

COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING - 15 JULY 2014

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 15 July 2014 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

42/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Angell, Mrs Barton, Mrs Coleman, Mr Gosling, Mr Gulati, Mrs Hicks, Ms Le Gal, Mrs Mountain, Mr Young and Mrs Young.

43/14 MINUTES [Item 2]

Subject to amending the typo in item no: 31/14 – Members' Questions, Q1, the minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 6 May 2014 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

44/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (1) He drew Members' attention to the list of Her Majesty the Queen's Birthday Honours List 2014, included in the agenda and said that he had written to each Surrey recipient, who had gained the honour for services to Surrey.
- (2) The passing of Mr Tom Phelps-Penry, former County Councillor for Walton. Members stood in silent tribute.
- (3) He welcomed Liz Mills, who will be joining Democratic Services as Lead Manager in August, to her first County Council meeting.
- (4) Chairman's Receptions – he informed Members that he had hosted two receptions recently, both at Painshill Park. The first one on 2 July to thank all volunteer and community organisations who work closely with the County Council and secondly, on 14 July, a reception hosted with the Lord Lieutenant, to thank all those people who helped during last winter's flooding crisis.
- (5) The lunchtime speaker was Andrew Wates OBE DL – the Vice Lord Lieutenant of Surrey

45/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

[**Note:** Prior to the next item, the Leader of the Council made a personal statement, in relation to the Council's decision on Members' Allowances, made at the last County Council meeting in May. He informed Members that both he, and the Deputy Leader, had made a personal decision to accept only the level of allowance, for their positions, recommended by the Independent Remuneration Panel.]

46/14 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 and ask questions. They made the following points:

- Following on from Surrey's policy to keep every library open, he was asked if he would apply a similar policy to Surrey's fire stations.
- Whether the Project Horizon initiative for Highways would be at some risk, unless the Council received additional Government funding for flooding Recovery work.
- The expansion of schools to accommodate the increase in school places required was welcomed, however, it was considered essential that highways officers were involved at the planning stage to ensure safe access to schools.
- Consideration should be given to updating Surrey libraries to ensure that they became more community hubs.
- The value of Members' Allocations, with a request that they would not be reduced further in future years.

47/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROGRESS REPORT: JANUARY - JUNE 2014
[Item 6]

The Leader presented the Surrey County Council Progress Report – January - June 2014, the tenth of the Chief Executive's six monthly reports to Members.

Three Members made the following comments:

- That the regular six monthly report from the Chief Executive was a valuable document that clearly set out the achievements and work of the County Council's Members and officers.
- Case studies were highlighted, in particular, the joint work that the Fire and Rescue Service had undertaken with the Adult Social Care Service to reduce the risk of older residents from fire and also the partnership working between the person who had joined the Council on secondment from the Department for Works and Pensions to work on the Family Support Programme.
- The work undertaken with communities and partners across the county in response to the persistent flooding, demonstrated the 'one team' approach.

RESOLVED:

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

48/14 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

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

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

(Q1) Mr Witham said that he would be submitting his views and also those of his residents to Guildford Borough Council and he urged other Guildford County Councillors to do the same.

Other Guildford Members made points about school place planning and roads. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning was also asked whether he could persuade Guildford Local Committee to have an additional meeting to discuss the Borough Council's draft local plan so that there would be a co-ordinated response from this committee. The Cabinet Member said that it was not within his remit to instruct local committees to do this. Also, the dates for the arrangements were yet to be defined and therefore he suggested that Members met with officers to discuss their views and that he would take further questions outside the meeting.

(Q2) Mr Jenkins considered that his question regarding the production of a detailed timeline for flood defence and alleviation work had not been answered and he also asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery why officers and Members from affected authorities were trying to raise £120m when the Prime Minister had previously said 'money was no object'. The Cabinet Member referred to funding which Oxfordshire CC had recently received and said that Surrey had not yet received any funding for the River Thames scheme. He confirmed that the multi-agency plan to raise £120m would be difficult and was still being discussed.

(Q3) Mrs White asked the Leader of the Council what arrangements had been made to discuss funding for the Junior Citizen Scheme with the office of the Police and crime Commissioner and could she be advised of the outcome. The Leader confirmed that it would be discussed as part of the regular meetings that both he and the Chief Executive had with the Police and Crime Commissioner.

(Q4) Mrs Watson requested assurance that funding cuts would not be made to the Highways budget and this was confirmed by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery. **Mr Essex** asked for clarification on Value for Money and was advised to speak to the Cabinet Member outside the meeting.

(Q6) Mr Orrick confirmed that he would like to accept the Leader of the Council's offer for updates on the setting up of networks. He also asked the Leader what authorisation did the County Council have to set up these Boards and was assured that proper processes were in place which could be scrutinised by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

(Q7) Mr Beardsmore questioned the response and referred to the Council motion from 16 July 2013 meeting when the Council had agreed to oppose any proposals that would reduce Heathrow's role as a hub airport. The Leader of the Council confirmed that, since 2008, the County Council had recognised the crucial role of the airport and had continued to support the economic position for Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, providing the infrastructure was in place. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning agreed. They both considered that Mr Beardsmore had received a full answer and it would be wrong to say more until the outcome of the Davies Commission was known in 2015.

(Q8) Mr Robert Evans considered that since the Leader's personal statement made earlier in the meeting, the response was now inaccurate. **Mr Beardsmore** accepted that County Council's had been given 42 new responsibilities since 2010 but considered that the work was being done by all Members and staff and asked when

they would receive financial remuneration. **Mrs Watson** said that, in the light of the recommendations from the Minister, Brandon Lewis in relation to Special Responsibility Allowances, would the Leader of the Council be reconsidering them. **Mr Essex** asked if the Leader's decision to accept the level of allowance recommended by the Independent Remuneration Panel was made as a result of public opinion. The Leader of the Council responded by stating that all Members of the Council were entitled to make personal decisions on what they claimed as allowances or expenses and made no further comment.

(Q9) Mr Mallett considered that the parking at the adjacent sports club was critical for Woodmansterne Primary School and asked that the Council resolve this problem. The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning informed him that the sports club was privately owned, was not on County Council land and that the club was not interested in resurfacing their car park. Therefore, officers were exploring other options to mitigate the parking issues at this school.

(Q10) Mr Beckett asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery when had a building survey last been undertaken on Rowan House. Also, **Mrs Mason** challenged the statement that services to the public had not been affected, citing an issue of a delay in 180 disabled parking bays awaiting inspection. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery said that, whilst recognising that there had been IT issues, the whole operation was working again and he challenged the comments made by Mrs Mason.

(Q11) Mr Harrison asked the Leader of the Council, if he was confident that sufficient progress had been made so that the County Council would not have to use reserves and balances to achieve a balanced budget. Mr Robert Evans asked the Leader why he considered that the County Council got a 'raw deal' from Government when the County had 11 MPs. The Leader referred to the Council Budget meeting in February when it had been agreed to build up reserves to meet current needs. In response to Mr Evans comment, he said that the County Council had also received a low level of Central Government funding under the previous Labour Government.

(Q12) Mr Kington considered that the Council should have a contingency plan in place and that the delay in obtaining planning permission for a demountable classroom at the Vale Primary School was unacceptable. **Mr Hickman** said that there had been a similar instance in his division. **Mr Taylor** acknowledged the enormous effort that officers were making to provide school places. **Mr Beckett** referred to the school's travel plan which was due to be updated in the Autumn and asked that officers made it a priority to obtain the views of local residents.

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning responded by stating that the County Council was embarking on the biggest school expansion programme for many years and publically thanked officers from property, planning, education and highways, without whose work, this scale of expansion would not be possible. She acknowledged that parents preferred a local school so their children could walk there. On forecasting, she said that it could never be an absolute science but that the figures were within 2% accuracy of what was required and that work was on-going to improve the accuracy. Finally, she offered to respond to the questions from Mr Beckett and Mr Barker outside the meeting.

(Q14) Mrs Watson asked for the performance data to be available so that it could be scrutinised in public. The Leader of the Council said that scrutiny was the responsibility of select committees and that the Council Overview and Scrutiny

Committee examined the Council's performance on a quarterly basis, as stated in his written response.

(Q15) Mr Harrison asked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, who said that he was cautiously optimistic, if he was content with the progress of the re-assessments of the open cases within the 'Older People' category.

(Q16) Mr Jenkins questioned the validity of the answer, because the biggest cost element was excluded. The Cabinet Member for Community Services provided an explanation concerning the capital investment in the new fire station and said that it represented good value for Surrey and that she would like to see more investment in other fire stations across the county.

49/14 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were no statements from Members.

50/14 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]

Item 9(i)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Clare Curran moved the motion which was:

'Council notes:

- this Administration's commitment to economic stimulation which has helped significantly in reducing the number of NEETS in the county with Surrey now down to the lowest level nationally and;
- the great success in exceeding the target of 500 apprentices in just ten months which has led to the recently-launched drive to create a further 170 new apprenticeships for this County's young people.

Therefore, this Council thanks:

- our Skills Centres and all their staff who perform the vital role of filling a gap in post-16 provision and support young people towards full participation by focussing on preparing them for employment opportunities;
- the County's young people and apprentices who so enthusiastically embrace programmes such as the Ready for Work Re-engagement Programme, and;
- Surrey's business community and other partners who have been so supportive in giving Surrey's youth an opportunity in the workplace.'

Mrs Curran made the following points:

- That all Members joined her in congratulating those staff who had worked hard in achieving both the reduction in the number of NEETS in the county and also exceeding the Council's target of 500 apprentices in ten months.

- Initiatives such as the Ready to Work Re-engagement Programme and meaningful work placements were commended.
- The importance of networks.
- That, through the Local Committees, the Youth Service was embarking on re-commissioning its services for the next five years and she urged Members to ensure that the needs of the young people in their divisions were understood.
- The statutory duty of the Early Years Service to ensure all young children were 'school ready'.
- The Family Support Programme.
- The need to improve careers advice for all young people, starting in Year 9.
- That the service was working closely with LEPS and also the proposal for a University Technical college would broaden opportunities for young people.
- All these initiatives would help ensure that the County Council provided young people with the opportunities to enable them to have a good start in life.

The motion was formally seconded by Dr Grant-Duff.

Seven Members spoke, making the following points:

- Support for the motion – this was a 'good news' story.
- Promise of continued support through Members' allocations for young people's initiatives.
- The reduction in the number of NEETS was excellent news.
- Concern that the Youth Service future plans were presented with lack of clarity.
- Early intervention and prevention was crucial.
- Business Investment in Surrey – an example of how Surrey businesses were working to supply components for aircraft was given.
- Apprenticeships had been a success and were life changing opportunities for young people and Surrey's commitment to the scheme deserved credit.
- It was good news that no Looked After Child (LAC) had entered the youth justice services in the last two years.
- The prospect of having a University Technical College (UTC) was a new concept of education.
- An invitation for all Members, who are aware of businesses in their division who may be willing to take on an apprentice, to contact the Head of Commissioning and Development.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote and agreed, with no Member voting against it.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That Council notes:

- this Administration's commitment to economic stimulation which has helped significantly in reducing the number of NEETS in the county with Surrey now down to the lowest level nationally and;

- the great success in exceeding the target of 500 apprentices in just ten months which has led to the recently-launched drive to create a further 170 new apprenticeships for this County's young people.

Therefore, this Council thanks:

- our Skills Centres and all their staff who perform the vital role of filling a gap in post-16 provision and support young people towards full participation by focussing on preparing them for employment opportunities;
- the County's young people and apprentices who so enthusiastically embrace programmes such as the Ready for Work Re-engagement Programme, and;
- Surrey's business community and other partners who have been so supportive in giving Surrey's youth an opportunity in the workplace.'

Item 9(ii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Ian Beardsmore moved the motion which was:

'This Council welcomes the recently announced additional funding allocation from the Pothole Repair Fund and the Weather Repair Fund totalling £9.2m.

This Council notes that the Government allocated a greater share of funding to a number of model councils that were able to demonstrate best practice in highway maintenance. These councils have invested in new technology and initiatives.

This Council agrees that Surrey County Council will:

- (i) learn from best practice of other Councils to improve the speed and quality of pothole repair in Surrey

and

- (ii) review the way in which the County Council bids for funding from Government so that Surrey receives its fair share of funding in future.'

Mr Beardsmore said that this was a straight forward motion about the discrepancy of funding between different County Councils – both Kent and Hampshire had received more funding than Surrey and therefore, this Council needed to ascertain what the other counties were doing and then incorporate their 'best practice' into Surrey's bid for Government funding.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Cooksey.

Mr Furey moved an amendment at the meeting, which was formally seconded by Mr Harmer.

The motion, as amended, read:

'This Council welcomes the recently announced additional funding allocation from the Pothole Repair Fund and the Weather Repair Fund totalling £9.2m.

This Council notes that the Government allocated a greater share of funding to a number of model councils, Surrey being one of them, that demonstrated best practice in highway maintenance and congratulate the Leadership of the County Council on achieving this recognition. Surrey has invested in new technology, a long term approach to the maintenance and renewal of the highway asset, with a clear understanding of its values to residents, visitors and the economy.

This Council agrees that Surrey County Council will:

- (i) share, learn and work with other best Councils to continue to improve the quality and timeliness of pothole repair in Surrey

And

- (ii) Continue to press Government to review and change the funding methodology to take proper account of:
 - a) The economic importance of the Surrey Road Network to the national economy.
 - b) The significant high wear and tear on Surrey Roads which is not recognised within the current funding framework.
 - c) The exemplary Asset Management approach to the Surrey Road network, by the use of term investment, ensuring Value for Money for the residents of Surrey.'

The Chairman confirmed to Mr Beardsmore that the amendment to his motion was ruled 'in order'.

Speaking to his amendment, Mr Furey highlighted the following points:

- The County Council had been awarded nearly £4m from the Government's 'pothole challenge' fund – the remaining funding awarded dealt with last winter's flooding crisis.
- The Department for Transport had confirmed that the County Council's bid was exemplary.
- Surrey was regarded as a 'top authority' and as such had received a 30% uplift in funding – one of only 15 (out of 153) highway authorities that had received this uplift.
- The development of a 15 year Asset Management programme had assisted the County's case.
- As part of the Council's contract with Kier, the liability for pothole repairs had passed to them – this highly efficient contract provide Value for Money for Surrey residents.
- The highway asset was one of the most valuable assets under Surrey's control.
- The County was one of the largest net contributors to the UK economy – a fact not reflected in the funding received from the Department of Transport.
- There were high traffic volumes in Surrey and there was a direct correlation between number of vehicles and highway defects.
- 59% of Surrey's roads were urban and working on these roads was more expensive, due to peak restrictions around peak hours.
- The damage caused by utility companies

- That the Government raised £33bn from fuel duty annually – if 2p per litre was invested in highways, and based on the current funding formula, this would provide an extra £18 – 25m per year for Surrey.

Six Members spoke making the following points:

- This was an important motion / amendment because many residents were concerned about potholes.
- It was also important to learn from the best practice of other local authorities.
- Most damage was caused by lorries rather than cars.
- Repairing the potholes was vitally important.
- The amendment was part of the process to obtain a better deal from Government.
- The Highways Members' Reference Group was doing an excellent job and all Members were encouraged to visit the Highways depot in Merrow to see their work firsthand.
- The introduction of the permit scheme had helped.
- Extra funding was needed from Government – the problems of the M25 and the effect on the A25 were highlighted.
- The amendment was self-congratulatory and did not address the issues raised in the original motion.
- Residents would not agree that Surrey was a model authority.
- Recognition that the County Council had more to learn from other local authorities.
- The Government did not believe that Surrey needed more support.

The amendment was put to the vote with 50 Members voting for and 14 Members voting against it. There were five abstentions.

The amendment became the substantive motion.

Under Standing Order 23.1, Mr Kington then moved:

'That the question be now put'

20 Members stood in support of this request. The Chairman considered that there had been adequate debate and agreed to the request.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council welcomes the recently announced additional funding allocation from the Pothole Repair Fund and the Weather Repair Fund totalling £9.2m.

This Council notes that the Government allocated a greater share of funding to a number of model councils, Surrey being one of them, that demonstrated best practice in highway maintenance and congratulate the Leadership of the County Council on achieving this recognition. Surrey has invested in new technology, a long term approach to the maintenance and renewal of the highway asset, with a clear understanding of its values to residents, visitors and the economy.

This Council agrees that Surrey County Council will:

- (i) share, learn and work with other best Councils to continue to improve the quality and timeliness of pothole repair in Surrey

And

- (ii) Continue to press Government to review and change the funding methodology to take proper account of:
- a) The economic importance of the Surrey Road Network to the national economy.
 - b) The significant high wear and tear on Surrey Roads which is not recognised within the current funding framework.
 - c) The exemplary Asset Management approach to the Surrey Road network, by the use of term investment, ensuring Value for Money for the residents of Surrey.

51/14 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 27 May and 24 June 2014.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

The Bursary Fund Report 2014 was tabled on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Children and Families (Appendix C).

(2) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- High Performance Leadership Development Programme
- Establishment of a Property Company
- Surrey's Strategy for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Children and Young People 2014 - 2017
- Quarterly report on decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 April – 30 June 2014

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 27 May and 24 June 2014 be adopted.

52/14 REPORT BACK ON REFERRED MOTION [Item 11]

The Chairman reported that the motion from the Council meeting on 6 May 2014, standing in the name of Mr Forster, and which was referred to the Children and Education Select Committee and the Adult Social Care Select Committee for consideration was not supported, as detailed in the report set out in the agenda.

Mr Forster was given the opportunity to address the Council and expressed his disappointment with the outcome. He considered that he had presented a viable

option to help Young Carers in Surrey. The Chairman of Children and Education Select Committee responded by drawing attention to the report of the young carers joint research group, which had been endorsed by the Children and Education Select Committee and then the Adult Social Care Select Committee.

53/14 REPORT OF THE PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE [Item 12]

The Chairman of Planning and Regulatory Committee presented the report and its recommendation to Council.

RESOLVED:

That the Surrey Code of Best Practice in Rights of Way Procedures, attached as Annex A to the submitted report, be approved, for inclusion in the Constitution.

54/14 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 13]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee commended the report and the recommendations of his committee to Council:

RESOLVED:

1. That the Risk Management Policy Statement and Strategy, attached as Annex A to the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.
2. That the Code of Corporate Governance, attached as Annex B to the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.
- 3.

55/14 AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION [Item 14]

The Leader of the Council introduced the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the following delegation to the Chief Executive and to the Strategic Director for Business Services be approved:

Arrangements for the discharge of functions

In consultation with the Leader and with any Cabinet Member responsible for the function for which the Council is proposing to take responsibility, to agree arrangements with another local authority to discharge functions on behalf of that other authority.

2. That the amendments to the Scheme of Delegation, agreed by the Leader of the Council, as set out in the submitted report, be noted.
3. That the relevant changes to the Constitution to enable the Shareholder Board and the Coast to Capital Strategic Joint Committee to be established and become operational, as set out in Annex A and B of the submitted report be approved, and that the terms of reference of the Shareholder Board and the

Coast to Capital Strategic Joint Committee be included in the County Council's Constitution.

56/14 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 15]

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 1.05pm]

Chairman

Leader's Speech to County Council – 15 July 2014

Chairman, I thought I would start my statement today a bit differently – by showing you a photo of my recent visit to a new skate park. Now, don't worry, I haven't taken up a new hobby! I went to the skate park with the Chief Executive, as part of our regular visits to each of our eleven District and Boroughs.

The skate park was built at Cox Lane, Epsom at the request of young people, for young people. They even helped the developers with the design! It is proving really popular as a result. In an area where car ownership is low, and many homes don't have a garden – the skate park is providing young people with a really important leisure facility.

So why did I want to share this with you today?

The visit to the skate park reminded me of what a huge difference we can make to our communities when we initiate and deliver projects at a local level. This isn't an isolated example - the skate park is just one of a number of projects funded by the **Community Improvement Fund**.

Over the past 3 years, this fund has approved over 60 applications – channelling **£1.8 million** directly into local communities. The list of successful applications is varied - from building outdoor gyms or recreation areas, to renovating community buildings or shops, or supporting a Starbucks style coffee shop run by young people. In Tatsfield, we even provided funding for a composter to be used by the local community, which is increasing composting to record levels - a first in Surrey!

However, they all have one thing in common – that is that funding is given to local areas to address local needs at the request of local people, supported by local Councillors. The Community Improvement Fund is a great example of how this Council is making a positive difference to people lives - through funding the schemes and supporting the services that really matter to local people.

Another great example is our Adult Social Care Hubs.

We all know that this country's health and social care systems are complex. For many residents, they can sometimes feel impossible to navigate alone. That's why, back in 2009, this Council began to develop a network of adult social care 'hubs', drop in centres located on the high street, where residents could get advice and support to help them live independently. Staffed through a combination of paid advisors and volunteers, many of whom have disabilities themselves – the hubs are proving a hit with residents who really value the opportunity to speak to someone face-to-face.

Five years on, and we now have 8 hubs up and running across the county - with plans to develop a hub in every District and Borough. We are even exploring the possibility of developing 'pop up' hubs to provide an even more local service. I hope that in time these hubs can be as integral part of the local communities as our libraries are.

And Libraries are another great example of where this council is delivering locally.

Throughout the rest of the country, over 300 libraries have closed within the last 2 years. But how many libraries have closed in Surrey? Not one! We know how important libraries are to our residents. This Council is committed to keeping libraries open. But we don't just want to keep them open. We want to enhance them and promote libraries even further. And I am delighted to say that our Community Partnered Library Scheme is making this happen!

Thanks to the commitment and energy of our army of volunteers – visitor numbers at CPLs are bucking national trends and increasing steadily! Some libraries are even extending their opening hours. The buildings are also being used for a whole host of other activities – ranging from IT lessons and coffee mornings, to knitting clubs and health and fitness classes. We are making sure that libraries remain the cornerstones of our communities.

These examples show that, working together as **one team**, not only can we protect vital local services – **we can make them even better!** And I'm so proud that we've managed to achieve this despite the huge cuts to our funding over the past few years.

There is however no denying we've got a tough task ahead of us.

As the Chief Executive highlights in his six month report – around 60% of the planned spending reductions by Government in public services are yet to take place. This council is going to have to contend with yet more cuts whilst also battling against huge demographic pressures. I have said it before but there simply is no escaping the fact that our job is going to get tougher and tougher.

But I don't mind hard work.

In fact, I know that nobody in this chamber would be here now if they weren't up for a challenge **and I recognise the financial position the country is in** – everyone has to play in part in reducing the deficit but there also needs to be recognition of the financial pressures Surrey is facing.

Members may recall the unit cost booklet which we produced last year. This demonstrated that not only are we protecting core services at their current level whilst budgets fall, in many cases we are improving and enhancing our local offer. We will shortly send each Councillor a copy of the updated version for this financial year – I encourage you to read it and share the information with your residents.

Chairman, my call to Government and our 11 Surrey MPs is this –

If you want Surrey County Council to continue to protect the services that residents value the most – then you must support us. When you consider our demographic pressures it is simply unacceptable that we continue to receive one of the lowest funding of any County Council in the country.

What we need is a fairer funding system:

- **that recognises that the number of older people in Surrey has risen by 10% in the last year - and that the demands on our adult social care services continues to grow.** At the same time we need to deal with the added responsibilities imposed on us by the Care Act – which could leave the Council short of £40m every year.

- **that acknowledges Surrey is experiencing its highest ever birth rate – and that we need support to enable the greatest ever expansion of school places.** Government places a statutory duty that every child must have a school place – and rightly so. In the next 5 years, we must find a further **£215m** to ensure every child has a school place. This is a huge sum of money. Without a fairer funding settlement from government we could be left with little choice but to raise council tax in order to fund our school building programme. That would be regrettable and unfair on Surrey residents.
- **that replaces simplistic formulas which allocate money on length of road alone.** Instead Government needs to recognise that Surrey roads are some of the most heavily used in the country – funding needs to be allocated accordingly!

This administration is already injecting £100m into improving Surrey roads. However, if we want to continue our outstanding programme of resurfacing we need at least another £60m over the next 5 years.

Over the last 3 years I have made the case to Government Ministers and officials for fairer funding for Surrey. I have also had discussions with our Surrey MPs to ensure they understand our position.

Mr Chairman, let me make absolutely clear today, my determination to work with our Surrey MPs to take every opportunity to raise this with Government and to ensure the residents of Surrey receive a fairer funding deal.

Chairman and Members,

Despite all the challenges we have faced – Surrey is performing well. Not only are we protecting core services whilst budgets fall, in many cases we are improving and enhancing our local offer. Together with our communities we are keeping Surrey special. I think we should all proud of that.

- Imagine what we could achieve given the right support for those three important issues for Surrey residents.
- Imagine if Surrey was funded fairly by Government, in line with the average of all County Councils in England - that would mean an extra £66M every year.
- Imagine what we could achieve if Councils like Surrey were given the freedoms and flexibilities to unlock our full potential.

I will say it once again - I strongly believe that Surrey needs a fairer funding settlement from Government and my call today is for all of us to work with our eleven Surrey MPs to represent our case in the corridor of Westminster and Whitehall. That is the least our residents expect of us all.

I would like to end by once again thanking Members for all their hard work and commitment over the past year.

I hope you have the opportunity to relax over recess and come back in September refreshed and ready to take on the challenges ahead.

David Hodge, Leader of the Council
15 July 2014

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 15 JULY 2014

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

CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(1) MR KEITH WITHAM (WORPLESDON) TO ASK:

Will the Cabinet Member, responsible for Surrey County Council's (SCC) formal response to Guildford Borough Council's (GBC) Draft Local Plan, please give assurances to residents and me:

- That SCC's response, particularly in respect of planning for housing in Guildford and on the future need for additional school places, highways and transport issues, and other County Council services, will be thorough and robust, and include the representations of County Councillors representing Guildford
- Advertise clearly on the SCC website the contact details of those responsible for the above, and, if different, how and to whom the public and Members should address questions and comments, and, also;
- Set out the process for finalising the SCC response to GBC and how Guildford SCC Members will be able to input to that before it is finalised?

Reply:

Officers from across County Council services will input into a corporate response focussed on the implications for those services of the policies and proposals in Guildford Borough Council's draft Local Plan. The response will consider the future need for additional school places, highways and transport and other County Council services. It will be based on the best evidence currently available and officers will use their professional and specialist knowledge to ensure that it is robust. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning will agree the response with the Planning and Development Group Manager before it is signed off. As is normally the case, Members are able to advise the Cabinet Member of their views and he may consult with them before the response is finalised. Members are also encouraged to make their own individual representations to the borough council.

It is Guildford Borough Council's responsibility as the local planning authority to ensure that its plan is 'sound' and deliverable and that adequate infrastructure can be delivered in a timely manner to support new development. The draft Local Plan is the borough council's document and the

borough council is responsible for running a statutory public consultation process in line with the requirements and processes set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and subsequent regulations. The borough council will need to demonstrate to an independent inspector at examination an audit trail of comments received on the draft Local Plan and how it has responded to these comments before producing the next pre-submission version of the document. It is important for any comments and questions from the public on infrastructure issues to be submitted to Guildford Borough Council and/or raised at the various consultation events to be held during the consultation period and for the borough council to respond and take these up with the county council if necessary. Comments on the draft Local Plan can be made to the borough council by:

- Making comments against the online version of the plan that can be viewed at <https://getinvolved.guildford.gov.uk/consult.ti/DLPSS14/consultationHome>
- Complete the online or paper version of the questionnaire
- Email comments to the borough council at localplan@guildford.gov.uk or write to the council at Planning Policy, Planning Services, Guildford Borough Council, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, GU2 4BB

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING RECOVERY

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

It is now over five months since the terrible flooding that affected so many residents in Spelthorne. Yet there still appears to be ambiguity and confusion as to where responsibility lies between the various agencies, notably Thames Water and the Environment Agency.

Worse - No works on flood defences or flood alleviation have begun.

No decisions have been reached by any of the agencies as to exactly what works should be undertaken. No definitive time frame exists by any of the agencies as to when decisions will be made or actual works begun.

Why has Surrey County Council allowed this situation to occur?

Why hasn't Surrey County Council, as the lead flood authority, demanded that Thames Water and the Environment Agency produce a detailed time plan for flood defence and alleviation works, with specific dates for decisions to be reached and works to commence?

Reply:

Lead Local Flood Authority Duties

With the introduction of the Flood and Water Management Act in 2010 the county council became the 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 responded proactively to flooding issues throughout the county, and will continue to do so, 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 to promote action where appropriate.

Following the flood events since Christmas the council has been collating and evaluating a wide range of data to confirm where official 'investigations' are now required and 54 sites across the county have been identified and prioritised. All individual investigations will require the involvement of the various flood risk management authorities concerned in order to provide appropriate conclusions. This process has commenced.

The Surrey Local Flood Risk Management Strategy has been produced and is currently being revised, following a public engagement exercise, prior to approval by Cabinet in due course. The Asset Register has also been established and is being maintained.

River Thames Flood Events

The significant flood events that affected Spelthorne and other areas of northern Surrey, together with adjacent authorities, in February and March of this year were substantially due to fluvial flooding from the River Thames and its various tributaries. The Environment Agency (EA) is responsible for managing the flood risks on these main rivers. When reviewing these events over a two month period it is clear that both the duration and total volume of water discharged easily surpassed anything previously recorded. This includes the major events in March 1947 and November 1894.

Due to the scale and extent of the event the EA has investigated and reviewed the reactive and recovery phases of the response to learn from the experience and inform how any future incidents are dealt with. As LLFA the

County assisted with this work, with other risk management authorities, and will use the outputs to inform ongoing investigations and works. Surrey, the EA and Thames Water were also represented at public and private meetings organised by Spelthorne Borough with the local MP and local residents on 5 June.

In addition there is regular liaison enabling all risk management authorities to engage through the Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board and supporting Working Group. The Board has established collaborative working arrangements to promote and progress flood and water management objectives, priorities, programmes and funding bids across Surrey.

The River Thames Scheme

At the SFRPB meeting on 17 June the EA provided an update on the River Thames Scheme (Datchet to Teddington). The aim of the current scheme is to:

- Construct a flood channel (in three sections totalling approximately 17 km in length and 20-30 m wide to increase flow capacity of the River Thames
- Increase the capacity of three of the Thames weirs
- Develop a major incident plan
- Install property level protection for up to 1,200 properties

A multi agency team of senior officers and members from affected authorities is working closely with scheme owners and managers from DEFRA and the Environment Agency (EA), to promote the new scheme and develop joint funding initiatives to locally raise approximately £120m towards the scheme cost currently estimated to be approximately £256m. The provisional programme indicates that from the current consents stage completion of the scheme is programmed in Spring 2025.

I believe the above information clearly demonstrates the extent of the collaborative working arrangements between Surrey, as the LLFA, and all other flood risk management authorities and partner organisations in and adjacent to Surrey.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

I attended a recent Junior Citizens' Event held at Dapdune Wharf in Guildford. In a series of 10 minute sets, it delivered training in road safety, water safety, stranger danger, bullying, how to deal with dogs (including the dangers of dog mess), parks and countryside safety among other things. A lot of the people delivering the sets were volunteers but there is always a cost to arranging such events. In view of the costs of dealing with accidents

to children, would the Leader of the Council agree with me that these events are good value for money. Further, would he agree that Surrey County Council should support these events by contributing to those costs?

Reply:

Junior Citizens Schemes have been coordinated, administered and managed by the district and borough community safety partnerships (CSPs). Prior to 2012 when the CSPs were in receipt of direct central government funding, Junior Citizens Schemes were run across the County. However, with the loss of the direct funding and the increasing difficulty of securing the support and commitment of partners, including the County Council, a number of the CSPs decided, albeit reluctantly, to no longer run the Scheme in their area. Of the eleven CSPs in the County there are only five who currently deliver a Junior Citizens Scheme in their area.

The core cost to running a Junior Citizens event is not the day itself rather it is the administration and organisation in the weeks and months leading up to the event and many of the CSPs no longer have the resources or capacity available to deliver such a commitment.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner has taken a keen interest in Junior Citizens and has been working to find support and assistance so that Schemes could again cover the whole of the County. There is funding and other resources available to the CSPs to support both existing Junior Citizens Scheme and develop new ones from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Before the County Council contributes to the costs of Junior Citizens, a discussion with the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner would be in order.

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING RECOVERY

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

At the May 2014 meeting of the County Council, the Leader of the Council announced additional £23m funding for repairing Surrey's roads, bridges and drains without specifying where the money was coming from. Government has allocated Surrey an additional £9.2m funding for highways maintenance in 2014. Where is the £14m shortfall in funding to be found to reach the £23m announced by the Leader of the Council in May?

Reply:

The cost of highway flood repairs this year has been estimated at £23m. This is partially funded by £9.2m received through severe weather and pot hole challenge funding. The remaining cost will be met from savings within the existing Highway budget, funding secured from developers, and funding

identified following a review of the authority's capital programme, the outcome of which will be reported to the next Cabinet meeting on 22 July.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(5) MR STEPHEN COOKSEY (DORKING SOUTH & THE HOLMWOODS) TO ASK:

What actions are being taken to ensure that the County Council fully complies with the Department for Communities and Local Government's Local Government Transparency Code 2014?

Reply:

The Council already provides a significant amount of information in accordance with the 2012 Transparency Code. The new code, which is more detailed and wider-ranging, is in the process of being implemented and is awaiting Government regulations. Officers in relevant Services across the Council are currently doing work to ensure that the additional requirements of the 2014 code are met.

Key points are as follows:

- Procurement- the Council already publishes details of contracts on its Contract Management System, and all items of expenditure over £500. Officers will add to this - details of grants, all purchase orders over £5k, Invitations to Tender and Requests for Quotation, and details of purchase card transactions. There is some development work needed to prepare and collate appropriate reports and ensure data is as complete as possible. The plan is to begin publication under the new standard from January 2015 for data relating to Quarter 3.
- Land and building assets- the information required exists on both the Property Asset Management System (PAMS) and the Property Asset Register and work is in hand to create the required schedule with any additional details that need to be included.
- HR- Information already published on our website includes the Pay Policy statement in accordance with the Localism Act. The Pay Multiple (defined as the ratio between the highest paid salary and the median salary) is also already shown in the Pay Policy statement. Details of the salaries of senior Council officers are also on the website. Further requirements include details of trade union facility time and these and other updated matters are being worked on.
- Parking- the Council currently publishes annual parking reports that provide an overview of on street parking management across the county. This includes financial information as well as data concerning the issue of penalty charge notices. For the 2013/14 financial year the

report will include the financial outturn in each area more comprehensively including the data stipulated by the Code. Work is currently being done in relation to providing details of the total number of designated and free on street spaces in the county and this will be included in the 2014/15 annual report.

- Governance- the Council already publishes its Constitution on the website.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Which Boards has the County Council established, what are their terms of reference and membership? Do all of the Boards meet in private and if so are their minutes published on the external website?

Reply:

I believe that Mr Orrick is referring to the new networks that are in the process of being established by the County Council.

As I have said in this chamber before, if we are to meet the challenges that lie ahead we need to be able to direct our resources and skills nimbly onto the most important tasks. It is also important that we are able balance the day-to-day delivery of current services with work to design and implement new models of public services.

That is why we are moving away from a purely functional and directorate/service centred set of arrangements and supplementing these with networks focussed on cross-cutting goals.

The networks are still in the process of being set up and therefore Terms of Reference are yet to be finalised. However, I would be more than happy to update Mr Orrick (or indeed any other Member) on the set up of the networks after the summer recess.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(7) MR IAN BEARDSMORE (SUNBURY COMMON AND ASHFORD COMMON) TO ASK:

Under the latest proposals by Heathrow to the Davies Commission the huge Colnbrook Incinerator will be relocated to Spelthorne. Does the Cabinet Member support this?

Reply:

The proposal for a third runway at Heathrow is one of a number of options being considered by the Airports Commission, which is due to report in summer 2015. If the proposal for a third runway at Heathrow is agreed then it would be at least 2025 before it could be delivered. If, as suggested, the construction of a third runway would involve demolition of the existing energy from waste plant at Colnbrook and its replacement at another location then this in itself is likely to take many years given the planning and other regulatory approvals that would be required, as well as the considerable build time.

Given the uncertainties surrounding this whole proposal and the fact that there is no clarity on the detail of what is being proposed, it is not possible to make any comment at this stage.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Over 2000 people have now signed an e-petition on the council's website, critical of the decision of Surrey's ruling group to award themselves huge increases in special responsibility allowances. The Leader of the Council was questioned about the matter when giving evidence recently, to a House of Commons Committee and at least one MP, Guildford Conservative Anne Milton, has asked the Council to reconsider the decision. In light of all this public opposition, does the Leadership intend to press on with these enormous rises regardless?

Reply:

The Government has given county councils 42 new responsibilities since 2010 and these have increased the workload for the Cabinet and other senior councillors. There had been no review of allowances for four years and it is important that they are adjusted to reflect increases in roles and responsibilities. Therefore I stand by this Council's decision, whilst I recognise that there has been public debate on the matter.

CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING

(9) MR KEN GULATI (BANSTEAD, WOODMANSTERNE AND CHIPSTEAD) TO ASK:

The Cabinet Member will be aware of the recent closure of the facilities for parental parking in the sports club next door to Woodmansterne Primary School in my Division.

Would the Cabinet Member please inform me of the course of and the current state of the negotiations with the sports club over the resumption of those facilities and what the Council is able to do to ameliorate the resulting problems for the parents, children and residents.

Reply:

I am aware of the closure to parents of parking facilities next to Woodmansterne Primary School. The private car park is owned by the Old Walcountian Sports Club. A formal arrangement had been in place that enabled the parents to use the car park at the start and end of the school day.

Unfortunately the car park is situated on an un-made surface that has significantly deteriorated due both to its use and extreme weather. The car park has now reached a state where the previous agreement has now been terminated.

Officers of the Council have met with representatives of the Sports Club and at this stage the estimated costs of making the existing car park available for long term vehicular use remain prohibitive for both sides. We will continue to work with the Sports Club and monitor this situation. In addition, officers have also approached other third party car parks in the area but have been unsuccessful in gaining agreement for their use by parents.

We recognise that as a result difficulty has been created in the area both for those wishing to access the school and drop off their children and local residents in what is a confined location. In response council officers including the Road Safety Audit Team, the Local Highways Team, the Surrey Police Casualty Reduction Officer and the Sustainability Team have been working with the school to look at potential mitigation measures.

As part of this process, officers are considering the provision of a School Crossing Patrol on the Carshalton Road. In addition, the Local Highways team are examining the feasibility of providing a drop kerb to assist parents and children crossing outside the school.

Officers have also been working with the school to update its travel plan to ensure that best practise is promoted, in relation to all policies relating to access to the school.

We are aware that this will be an ongoing issue and has caused concern both within the school and the local area. I will ask officers to keep you informed of any developments.

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING RECOVERY

(10) MR JOHN BECKETT (EWELL) TO ASK:

I understand that our highways facility at Merrow has recently been subject to flooding. Can I ask the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery if there are any consequences for Surrey residents, especially to services and projects that have associated timescales?

Reply:

Serious flooding resulting from a mains water leak occurred in Rowan House at Merrow over the weekend of 21 and 22 June 2014. This relative new modular building housed two teams from the Local Highways Service, the Parking team, restaurant and welfare facilities and two meeting rooms.

Surrey Highways is a Category 1 responder and this event resulted in the Service Business Continuity Plan being immediately invoked on Monday 23 June 2014. Since then the Business Continuity Service Recovery Team have held regular meetings, chaired by the on call Highways Duty Officer. This team of officers has engaged with staff to ensure adequate alternative accommodation and IT has been available to maintain services throughout. Property Services have assisted with temporary office and welfare facilities in response to the initial event and also the ongoing recovery. IMT have delivered an enhanced service, including evening and weekend working, to repair damaged servers, recover data and reinstall printer services etc.

The ongoing event and recovery is now focused on completing the IT recovery and ensuring the longer term building repairs are completed with the minimum delay working with the insurance assessors and Procurement to achieve best value solutions.

As with all sudden, high impact events such as this there will be some learning opportunities for future operations in the various services concerned. These will be fully identified at a debrief to be arranged in the near future and lead by the Emergency Management Team.

It is noted, however, that our services to the public, Members, other colleagues and stakeholders was managed throughout and not severely impacted. This reflects the robust management and Business Continuity arrangements operating in the Highways Service and the successful cross cutting work undertaken with other support services in the council to maintain 'Business as Usual'.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(11) MR NICK HARRISON (NORK AND TATTENHAMS) TO ASK:

The Section 25 report by the Chief Finance Officer which accompanied the Budget Report presented in February 2014 states: "The Council is planning to apply one-off general reserves and balances totalling £26 million to achieve a balanced budget in 2014/15. This will enable the Council to further pursue the medium term strategy focused on securing a fair share of Government funding for this Council for the services where demand is uncontrollable by the Council: adult social care and school places in particular."

Could the Leader advise the Council what progress has been made towards securing a fairer share of Government funding?

Reply:

Members will be aware through the regular budget planning briefings that the Cabinet have a strategy for lobbying MPs, especially Cabinet Ministers, as well as partners and stakeholders to secure a fair share of funding for the County Council. Members will also appreciate that large government departments rarely change decisions quickly. A policy of lobbying such as this has to be a sustained long term campaign that is focused on the right people. We are fortunate at Surrey County Council that we have Cabinet Members with good connections in Government and the expertise of officers to provide the right lobbying information in the right way.

But for successful lobbying we cannot just say how bad our luck is and hold up a begging bowl. We present a positive message that shows the County Council is proactive in securing its financial sustainability and that it wants to be treated fairly.

Over the past year we have demonstrated that we are controlling costs, in spite of increased demand for services, through lower unit costs. You will all have a copy of the Unit Cost booklet we produced late last year for Surrey MPs. This is now being updated for the last financial year and continues to show Surrey County Council reducing its costs in the face of ever increasing demand.

Members will also be well aware of the publication "More than 50 Ways Surrey County Council Adds Value". This has been used successfully with MPs to demonstrate that the County Council strives to do the best for its residents and only asks to be treated fairly.

As I said, this is a long term campaign. But we have had plenty of success over the last twelve months. This is evidence we are being listened to

School places funding

- Additional £72m basic need capital grants awarded for 2014-17

Better care funding

- National allocation based on health demographics, not local authority demographics (*£65m was allocated to the Surrey area, including £25m to sustain Adult Social Care provisionally agreed with CCGs*)

New homes bonus

- Proposed transfer to Local Enterprise Partnerships withdrawn outside London – after personal representations by Leader in his dual role as Leader of SCC and Chairman of County Council Network which has led to SCC retaining over £30m expected cumulative funding over MTFP 2014-19

Council tax referendum threshold

- 2% limit maintained for 2014/15

Highways Maintenance

- £3.9m from the Pot hole fund
- £5.3m for flood damaged roads and bridges

I think Members will agree that we have achieved a great deal, but there is no time to sit back and rest on our laurels. The County Council still faces significant financial challenges and these successes provide a platform for continuing our campaign for Surrey to be treated fairly by government. We will continue to ask our Surrey MPs to work within the corridors of Westminster and Whitehall to fight for a fairer funding solution for their constituents.

CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING

(12) MR EBER KINGTON (EWELL COURT, AURIOL AND CUDDINGTON) TO ASK:

A planning application has been submitted to site a demountable classroom (modular building) on the site of **The Vale Primary School**, Beaconsfield Road, Langley Vale, Epsom to create an additional classroom for September. However, construction of the building has already started before the final date for objections and before planning permission has been granted.

1. Were you aware that the Property Team had authorised building work to begin before residents have had the opportunity to express their views and influence the planning decision?
2. Are you aware that there is no School Travel Plan or agreed highway traffic reduction measures yet published to reassure the residents that

this proposal will not result in additional, and unresolved, traffic problems in the area around the school?

3. Do you support a process whereby SCC can submit and agree its own planning application and give the nod to building work starting before the local community has had an opportunity to review and comment upon the application?
4. Do you accept that there is a serious flaw in school place planning and data collection and analysis, which sees the decision on the need for additional school places being taken less than 12 months before they are needed, and planning applications for new build being determined just two months before those buildings are required?

Reply:

The delivery team take extremely seriously the need to meet the statutory duty placed upon the local authority to provide a school place for every pupil seeking one, as well as the need to meet the statutory planning obligations of the authority. At times these obligations may possibly come into conflict and the applicant in this instance has recognised the duty and obligations to Surrey parents and taken the difficult decision to submit their planning application, enabling local residents to register their views for consideration, whilst running in parallel the development of the scheme.

The team undertook comprehensive and robust pre-application advice covering local planning and highways matters and implemented a review of the school travel plan in order to identify and mitigate areas of concern that may arise during the planning process. Subsequently and given the seriously restricted timescales and need to supply places to meet the local demand for school places in September 2014, the team undertook a calculated risk assessment and concluded that, in this particular instance, the planning application was likely to receive support and they would proceed in the knowledge that should planning permission be refused, the site would be returned to its prior state.

The SCC Environmental Sustainability Community Engagement Team has recently been commissioned to take forward all new travel plans for schools projects. The team were commissioned to review and update the Vale Primary School's travel plan, to enable a new plan to be produced and implemented in the Autumn term. This scheme is delivering one additional class with a maximum of 30 pupils and it is considered that a new travel plan will mitigate any impact on local residents arising from this small pupil intake.

SCC is the appropriate statutory planning body for such applications and acts independently from the other parts of SCC. This is similar to the approach taken by other Local Authority bodies, who act as planning authority where they are the majority funding partner. In this instance, following extensive pre-application planning and highways advice, the applicant decided after undertaking a calculated risk assessment, that the likelihood that the

planning application would not be successful was low and took the decision to run both the planning process and project scheme development in parallel in order to meet the urgent need to provide schools places in September 2014.

Predicting school demand is a complex process and involves a range of different factors, collecting data on birth rates, analysing fertility rates, parental preferences both between schools and between the state maintained and private sector, housing growth and inward/outward migration. As a result planning for school places is based on probabilities and not certainties and while projections are derived from sound calculations, they come without guarantees. Furthermore school organisation and the provision of sufficient places must take into account different, and at times conflicting factors. In the 3 year period to the academic year commencing September 2013 these figures were within 2% accuracy for each year.

Surrey County Council has a 5 year planned programme for school expansion which we are confident will meet the need arising from the projections as described above.

However, each year there are nationally set dates for parents to apply to admissions authorities with their preferences of school places, which is 15 January for primary admissions. As a result, there is always a very short window of opportunity for decisions to be made about where the Local Authority will require exceptional and temporary classrooms to meet demand for the start of the following academic year.

The delivery process involves undertaking discussions and reaching agreement with the individual schools, obtaining pre-planning and highways advice, surveys and development of schemes for planning application, procurement and delivery of the project.

A new and refined forecasting tool was acquired in June 2014 and it is considered that, together with a comprehensive review of the approach areas of pupil place demand, the County will be able to avoid similar situations occurring in all but rare occasions in future.

There is a statutory duty placed on the Local Authority to provide a school place for every pupil seeking one. We are in an era of unprecedented demand for school places which reflects a national trend and I am confident that officers are meeting this challenge, working to provide solutions that ensure all children will have access to education which is at the forefront of our school improvement agenda.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Why has Surrey County Council failed to respond to requests from Zane Gbangbola's parents to conduct the necessary tests and investigations into the presence of Hydrogen Cyanide gas at their former home where Zane became ill and subsequently died?

Can the council confirm that the tests and investigations requested by the parents will be conducted, and if not, why not?

Reply:

On behalf of the Council I wish to offer my sincere condolences to Zane Gbangbola's parents for the tragic loss of their son.

In response to your question, Mr Jenkins, I have checked with Council officers and they do not appear to have received any such requests. In the event that the Council were to receive such a request however, it would pass these onto the relevant authorities as the County Council do not carry out testing. That is because it is not something which is a function of county councils. I am sure you are aware that it will be for the Coroner to hold an inquest to determine the cause of Zane's death. Both the Council and Surrey Fire and Rescue will continue to do all they can to provide any information and assistance required by the Coroner and Surrey Police. It would therefore be premature for me to make any further comment at this time.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

The County Council's Cabinet used to include performance data on its agenda for debate which was published and available for everyone to read. However, this practice has discontinued and this information is now included on the agenda of the Finance and Performance Sub Group of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which meets in private. This means that the County Council's performance data is not in the public domain and is not scrutinised by the Cabinet. Can the Cabinet include the performance data of the County Council on its future agendas so that everyone can read it?

Reply:

There are many opportunities to scrutinise the Council's performance. The County Council continues to produce a performance report each quarter that reports progress towards Directorate Strategy Priorities, alongside key

Residents' Survey feedback, staffing and finance information. The reports against Directorate Strategy Priorities are jointly owned and prepared by the Portfolio Holder and Strategic Director. These reports are collectively considered by the Cabinet and Corporate Leadership Team and are then published each quarter on the Council's website as part of the Key Strategy Bookcase:

<http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/your-council/how-the-council-works/our-performance/our-key-strategies-bookcase/our-business-reports>

The Performance and Finance Sub Group of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee also scrutinises this information with a view to referring issues to the relevant Council Committee for further investigation or scrutiny. For example, at the meeting held on 2 June 2014, the Performance and Finance Sub Group agreed an action "that the Adult Social Care and Environment and Transport Select Committees scrutinise performance against the three priorities in each of their Directorates for which performance was rated red at year end 2013/14".

At the same meeting, Performance and Finance Sub Group, also agreed "Each Select Committee to scrutinise year-end performance information for the priorities set within their remit annually at their May/June meeting, with services providing written explanation for any priority rated as red" and "That the outcomes of the scrutiny be reported to the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee annually at its meeting in July".

Local Committees also continue to monitor the quality of services provided locally and recommend action as appropriate.

The Council welcomes external scrutiny. For example, in addition to statutory Government inspections, the Council has invited peers from other councils and organisations to visit and feed back on performance, including for example the LGA (Local Government Association) corporate peer challenge in February 2013.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

(15) MR NICK HARRISON (NORK AND TATTENHAMS) TO ASK:

The budget for Adult Social Care for 2014/15 includes plans for savings of £10 million through the Friends, Family and Community programme. At 1 February 2014, the Council had 9,128 open cases within the "Older People" category. Given we are now 30% of the way through the budget year, how many of the open cases have been re-assessed and what savings are forecast from these individual case reviews?

Reply:

It is important to emphasise that the primary purpose of the Family, Friends and Community (FFC) programme is to improve care outcomes, and the emerging evidence is that it increases independence and reduces isolation and loneliness whilst contributing to the savings target of the service.

The plan for delivery of the (FFC) programme is not based on reviewing all open older people cases, but on establishing an FFC way of working as the means of dealing with all new community placements, and to reassess those existing support plans where there is the most potential to make savings. The following summarises how those approaches are intended to work, and the progress to date:

Making all new placements in the community across all care groups by utilising the FFC approach. During the year some 5,000 new placements are expected to be made, and the key target is to reduce the average cost of those placements by 20%.

The overall position to date reflects good progress with Direct Payments, less progress in home based care support packages, and an overall saving identified across placements during June of £48,000 this year with a £72,000 full year effect.

Action plans are in place to prioritise the reassessment of cases with the most potential. A Programme Director has been identified from within Adult Social Care to oversee all aspects of the FFC programme. By the end of June 43 cases have been re-assessed which potentially show a saving of £165,000. Work is ongoing, but 24 cases across all care groups have been fully validated, of which:

- 9 achieved 20% or more of savings
- 1 achieved 0-19% of savings
- 6 no change in costs
- 8 increased costs

The ASC budget position incorporating the FFC position will be reported to the Cabinet as usual at the end of July. That first quarter position will indicate the position now projected against the £10m target, bearing in mind both the early results and adjustments to plans in the light of experience to date enabling the number of reassessments to increase quarter on quarter.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(16) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK: (3rd question)

The move from two fire stations to one in Spelthorne was intended as a cost-cutting exercise.

- When will the actual figure of the purchase of land in Kingston Road, Ashford, on which to build this new station, be released?
- How can Surrey County Council have publicly committed to the purchase of a block of land when it has yet to agree upon a price, yet still insist that this is an exercise in financial savings?
- Doesn't the construction of a new fire station negate any real savings to the council from the closure of the existing two fire stations?

Reply:

The acquisition of land is a commercial transaction and details of the figures involved are sensitive and therefore confidential until such time that any deal is completed. SFRS have received approval to close two fire stations and open a new one, based on operational efficiencies and savings. Property Services is undertaking to achieve this in the most advantageous way for the County Council.

The new fire station will provide a modern and efficient building from which to operate. It will house not only fire engines but also a rescue boat which can not only be used within Surrey but regionally and nationally to support wide area flood events. This new building will provide an agile workspace for Fire and Rescue staff to continue to work collaboratively with partners to deliver a range of high quality, early intervention activities to reduce community risk and vulnerabilities whilst at the same time improving community resilience. The associated training facilities will further enhance and consolidate our capabilities to respond to our core duties and provide flexibility to develop new skills as our role changes.

The money that Fire and Rescue is required to save, following the decision to have one fire station in Spelthorne, is from revenue budget. For Fire and Rescue, the biggest element of the revenue budget is staff wages and a saving has been generated - in this instance - by consolidating two fire stations into one, retaining two fire engines but changing crewing configurations to provide a suitable and sufficient response and prevention capability, at a reduced cost. The cost of the building is from the capital budget. It is important to recognise that both Sunbury and Staines are older buildings that would otherwise require modernisation to meet the needs of a modern Fire and Rescue service and to be efficient in terms of energy use. A new fire station would be built to the latest environmental efficiency standards. The provision of fewer crews and their allied equipment will generate a year on year saving.

CABINET MEMBER STATEMENT

Overview of the looked after children bursary fund

Surrey's Corporate Parenting Board continues to recognise and celebrate the achievements of our looked after children.

It was decided in 2012, that one way to do this would be to create a bursary fund used to give one off rewards to Surrey's looked after children (whether they live in Surrey or not) to encourage them to achieve their full potential. The fund is provided through contributions from all Members in Surrey County Council and is accessible to all Surrey's looked after children to support them.

The scheme is administered by a bursary panel made up of myself, John Orrick and Peter Hickman, as members of the Corporate Parenting Board.

In 2013, we had some great success stories with our looked after children with many achieving in the fields of education, sport and music. The most popular requests were for laptops, iPads, bicycles and sports and music equipment.

Over the past year, there have been scores of applications for bursaries and I am pleased to say there were some really good ones that we were able to support and many children, as always, left our care to move on to great things. I would also like to say thank you to all members who have contributed to the fund for their help and generosity. Without you, many of our children in care would not experience these amazing opportunities and I hope that with your help, we can continue to improve on this in 2014/15.

Facts and figures

Our budget for the fund this year, kindly donated by you all, was £40,000. We received 98 successful applications for bursaries, which is a significant increase from the 51 we received last year. This reflects the true value that the service and our children in care place on the bursary fund and clearly demonstrates the benefits of rewarding our vulnerable children.

Because of this, we decided to allocate a higher proportion of the money this year to support the bursary fund, as opposed to the celebration events. We will however, continue to decide how to divide the money accordingly each year.

Figures from 2013/14

Number of successful bursary applications: **98**

Total value: **£29,602**

Requests

- **45** requests for IT related equipment
- **26** requests for equipment for a hobby, interest or other activity
- **17** requests for lessons / courses
- **9** requests for miscellaneous items.

Nominations for the fund ranged from school/academic achievements and dealing with placement upheavals and life difficulties to achieving personal milestones and showing positive and supportive behaviour.

Bursary stories

I am so pleased we have been able to support some great bursary requests this year. Here are just a few examples of how the fund has changed the lives of some of our children (*all names have been anonymised):

First bicycle

Amy* and George* did not have enough opportunities to learn essential skills. The bursary money was used to buy the children bicycles so they could learn to ride a bike and develop their delayed motor skills. Despite a very difficult transition into foster care, the children have continued to be polite, well behaved and have maintained their engagement in education.

What was the bursary for?

Bicycles for both children, who have never had a bicycle and do not know how to ride one.

Amount: £150

Scouts About

Luke* has been placed in a children's home for almost two years. In that time he has made considerable progress both academically and emotionally. Luke has ADHD and has struggled with his behaviour. His school have noticed a change in his behaviour and his personality is really shining through.

What was the bursary for?

Luke has joined the Scouts and wanted to attend the 'Scouts About' camp, which is a national scouting camp held every three years. The bursary was used for uniforms and camping equipment for the trip.

Luke also loves cycling and his bike is too small for him. Part of the bursary was used to pay for a new bike.

Amount: £250

Singing lessons

Sarah* is a looked after child in foster care. She has been identified by her school as having significant singing potential.

The bursary was used to support weekly singing lessons that will help develop her potential and boost her confidence.

What was the bursary for?

Singing lessons.

Amount: £330 (£110 per term)

Celebration events

As part of the fund, the Corporate Parenting Board also organises events to celebrate the achievements of our children in care each year. These events are hugely appreciated by the looked after children and care leavers and are planned in consultation with our Children in Care Council.

Care Leavers' 'Celebrating You' event.

One example of many successful events from last year was the Care Leavers' 'Celebrating You' dinner. On Thursday 30 May, young people and staff from Surrey's Care Leavers' Service gathered together at County Hall to celebrate the young people's achievements over the past year.

The Ashcombe Suite was transformed from an average council meeting room in the day, to a grand dining room by night. The theme was red and gold, with the girls dressed in ball gowns and the boys in suits. They received a drink on arrival and enjoyed a spot of magic from two roaming magicians.

The young people were then treated to a three course dinner and an awards ceremony, where they all received at least one certificate each for their achievements. There were four categories: 'outstanding achievement', 'overcoming adversity', 'meeting a personal goal' and 'helping others'.

The evening ended in applause for all the young people and their achievements. One young person said: **"An amazing, wonderful and fantastic evening. I really enjoyed myself at the 'Celebrating You' event."**

Events to look forward to

Following on from the successful achievement events held last year, it was decided this year to put more of an emphasis on supporting the bursary scheme. However, we will be planning for some big celebration events in 2014/15. Two that are already well underway include:

- **Surrey Skills Fest' – Saturday 21 June 2014**
- **Juniors' jungle party – September 2014**

On behalf of all our looked after children, I want to thank all of you for your kindness and generosity in stepping up to the role of being corporate parents.

You have helped some of Surrey's children to benefit from feeling a personal sense of achievement and allowed them to celebrate this and have some fun, where often they have previously experienced very little happiness.

I do hope you feel that the bursary and celebration fund is worthwhile and is an excellent way for all Members to play an active role in supporting and celebrating the achievements of our Looked after Children and Young People.

I would like to invite you all to make a similar commitment in this new council year 2014-2015 and contribute £500 from your local area committee allowance.

Thank you very much for your interest and support.

Mary Angell
Cabinet Member for Children and Families
15 July 2014

