provision of £0.75m to support the apprenticeship programme;
 - setting aside £1.25m in a reserve for Business Rates Appeals as mitigation against potential business rates valuation appeals.
 - That it be noted that the Cabinet will receive the final detailed MTFP (2014-19) on 25 March 2014 for approval following scrutiny by Select

Committees.

Reason for Decisions

Full County Council will meet on 11 February 2014 to agree the summary budget and set the council tax precept for 2014/15. The Cabinet advises the Full County Council how best to meet the challenges the Council faces. The reasons underpinning the recommendations agreed by Cabinet include:

- to ensure the Council continues to maintain its financial resilience and protect its long term financial position;
- to enable the Council to meet the expectations of Surrey's residents as confirmed in their responses to the in depth consultation exercise undertaken in 2012; and
- to provide adequate finances for key services such as school places, highways, adults social care and protecting vulnerable people.

MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT (Item 8)

- That the following be noted:
 - (i) Forecast revenue budget for 2013/14 is to underspend (£0.9m) on services, adding the unused £13m risk contingency brings this to £13.9m overall underspend (paragraph 1 of the report submitted).
 - (ii) Forecast ongoing efficiencies and service reductions achieved by year end is £60.3m (paragraph 74 of the report submitted).
 - (iii) Forecast capital budget position for 2013/14 is -£22.3m on services and +£7.0m overall (paragraphs 79 to 84 of the report submitted).
 - (iv) Management actions to mitigate overspends appear throughout the report submitted.
 - (v) Quarter three balance sheet, reserves, debt and treasury report (paragraphs 85-93 of the report submitted)
 - (vi) debt written off during quarter three totals £583,828 (paragraph 92 of the report submitted)

Reasons for decision

To monitor the budget in compliance with the agreed monitoring strategy.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFORMATION (Item 9)

- That the next steps for each of the public service transformation strands, as outlined within the report and Annex 1 submitted, be agreed and the final partnership endorsed business cases for each of the individual projects be brought back to Cabinet as they are ready.
- That the broad approach and methodology taken for the cost benefit analyses and the business cases based on this methodology be agreed.
- That it be noted that £10m of efficiencies relating to Surrey County Council services' element of the public service transformation programme is included in the council's Medium Term Financial Plan(2014-19) from 2015/16 onwards and that progress towards delivery of these efficiencies will be monitored using the same mechanism agreed for all MTFP(2014-19) efficiencies.
- That the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board as co-chairman, be authorised to

sign-off the 'draft' Surrey Better Care Fund plan for submission to NHS England.

- That Surrey County Council commit an 'invest to save' funding of £300,000 for additional resources as outlined in paragraph 29 of the report submitted, covering the period to March 2016.
- That the Chief Executive be asked to work with partners to bring forward proposals for effective and appropriate governance arrangements.

Reasons for decisions

Partners in Surrey believe that working together more effectively will enable services to be transformed so as to give better value to Surrey residents.

The council is working closely with partners to develop its plans for public service transformation in Surrey, which forms a key part of its overall strategy to improve services and outcomes as well as delivery of its medium term financial strategy. Significant progress has been made towards the ambitions of the County Council and its partners, providing a strong basis for further development of both the business cases and implementation plans.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee]

JOINT STRATEGIC REVIEW OF SHORT BREAKS FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (Item 11)

- That the Joint Strategic Review of Short Breaks for children and young people with disabilities be endorsed.
- That the options for consultation be approved.

Reason for decisions

To enable recommendations to be considered by Cabinet on 27 May 2014 based on a comprehensive consultation process in February and March 2014.]

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children and Education Select Committee]

PROVISION OF EMOTIONAL WELLBEING AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS IN SURREY (Item 12 and 19)

- That contracts be awarded for a period of one year, from 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015, for the continued safe provision of CAMHS & HOPE.
- That these contracts be awarded to the four existing Providers:
 - Surrey & Borders Partnership (SaBP) NHS Foundation Trust
 - Virgin Care Limited
 - CSH Surrey (formerly Central Surrey Health)
 - First Community Health

Reasons for decision

Awarding one year contracts to the four existing providers ensures that the Council:

- Adheres to statutory requirements regarding the safeguarding of children by securing the provision of Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Services by contractually bound providers.
- Facilitates the implementation of changes in legislation and recommendations from authorised bodies whilst maintaining continuity of service and minimising risk to service delivery.
- Enables the joint re-commissioning of a co-designed, outcomes focused, streamlined service model that engages service users in order to deliver improved service quality and a service that is fit for purpose.
- Promotes internal collaboration and builds synergy with partners and providers which will yield efficiency savings and value added benefits.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children and Education Select Committee]

APPROVAL TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY TO AWARD FUTURE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS PROCURED THROUGH BUILDSURREY (Item 13)

- That authority to award future construction contracts above £500,000 in value, where a competitive tender procedure has been followed through the BuildSurrey portal, be delegated to the Chief Property Officer in consultation with the Head of Procurement, Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes, Cabinet Member for Business Services, Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, the Leader of the Council and Section 151 Officer.
- That authorisation obtained under the above delegation be formally minuted with the Section 151 Officer retaining the paperwork.

Reason for decisions

The agreed delegation ensures that the limited delivery timescales of some 30 School Basic Needs projects are met. The school projects totalling approximately £50m over the next two years, and other non-schools capital works up to £10m in aggregate will be tendered through the BuildSurrey portal. This will ensure that as much of the over £60m of construction works as possible will be delivered directly through Surrey based contractors.

The delegation is in line with the principles established under previous arrangements. The consultation and decision recording requirements of the delegation will provide an appropriate governance structure.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee]

HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES FOR SERVICE USERS (SUPPORTING PEOPLE) (Item 14 and 20)

- That the new contracts for Housing Related Support Services be awarded to run on a continuous contract basis with on-going service reviews and fixed annual reviews effective from 1 April 2014 as detailed in Annex 2 to the report submitted.
- That the information relating to the contract process be noted.

Reasons for decisions

To meet the need for localised provision that enables individuals to stay in their communities and continue to be supported by friends, family and the community thus reducing costs to the wider social care system.

The approach of this contracting strategy aligns to the wider commissioning intentions of Adult Social Care and recognises the needs of individuals who want continuity of providers and the support they receive. It also recognises the on-going partnership arrangements with, and objectives of, the District and Borough Councils. In some cases there is also the opportunity for service remodelling to enable more focussed service and value for money delivery.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Adult Social Care Select Committee]

CONTRACT AWARD FOR SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL ASBESTOS CONSULTANCY SERVICES (Item 15 and 21)

- That the background information set out in the report submitted be noted.
- That, having considered the results of the procurement process (as set out in the Part 2 annex submitted as agenda item 21), the award of the contract to the supplier detailed in the Part 2 annex submitted be agreed.

Reasons for decisions

To support the council's duty to protect its workers, visitors to its buildings, pupils etc., from the effects of asbestos and this is only possible through a risk management approach.

A full tender process, in compliance with the EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council. In addition to delivering savings compared to existing rates, the contract will also deliver an improved service with strengthened performance measures and robust contract management.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee]

TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS - PROCUREMENT OF INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE (Item 16 and 22)

- That contracts be awarded to the preferred bidders on the basis set out in the report submitted under agenda item 22 in Part 2 of the agenda.

Reasons for decision

To support Surrey County Council's duty to inspect and maintain traffic control systems on its highway network across the county.

A full tender process for the inspection and maintenance of Traffic Control Systems, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Environment and Transport Select Committee]

LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 17)

- That the decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last meeting as set out in Annex 1 to the report submitted be noted.

Reason for decision

To be informed of the decisions taken by Cabinet Members under delegated authority.

PROPERTY ACQUISITION (Item 23)

- That the freehold interest in the property be acquired on the basis set out in the report submitted.
- That the changes to the overage provisions which had been negotiated be noted and authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration to agree any further changes to the detail of the Heads of Terms.
- That the Chief Property Officer be instructed to develop a full business case in relation to the future use of the site on the basis set out in the report submitted.

Reason for decisions

To facilitate opportunities for public service integration with partners, regeneration and the provision of a site suitable for an identified service need

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee]

CABINET – 4 FEBRUARY 2014

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Members' Questions**Question (1) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills) to ask:**

In December 2013 and January 2014 parts of Surrey, including parts of my own Division, suffered severe flooding involving properties being flooded, in some cases people being rescued by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service by boat, and some roads including major A roads being impassable as a result of flooding.

What action is the County Council taking to work with the Environment Agency to reduce the risk of flooding in the future by improving flood defences in flood affected parts of Surrey? What action is being taken to improve the advance warning to residents so that they can take appropriate action to safeguard themselves, their properties and belongings?

Can the County Council provide progress reports to County Councillors, including myself, whose Divisions have suffered flooding so that we can reassure local residents that action is being taken to tackle flooding in Surrey?

Reply:

The Flood and Water Management Act, introduced in 2010, made the County a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) responsible for managing the flood risk associated with surface water runoff, ordinary water courses and groundwater. These responsibilities are in addition to the duties also imposed on the council as Highway Authority.

The LLFA has a duty under the Act to:

1. Produce a local flood risk management strategy
2. Create an asset register
3. Carry out an investigation where significant flooding occurs
4. Create a Sustainable Drainage Approval Body (not yet enacted)

In these circumstances Surrey has and will continue to respond to flooding issues throughout the county providing practical support and assistance with partner organisations where possible. The council is also ensuring that flood information is obtained, maintained, shared and communicated widely with other flood risk management authorities, and internal and external stakeholders, for future reference and action where appropriate.

Following the flood events over Christmas and in the interim the council has been evaluating the data to confirm whether official 'investigations' are required at approximately 20 sites across the county where significant flooding occurred. Any individual investigation of this nature will require the involvement of all the relevant flood risk management authorities concerned in order to provide appropriate conclusions.

Planning for the response to flooding incidents is undertaken through the Surrey Local Resilience Forum, chaired by the Surrey Chief Fire Officer. Flooding is assessed as one of the three very high risks for the County and plans to support residents affected by flooding are in place and reviewed on a regular basis. Based on risk assessments provided by the Environment Agency work is currently underway to plan for the response to a 1%-5% flooding event in the Lower Thames area that could impact on approximately 15000 properties in Surrey. Planning for the response to other flood risk in the County continues.

The council's operational response to the severe weather events and emergency situation over Christmas and the New Year included officers from a variety of services, together with staff from our service provider partners who successfully delivered on the ground. Many of the individuals concerned worked throughout the holiday period and over subsequent weekends to ensure services to Surrey residents were generally maintained. I would like to acknowledge the work done by all parties and thank the individuals and services concerned.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
4 February 2014

Question (2) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

At the Cabinet on 17th December 2013, the Cabinet Member for Communities promised to produce the Economic Impact Figures for Surrey and by District of the Ride London Surrey 2013 Race. Could she please supply them. Also how those figures were calculated?

Reply:

Independent research carried out during the event demonstrated that it generated £13m in direct economic benefit. The research used the "eventIMPACT" methodology, the UK government-endorsed standard approach to calculating the impact of events, which takes into account expenditure by organisers and visitors. The £13m direct economic benefit is made up of the proportion of the expenditure by participants, spectators and organisers during, and in the lead up to the Prudential RideLondon FreeCycle, Prudential RideLondon Grand Prix and Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic that would not have been spent without the event.

In addition, independent research was carried out to assess the value of the national and international TV broadcast. This demonstrated that London and Surrey benefited from £21m worth of media coverage from Prudential RideLondon-Surrey Classic which would not have occurred without the event.

Unfortunately we are not able to break down this data in order to provide Surrey specific figures, however, we have asked for this to be made available for this year's event. Event organisers are also working closely with businesses along the race route to help them prepare for this year's event, to ensure that local communities in Surrey reap the maximum economic benefit going forward.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (3) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Mole Valley District Council has agreed to "waive" their proportion of the Council Tax on those properties that were flooded in the recent storms, while the properties are empty.

Will the County Council do the same?

Reply:

Surrey County Council has been working in partnership with district and borough councils to support residents throughout the recent flooding, which is still on-going in many parts of the county. On 19 February 2014 I will be meeting with all district and borough leaders to assess

our response, and to discuss how we will support residents who have been affected by flooding going forward. This matter should be properly considered there.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
4 February 2014

Question (4) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Could the Cabinet Member for Communities tell us how much Prudential PLC is sponsoring the Prudential Ride London Surrey in both 2013 and 2014?

Reply:

Surrey County Council does not have access to this information as it is commercial and confidential to the event organisers.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (5) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Could the Cabinet Member for Highways and the Environment give the latest updated figures for storm damage to Bridges and Other Structures from the recent Storms and Floods?

Reply:

An update on the flooding situation was provided at the meeting.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
4 February 2014

Question (6) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

At both the Cabinet on 17th December, and the Meeting with Councillors on 20th November. The Cabinet Member for Communities stated erroneously that in the Cabinet in December 2011, had agreed the 2013 Ride London Surrey Race. Would she re-publish the Minute and admit that she was as was pointed out at both meetings to her wrong.

Reply:

Mr Hall will be aware that the Leader and I have already answered numerous questions regarding the process for agreeing the Ride London Surrey event. In December 2013 this Cabinet agreed to host the event for the next four years, as well as approving the Surrey Cycling Strategy, after a thorough public consultation. The Cabinet has learnt lessons from the 2013 event and we are now working with event organisers and local communities along the race route to deliver an improved event for 2014.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (7) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Sir Paul Beresford MP has stated publicly that he is working with the Leader of the County Council on the issues of Flooding. Could I ask how many meetings Sir Paul has had with the Leader on this subject if any?

Reply:

The flooding experienced in Surrey since late December has been some of the worst in recent memory. In order to support residents effectively through this time it has been vital that the Council works closely with emergency services, district and boroughs and the NHS, as well as communicating regularly with local stakeholders such as MPs. As we now begin to assess our response we will continue to work with MPs, including as Sir Paul with whom I have been in contact with, to ensure that lessons are taken forward for the future.

Perhaps Mr Hall is unaware that Sir Paul has recently raised the specific issues of Mole Valley flooding on the floor of the House of Commons when addressing the DEFRA Minister. This direct action by Sir Paul demonstrates that he is actively working with SCC, Mole Valley District Council and other agencies for the benefit of the residents in his constituency.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
4 February 2014

Question (8) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Could the Cabinet Member for Communities explain why the Route of the Ride London Surrey 2013 was not consulted on at all? And why the Route for 2014 was published before Consultations even started in certain communities such as Leatherhead?

Reply:

As with my response to Mr Hall's previous question, the Leader and I have already answered numerous questions regarding the process for agreeing the Ride London Surrey 2013 event. My focus is now working with event organisers and local communities along the race route to deliver an improved event for 2014.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (9) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills) to ask:

Mole Valley District Council has established a hardship fund for flood victims whose insurance does not cover double council tax. Will the County Council establish a similar hardship fund to refund the County Council's part of the Council Tax for flood victims who are forced to vacate their flooded homes and to live elsewhere to avoid them having to pay Council Tax on two properties?

Reply:

Surrey County Council has been working in partnership with district and borough councils to support residents throughout the recent flooding, which is still on-going in many parts of the county. On 19 February 2014 I will be meeting with all district and borough leaders to assess

our response, and to discuss how we will support residents who have been affected by flooding going forward. This matter should be properly considered there.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
4 February 2014

CABINET – 4 FEBRUARY 2014

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions**Question (1) from Mr Michael Connolly to ask:**

With regard to the new lamp posts in Surrey Villages, especially Parsonage Lane, Westcott RH4 3NL:

- i). Why do you consider all lamp posts in Surrey (towns and villages) should be urban in style?
- ii). Why were we not consulted about the style?
- iii). Why would different lamp posts (i.e. suitable for a village) cost any more? This is a village - not Sutton or Kingston or Surbiton!
- iv). Was there an environmental impact report? For instance, why were LED lights not used (90% cheaper to run)?
- v). Why do the lights pollute the houses and the streets (more power wasted)?
- vi). Why were they replaced (they seemed to work)?
- vii). After filling Dorking with unnecessary traffic lights, are you planning to urbanise all of rural Surrey?

Reply:

- i). The style of lanterns was chosen to reflect the type of road and its use. Principally there is a lantern used for residential roads and one for traffic routes and these were selected to ensure the correct levels of lighting were achieved within each type of road. This is no different to the lights which were previously being used to replace faulty or damaged lights although it is fair to say that prior to the replacement programme, lights were often replaced on an individual basis which resulted in a variety of styles of lantern, bracket and even light colour along many of the county's roads.

There were exceptions to this, namely in conservation areas and town centres. Within these areas, if the lights being replaced were already of a "special" design, they were (or will be) replaced with a similar design – discussions have taken place with officers within the relevant district or borough council's planning, heritage, or conservation department to agree what styles would be installed.

Given that nearly 90,000 lights will have been replaced by the end of the programme it would have been impractical to have a wider variety of styles and would also have seen a significantly increased cost to the council to install a wider variety.

- ii). Discussion and consultation took place covering a number of factors within a number of groups prior to the award of the PFI contract which included councillors (individually, in select committees and sub-committees), planning and conservation officers and representatives from the Campaign for Rural England among others.

It would not have been practical to consult all residents prior to awarding a new contract of this size.

- iii). I am not clear on the correspondent's definition of lights that would be suitable for a village. I can however advise that the special design columns used in conservation areas are considerably more expensive (ranging from £450 to over £1000 per column)

compared the standard equipment installed in the majority of roads. The details of these additional costs are published on the council's website since the replacement programme started and in some cases, residents groups, parish councils and other interested parties have contributed to the cost of installing special design columns instead of the standard replacements. This option remains open to replace lights, however the council cannot bear the cost of installing additional special design lights out of its maintenance budgets.

- iv). The impact to the environment was considered and was included in the business case for replacing the lights. At the time of contract award, LED technology in street lighting was not fully proven and was in many cases not cost effective with the initial cost of the units being higher than the savings it would have generated. The council did however adopt another energy saving technology through the installation of a Central Management System. This, amongst other things, allows us to control the on/off times remotely and dim the lights in the very late evening and early morning. By dimming the new lights by 25-50% between 23.00 and 05.30 each day, the council expects to save in the region of £12m in lower energy bills and approximately 60,000 tonnes of CO2.
- v). The new lights actually reduce "light spill" compared to many of the previous lights. This is because, rather than being housed in an open glass/plastic cover, the lamp is recessed into the luminaire with a series of angled mirrors redirecting this light back downwards to the road and footpath it is intending to light. On occasion some residents do experience a unwanted light into their property – should this be the case, the residents can make a request through the council's contact centre to have a shield fitted and provided it doesn't reduce the light to the footpath or road, will be fitted free of charge.
- vi). Although individual lights worked, the volume of lights requiring replacement or expensive repairs was increasing year on year. Added to this, a significant majority of the council's street lighting columns were over 40 years old (their expected life), some being in excess of 60 years old; the result being an increased risk of structural failure. By entering into the PFI credit, the county council received support from the Department of Transport in the form of £74m funding to carry out the replacements. It also enabled the council to freeze the budget for street lighting, preventing the continuing increase.

Full details of the rationale for the new Street Lighting Service and contract can be found on the Council's website.

- vii). Traffic signals for road junctions and pedestrian crossing facilities are needed in Dorking for pedestrian safety and to enable traffic to flow around the town. We monitor the functionality and reliability of these signals regularly to ensure they operate to maximum efficiency. Any new proposed signals in more rural areas of Surrey will only be commissioned where a specific need is identified, usually by locally elected representatives.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
4 February 2014

Question (2) from Mr Tim Jones to ask:

Following Kay Hammonds statement at the Communities Select Committee meeting in January, where she said that "she had listened to the concerns of the Spelthorne residents, about the NEED for two appliances stationed in Spelthorne and that Option 5 was a result of her listening to those concerns," will she (and the Senior Management of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service) state, categorically, that they GUARANTEE, that they WILL provide a RELIABLE, COMPETENT, On-call crew 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, albeit with the understanding that this is unlikely to be achieved 100% of the time, but they will GUARANTEE

that if the availability drops below 90% (the stated success rate of Cranleigh's first appliance), they will recognise that Option 5 is NOT a feasible option and WILL reinstate 2 full time, whole-time appliances?

Reply:

On a daily basis Surrey Fire and Rescue Service seeks to ensure that it delivers the right balance of services to people and communities across Surrey. This includes community fire prevention work, community fire protection advice to businesses with enforcement where necessary and responding to incidents, some of which are emergencies. Today's Fire and Rescue Service does much more work to prevent fires and other emergencies from arising through a variety of initiatives and important work with other partners and agencies whilst at the same time ensuring that it has the right people with the right skills and the right equipment to respond to incidents wherever and whenever they arise. In support of that the Fire and Rescue Service already has an agreed competency based framework and assurance regime for all uniformed staff (full-time and On-call) which is well established and effective.

The establishment of the On-call unit at the new fire station will require the community and other stakeholders to work closely and diligently with the Fire and Rescue Service to achieve the right people who are consistently capable of delivering the variety of community emergency prevention work which is central to the community risk reduction activity of today's Fire and Rescue Service, as well as responding to incidents. By recruiting the right people and employing them on a part-time basis using the new On-Call contracts – ostensibly an orthodox part-time job with time-slots that must be fulfilled - the Service seeks, so far as is reasonably practicable, to achieve a reliable service 24 hours a day, 365 days of the year. There will of course always be factors that mean that fire appliances are not available 100% of the time due to operational commitments, training commitments or vehicle maintenance schedules, for example. Nevertheless, by attracting people from the local community who are willing to play their part in delivering a wide range of fire and rescue services in Spelthorne and Surrey we will maximise the availability of the On-call appliance which will have a initial target for operational availability of 90% - the Service decides on a constant basis how to continue to achieve its target attendance standard in all areas of the County which can be achieved by a variety of means e.g. moving fire engines and crews to different locations informed by operational intelligence

Should an On-call unit not be secured in the way described we have made it clear that the alternative option is to locate one whole-time fire engine at one location, which was the original proposal.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (3) from Mr Jeremy Spencer to ask:

Would the fire authority please advise what the annual spend on fire crews based in Spelthorne would be if option 5 is approved (ie one whole-time fire appliance and one on-call fire appliance) and advise how that compares with the total annual fire budget for 2013/14. This can then be compared with the number of rate payers in Spelthorne compared with the rest of Surrey to determine how heavily Spelthorne will be subsidising fire cover for the rest of Surrey?

Reply:

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service provide a county wide response to the communities of Surrey. If 10 fire appliances are required for a fire in or outside of Spelthorne, costs are not apportioned and money does not move either way. We have 35 frontline fire appliances, 2 of which are

located in Spelthorne. Under Option 5, 2 fire appliances will continue to be located in Spelthorne and will continue to meet the agreed attendance standard all things being equal, whilst securing £880,000 as a part contribution to the revenue savings target allocated to fire and rescue under the Medium Term Financial Plan.

This is being taken as part of a rationalisation of fire and emergency cover to achieve the agreed attendance standard and providing a balanced level of county wide service provision within a given total budget. Therefore the network of fire stations is being configured to provide the requisite assurance of achieving the response standard, acknowledging that incident numbers and types have reduced by a significant degree, that the risk profile still exists and that the prevention and protection work will remain a high priority to support the management of that risk. This will be supported by appropriate response resources in neighbouring boroughs and districts and will provide a suitable and sufficient presence to assure local, sub-regional, regional and national responsibilities when the Service is looked at as a whole.

The majority of the “annual spend” in Spelthorne comprises revenue costs (staff wages). To staff one whole-time 24/7 fire engine at one fire station costs £1.05million per annum. The current costs for Spelthorne with Sunbury and Staines fire stations amount to £2.1million per annum. By contrast the cost per annum of staffing one 24/7 On-call fire appliance is in the order of £170,000. Therefore the total “annual spend” under option 5 will be £1,220,000 per annum on staff in Spelthorne. The total annual budget for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service for the year 2013/14 was set at £45,752,000.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

CABINET RESPONSE TO FIRE SERVICE PETITION

“Keep both of our fire stations open in Spelthorne”

Presented on behalf of ‘Save our Services in Surrey’

RESPONSE

The consultation undertaken by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service provided valuable information with regard to the views of the people who responded to the surveys or who attended the meetings. Having considered the comments Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has considered and put forward another option in order to address the concerns expressed by Spelthorne residents and local leaders and which is now referred to as option 5 in the paper placed before the Communities Select Committee.

Option 5 suggests a new centrally located fire station with two fire engines, one 24/7 whole-time crewed fire engine and one 24/7 fire engine staffed by people who are on-call (part-time staff who are available on a pager system from their home, a place of work or from within a certain time of the fire station) from the local community and who are trained to the same standards as whole-time staff. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service already operate this type of duty system in other parts of the county, for example, at Walton and Guildford. Under this option 18 new, local jobs would be created and would be recruited from within a 4-5 minute response footprint of the new location. As part time workers they would then commit to being available at least 54 hours each week.

This option provides the community with two fire engines which will support the provision of fire cover across the county not just the borough of Spelthorne. It will also provide the communities of Spelthorne with an opportunity to work with the Fire Service to continue to reduce the risk from fire and other incidents through community fire prevention work which is a key role of today’s Fire Service.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

CABINET RESPONSE TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS TRAINING

That the Cabinet Member for Business Services consider the need for internal training for Surrey County Council employees, in order to prevent discrimination against staff and residents with mental health difficulties.

I welcome the recommendation to promote mental and emotional well-being in the workplace and put an end to the stigma and discrimination that people with mental health problems can face. I consider our internal training adequate for our employers, in order to prevent discrimination against staff and residents with mental health difficulties. As well as supporting [Time to change Surrey](#)¹ we have in place a number of programmes and are developing new ones. These are:

1. **Manager Masterclasses “ Supporting mental and emotional Well-being“**

A 90 minute Manager Masterclass called ‘supporting mental and emotional well-being’ was launched on 8 Jan 2014. There are four 90 minute masterclasses per day, over 6 days, from February to March 2014 in multiple locations. They are delivered by Santia (our occupational health provider) and Workplace Options (our employee assistance programme provider). Up to 20 managers can attend each workshop, so in total up to 480 can attend. We can roll this out further from April 2014. There will be a strong emphasis on spotting early signs, early support and creating workplace environments that support mental well-being. As of 29 January 2014, 180 managers and supervisors have pre-booked.

2. **E-Learning**

We are putting together a mental health awareness e-learning package. We are using embedded video from Time To Change, MIND, Mindful Employers² and Re-Think³, using actual clips of people with mental health problems, to make the offer more powerful.

3. **Equality and inclusion matters training**

This is mandatory one day training for all new staff. Also, refresher sessions are available. On average 4-6 sessions are delivered per month and there is coverage of mental health awareness. These sessions have been delivered since 2010 and are regularly refreshed.

4. **Reasonable adjustments and flexible working training for managers (Institute of Leadership and Management accredited)**

Covers mental health conditions and supporting staff with various challenges. Has been delivered since 2010.

5. **Time To Change – Employer Health Checks – Engagement Study**

¹ **Time to Change Surrey** – Campaign to tackle discrimination, stigma and inequalities in mental health services

² **Mindful Employer** – National Campaign for employers to sign up to action that supports a healthy workforce

³ **Re-think** - Rethink Mental Illness helps millions of people affected by mental illness by challenging attitudes and changing lives.

The council has been successful in becoming part of a national study, with 49 other organisations in a comprehensive study and review of their performance, in relation to mental health in the workplace. A Time To Change consultant will work with the Council for 3 months, using a survey, interviews and desktop research, to produce a comprehensive report, identifying current and future improvements.

6. 'Flashpoint': Interactive drama training

It is intended to roll out a programme of drama workshops which illustrate the impact of stigma and discrimination. The forum theatre style enables participants to re-direct the script to enable more positive outcomes for the characters. Rollout, delivery and funding options are currently being discussed.

7. Mental Health Awareness (multi-agency training)

Aimed at anybody who works with people who may be at risk of developing symptoms of depression, anxiety or any other mental illness, or anyone interested in learning about mental health and emotional well-being.

8. Mental Health Awareness and Improving Wellbeing at Work (multi-agency training)

A further mental health awareness programme has been developed as a joint training venture by Surrey CC as part of their Time to Change campaign in collaboration with the First Steps⁴ team and Employment Support Retraining Agency.

9. SADAS Substance Misuse and Mental Health Programme (multi-agency training)

An exciting programme of modules in the Guildford area facilitated by the Southern Addictions Advisory Service (SADAS)⁵ and their partners aimed at health and social care staff, mental health staff, emergency services personnel, volunteers and all those whose work brings them into contact with people who may have mental health or substance abuse issues in Surrey.

I believe we have an excellent workforce whose values are consistent with the aims of the County Council but we need to ensure that all directorates are aware of, and avail themselves of the training that tackles inequalities discrimination and stigma within the council.

Ms Denise Le Gal
Cabinet Member for Business Services
4 February 2014

⁴ **First Steps** – Universal primary care access to mental health services

⁵ **Southern Addictions Advisory Service (SADAS)** - Southern Addictions Advisory Service are an organisation dedicated to improving the lives of drug and alcohol users and people with mental health problems by providing different services to meet needs

CABINET RESPONSE TO COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

CHANGES TO FIRE ENGINE DEPLOYMENT IN THE BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE

Communities Select Committee recommends the inclusion of option 5 for the Cabinet report for 4th February 2014.

Response

I would like to thank the Communities Select Committee for the scrutiny that they applied to this paper. I also note the key points that were discussed which demonstrates the diligence that was applied by the Committee in allowing the inclusion of option 5 for the Cabinet report. I will ensure that this option is now presented to Cabinet on 4th February 2014 for their decision.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

DEMOCRATIC SERVICES – CONTACT LIST

Democratic Services Lead Manager

Rachel Crossley - x419993

rachel.crossley@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet and Regulation

Senior Manager

Katie Booth - x417197

katieb@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Business Manager

James Stanton - x419068

james.stanton@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Committee Manager

Anne Gowing - x419938

anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

Regulatory Committee Manager

Cheryl Hardman - x419075

cherylH@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Victoria Lower - x132733

victoria.lower@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Andy Spragg - x132673

andrew.spragg@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Huma Younis - x132725

huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny

Senior Manager

Bryan Searle - x419019

bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Manager

Helen Rankin – x419126

helen.rankin@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Damian Markland - x132703

damian.markland@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Ross Pike - x417368

ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Tom Pooley - x419902

Thomas.Pooley@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Jisa Prasannan – x132694

jisa.prasannan@surreycc.gov.uk