

COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING - 9 DECEMBER 2014

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 9 December 2014 commencing at 10.00 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Mr D Munro (Chairman)
Sally Marks (Vice-Chairman)

*	Mary Angell	David Ivison
	W D Barker OBE	Daniel Jenkins
	Mrs N 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	Ms D Le Gal
	Bill Chapman	Mary Lewis
	Helyn Clack	Christian Mahne
	Carol Coleman	Ernest Mallett MBE
	Stephen Cooksey	Mr P J Martin
	Mr S Cosser	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
	Mrs P 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
*	Mr D Harmer	* Fiona White
	Nick Harrison	Richard Wilson
*	Marisa Heath	* Helena Windsor
	Peter Hickman	Keith Witham
	Margaret Hicks	Mr A Young
	David Hodge	Mrs V Young
	Saj Hussain	

*absent

72/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Angell, Mr Bennison, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Miss Heath, Mrs Moseley, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mrs White and Mrs Windsor.

73/14 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 14 October 2014 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

74/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (i) That the County Council had received the Best Website Award 2014 from the Society of Information Technology Management.
- (ii) He reminded Members that their Christmas lunch was on Thursday 18 December 2014 and was preceded by the Member and staff carol service.
- (iii) He invited Members to view the exhibition in the Grand Hall today in relation to 'Thursley goes to War'.
- (iv) Finally, he said that the lunchtime speaker today would be the Rt. Hon, the Baroness Bottomley of Nettlestone, Virginia Bottomley.

75/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

76/14 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Support for greater local devolution to Surrey.
- That the additional funding to support Children in Need in Surrey was welcomed.
- Fairer funding for school places in Surrey was critical - the potential shortfall was a huge challenge for Surrey.
- Disappointment that junction 9 was not included as one of the major improvements to junctions on the M25, in the Chancellor's Autumn Statement.
- Long term issues, such as provision for increasing numbers of school places and Adult Social Care, would not be solved in the forthcoming budget round.
- That Local Government in this area still needed to find £40m for flood defence schemes.
- Stamp Duty reforms, introduced in the Chancellor's Autumn Statement would be welcomed by Surrey residents, as would the reduction in National Insurance for apprentices.

- A request that the newly introduced Cabinet Member updates could be circulated a minimum of five working days before the Council meetings.

77/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROGRESS REPORT: JULY - DECEMBER 2014 [Item 6]

The Leader presented the Surrey County Council Progress Report – July – December 2014, the eleventh of the Chief Executive's six monthly reports to Members. He considered that this regular report, including the case studies, was invaluable for keeping Members informed and expressed his appreciation to the Chief Executive for it.

Members made the following comments:

- Mr Witham thanked the Chief Executive for visiting his Worplesdon division. He also referred to paragraph 42 of the Chief Executive's Six Month Progress Report, which related to the affect of the Introduction of the Care Act from April 2015 and requested that there should be a single comprehensive database, available to every work practitioner in Surrey's Adult Social Care Service, detailing up to date information regarding voluntary organisations and the services provided, by area. Also, that an update re. this request is provided in the next Chief Executive's progress report in July 2015.
- Mr Walsh, who was the Mental Health Champion, welcomed the inclusion of a case study which tackled the mental health stigma in Surrey.

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.

78/14 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Notice of 14 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 Robert Evans asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning if he shared his concern that the change to the 441 bus route was an accident waiting to happen and that the County Council should act now. The Cabinet Member referred him to his written response, which stated that private operators could alter routes without consulting the County Council. He also said that he had attended a meeting in Spelthorne in July where this issue had been discussed and said that further work and cost estimates would be presented to the Spelthorne local committee in due course for their consideration.

(Q2) Mr Jenkins queried the responses to his questions (a) and (d).

Mrs Salaigopoulos made reference to the Environment and Transport Select Committee's flooding task group report and said that the situation had now moved on. She asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding to confirm that Surrey County Council, as the Lead Flood Authority had no powers to compel Thames Water to accept responsibilities for the aqueduct in Staines.

The Leader of the Council asked the Cabinet Member to confirm that Thames Water would shortly sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Environment Agency which would benefit Surrey in the long term.

Mr Walsh asked the Cabinet Member to acknowledge the huge amount of work undertaken by officers to alleviate and come up with solutions since the flooding had occurred.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding confirmed that Thames Water was the owner of the aqueduct. He also referred to the Section 19 investigation, which would be published on the Council's website in due course. Finally, he confirmed that Thames Water were working with the County Council and that further meetings were planned in the New Year.

(Q3) Mr Fuller asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services if a league table, by Borough and District, showing the number of people penalised for dropping litter could be included on the County Council's website. Whilst the Cabinet Member said that she was encouraged by the progress that Borough and Districts had made in this area, she did not consider that a league table would be beneficial.

(Q4) Mr Cooksey expressed concern about the length of time proposed to repair the county's footways. He also asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding for details on the consultation process concerning the development of a number of models showing different outcomes for the condition of the footway asset. The Cabinet Member confirmed that this information would be circulated to all Members before Christmas.

(Q5) Mr Orrick said that details of the potential receipts from the sale of the residential home sites, if they were sold, and whether the information he requested could be put on the Council's website, were not set out in the response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care. The Cabinet Member said that the results of the consultation process needed to be considered before any alternatives for the sites were explored. He would, however, discuss with officers whether the details set out in his written response could be placed on the Council's website.

(Q6) Mrs Watson asked the Leader of the Council if the information about reserves and balances had changed since 30 September 2014. **Mr Selleck** asked about the minimum level of reserves going forward. The Leader of the Council said that budget information was public information presented regularly at Cabinet meetings but that he was not in a position to know what the current balances were today. Referring to the minimum level of reserves, he said that he took advice from the S151 officer but it was likely to be approximately £17m / £22m.

(Q7) Mr Forster asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning if he would consider not excluding local roads from this funding source and if he would ensure that local committees were consulted at the appropriate time. The Cabinet Member agreed to both requests.

(Q8) Mr Beardsmore said that he would like a copy of the North West Surrey Minerals Local Plan 1985 but it was three decades out of date. He said that his question referred specifically to Spelthorne and the answers would be different if it applied just to Spelthorne rather than the cumulative impact across North West Surrey. He also requested responses to his supplementary questions asked at the previous Council meeting.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning agreed to provide a written response to Mr Beardsmore's questions by the end of the week.

(Q10) Mr Jenkins referred to the suffering of the residents in the Staines area who had been affected by the flooding earlier in the year and asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding if Surrey County Council would be conducting a thorough investigation. The Cabinet Member responded by stating that Surrey County Council was the Lead Flood Authority and not the 'supposed Lead Flood Authority' as stated in Mr Jenkins question. He also considered that his response had fully answered the question and said that the topic had been fully discussed at the Environment and Transport Select Committee.

(Q11) Mr Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Business Services for details of the cost and the return on investment for the installation of solar panels of the three existing schemes and whether there were any plans to expand this pilot to other Surrey buildings / sites. The Cabinet Member agreed to provide a response outside the meeting.

(Q12) Mr Forster asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding, who agreed, to attend a site visit with him so that he could see the issues for himself.

Mr Townsend asked for the latest update on Pebble Hill, in his division, which the Cabinet Member agreed to provide outside the meeting and he also said that all local committees would be provided with an updated and revised report on Operation Horizon.

(Q13) Mr Robert Evans made reference to the Drive Smart / Make Roads Safer web pages and asked about the effect that the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding road traffic offences would have on Surrey residents. The Leader of the Council referred him to his written reply.

(Q14) Mr Jenkins said that his question had been about the future fire and rescue cover for Spelthorne.

Mrs Saliagopoulos asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services if she agreed that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service's attendance at the incident on the Renshaw Industrial Estate was to be commended and that the reciprocal agreements had operated smoothly across boundaries.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services did not agree with Mr Jenkins suggestion. She did express her thanks and support to Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and other Fire and Rescue Services for the effective way that the fire had been dealt with and contained on the Renshaw Industrial Estate.

Cabinet Member Briefings on their portfolios are attached as Appendix C.

7 Members made the following comments:

- Adult Social Care: Realignment of Senior Roles to ensure maximum joined up working with the six Clinical Commissioning Groups had saved £0.5m per year in senior management costs.
- Schools and Learning: (1) School place planning – a request for the highways officers/ community transport team to meet with the Headteacher at the Greville School, Ashted to discuss mitigating measures for their school transport plan. (2) Surrey Educational Trust – further details on how to apply was requested, together with the total funding available in the next round (this information is available via a link on the Council's website).
- Highways, Transport and Flooding – (1) flood mitigation and confirmation that the number of sandbags held this year was similar to last year's numbers, (2) a specific road / junction in the Horsleys division and how it was categorised for priority flooding work, (3) a request to comment on the County's policy on roads that have been flooded and the effect on the planning applications for new developments being considered by Borough / District Planning committees.
- Environment and Planning – Eco park: clarification on why a further report to Cabinet was required in February 2015.

79/14 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There was one statement from Mr Sydney in relation to Young Epilepsy.

80/14 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]

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

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

'Council notes that:

1. the County Council has set as an objective that 99% of Surrey households will receive fibre based broadband by the end of 2014 and that 94% of households would achieve Superfast Broadband speeds of 15Mbps or more;
2. the Superfast Surrey Broadband Programme was established to ensure that these targets were met and to address the situation of residents in the County that were excluded from any fibre broadband coverage roll-out plans by commercial operators – with the result that more than 75,000 premises out of 84,000 premises in the Intervention Area are now able to access download speeds of at least 15mbps;

3. to be able to connect to fibre-based broadband, the distance from the fibre-enabled cabinet to the individual premises can be no more than 1.8km; a significant number of properties included in the commercial roll-out are further than 1.8km from the fibre-enabled cabinet that serves the area and as a result residents living in these areas are not being provided with a Superfast broadband service from the commercial operator;
4. areas that are currently part of the commercial roll-out of Superfast broadband that are not being served by the commercial operators cannot be included in the Intervention Area and become part of the Superfast Surrey Broadband Programme and thus are unable to receive a Superfast broadband service at all.

Council calls for the Leader of the Council to review the contracts with the commercial operators providing Superfast broadband to Surrey residents and to identify the emerging gaps in Superfast broadband coverage (such as areas in the commercial roll-out that are further than 1.8km from the fibre-enabled box that covers their area) and to develop solutions to ensure that either the commercial operators provide Superfast broadband to residents living in these areas or that the Surrey Superfast Broadband programme is extended to cover residents living in these areas.'

Mrs Watson made the following points in support of her motion:

- Superfast Broadband was essential in today's Digital Age but some households in parts of Surrey were unable to receive it.
- The County Council had set objectives for the percentage of households receiving the fibre based Broadband and these had not been achieved.
- The Intervention Area was supposed to fill the gap of the service provided by the commercial operator. However, there were still areas where the Superfast Broadband Service was not being provided.
- She requested that the Leader of the Council acted now to identify the emerging gaps and develop solutions so that the Broadband cover was extended to cover those households in the affected areas.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Orrick.

Mr Martin moved an amendment at the meeting, which was formally seconded by Mr Kemp. He proposed deleting the last paragraph of Mrs Watson's motion and replacing it with the following paragraph:

'Council congratulates the Superfast Surrey team on its significant and successful rollout to 77,000 premises so far, acknowledges that Surrey is now the best broadband connected county in the country and requests the team to complete the delivery of the contract, and by the end of March 2015, to identify options for using any remaining funds to either focus on the existing Intervention Area or to broaden the scope of the programme.'

Copies of the amendment were tabled at the meeting.

Speaking to his amendment, Mr Martin made the following points:

- That his amendment had replaced the last paragraph of the original motion.
- That the review of contracts was beyond the scope of the County Council.

- He explained the history of the Superfast Broadband programme from 2011 and the reasons why the County Council had embarked on its ambitious programme, which had resulted in the county being the best broadband connected county in the country.
- He stressed the importance of this achievement and the positive effectiveness that it was having on the provision of Digital Services and the benefits to Surrey residents.
- That the County Council had allocated £20m in 2012 for the Superfast Surrey Broadband Programme and cited the improvements made to cabling and telephone exchanges in Surrey in 2013.
- He acknowledged that there were a small number of difficult to reach households and premises and had requested that BT undertook a review of the remaining 5000 premises in the Intervention Area. However, there was a need to balance the outcome of this review against the remaining funds in the programme.
- Finally, he urged Members to support his amendment which recognised the achievements of the programme to date and proposed action to bring the best possible service to Surrey residents.

Speaking to the amendment, Members made the following points:

- The amendment gave the opportunity to celebrate the achievement of the Superfast Broadband programme.
- It had brought economic benefits to Surrey.
- That it had been accepted from the outset of the programme that some areas would be hard to reach and there was a need to balance this against the funding available for the programme.
- It was important to enable people to work at home, particularly in rural areas and the lack of access to Superfast Broadband had been a huge issue in some areas.
- The commitment to look at options for using the remaining funds was welcomed.
- The original motion had not stated the achievements to date, which the amendment did.
- This initiative had been very successful and was received positively in many areas.
- The County Council Network (CCN) had requested, on 3 September 2014, a detailed report of Superfast Broadband programmes in each county and would be debating this issue on 9 March 2015.
- Concern that this technology could be obsolete in a few years.
- The amendment had deleted the objectives set out in the final paragraph of the original motion and did not seek to find a solution.
- An open invite for Members to contact or visit the Superfast Surrey Broadband team.

The amendment was put to the vote with 54 Members voting for it and 11 Members voting against it. There was 1 abstention.

The amendment was carried and became the substantive motion. This was put to the vote and Members agreed it.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

‘Council notes that:

1. the County Council has set as an objective that 99% of Surrey households will receive fibre based broadband by the end of 2014 and that 94% of households would achieve Superfast Broadband speeds of 15Mbps or more;
2. the Superfast Surrey Broadband Programme was established to ensure that these targets were met and to address the situation of residents in the County that were excluded from any fibre broadband coverage roll-out plans by commercial operators – with the result that more than 75,000 premises out of 84,000 premises in the Intervention Area are now able to access download speeds of at least 15mbps;
3. to be able to connect to fibre-based broadband, the distance from the fibre-enabled cabinet to the individual premises can be no more than 1.8km; a significant number of properties included in the commercial roll-out are further than 1.8km from the fibre-enabled cabinet that serves the area and as a result residents living in these areas are not being provided with a Superfast broadband service from the commercial operator;
4. areas that are currently part of the commercial roll-out of Superfast broadband that are not being served by the commercial operators cannot be included in the Intervention Area and become part of the Superfast Surrey Broadband Programme and thus are unable to receive a Superfast broadband service at all.

Council congratulates the Superfast Surrey team on its significant and successful rollout to 77,000 premises so far, acknowledges that Surrey is now the best broadband connected county in the country and requests the team to complete the delivery of the contract, and by the end of March 2015, to identify options for using any remaining funds to either focus on the existing Intervention Area or to broaden the scope of the programme.

81/14 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]

The Leader presented the Report of the Cabinet meeting held on 21 October and 25 November 2014.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

There were none.

(2) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Surrey Educational Trust
- Creation of a Joint Trading Standards Service with Buckinghamshire County Council

- Endorsement of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Management Plan

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 21 October and 25 November 2014 be adopted.

82/14 RIGHTS OF WAY PRIORITY STATEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN [Item 11]

This report set out the revised Public Rights of Way Priority Statement and the Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Surrey.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning agreed to check whether the local committees had been consulted on the Plan and would advise Members.

RESOLVED:

1. That the revised Public Rights of Way Priority Statement 7th Edition dated October 2014, be approved.
2. That the revised Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Surrey 2014 be approved.

83/14 REPORT OF THE PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE [Item 12]

The Chairman of the Planning and Regulatory Committee introduced the report.

RESOLVED:

That the Scheme of Delegation be amended so that:

For applications, under section 19 and paragraphs 6 to 9 of Schedule 2 of the Commons Act 2006, where the County Council is the determining authority, if no significant objection has been received and the authority has no legal interest in the land, after consultation with the Chairman of the Planning & Regulatory Committee, the decision to determine an application be delegated to the Director of Legal and Democratic Services.

84/14 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET [Item 13]

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

[Meeting ended at: 12.25pm]

Chairman

Leader's Speech to County Council – Tuesday 9 December 2014

Chairman, by now, I hope that all Members will be familiar with this Council's Fairer Funding Campaign. It is something that I have spoken about at length in this chamber, discussed regularly with our Surrey MPs and raised persistently in meetings with Ministers.

(Even I'll admit it – I'm beginning to sound like a broken record!)

The message to Government has been simple.

Surrey has done more than our fair share to support the country's economic recovery. We have done everything we can to reduce our own costs but the growing demand on our services means that we are reaching crisis point. Without fairer funding we simply are not able to guarantee that the residents of Surrey will get the school places, the adult social care, the highways or the flood protection that they need and deserve.

I have been strongly supported in this campaign by my Cabinet team, Officers and many Members in this room. In fact, you could say, it's been a real One Team effort. Together we've put forward some really clear, evidence based arguments to Government and I'm delighted that last week's Autumn Statement revealed that the Government has listened - pledging investment in Surrey roads and flood defences.

Starting with roads –

Over many months we have worked to highlight how Surrey's highways are some of the most heavily used in the country. As a result, congestion is a serious issue – one that affects not only our residents but also the hundreds of thousands of commuters and businesses who travel through our county each day. We spoke out on this issue and Government listened – with the Chancellor announcing investment for a number of major road schemes in Surrey last week.

These included:

- Widening of the A3 through Guildford to the Hog's Back – with improvements to junction safety.
- Improvements to 10 of the 31 junctions on the M25 – including a major rebuilding of junction 10
- A study into long-term options for improving conditions on the South-west section of the M25.

Chairman, I know these investments will be welcomed by our residents for whom we all know roads are a key concern.

Moving on to flooding –

The River Thames between Datchet and Teddington is the largest area of developed floodplain without defences in England.

This means that flooding in this area can cause severe disruption, such as:

- Major disruption to our road network
- Affect key drinking water systems

- Threaten 20 electricity sub-stations
- And leave over 15,000 homes and businesses at risk.

This Council wants to do everything we can to protect Surrey residents. That is why we have been working with the Environment Agency and neighbouring Local Authorities on our flood defence plans – making a pledge to work together to deliver the Lower River Thames Flood Defence Scheme.

Together, we have lobbied Government heavily on this issue and they have listened – with the announcement last week of an additional £60m for the scheme. Of course, this still leaves local government needing to find around £40m, which is tough given the pressures we're facing on school places and elderly social care.

However, this announcement from Government is a step in the right direction and I want to put on record our thanks to Philip Hammond MP, the Cabinet Flooding lead for Surrey, for his assistance in this matter. I hope that this announcement will encourage all partners to continue to work together and be clear on just what resources we can each commit to this scheme.

However, when it comes to flooding, there is still more we need from Government in order to protect Surrey residents. For example, we are still awaiting announcement of funding for the other affected flood areas in Surrey, such as River Mole, and its effects on towns like Fetcham, Leatherhead, Godalming and Guildford and the River Bourne in the East of Surrey. I have also written to Ministers to oppose the proposed early closure of the Government's Flooding Repair and Renew Grant which, if it goes ahead, will have a negative impact on a number of Surrey residents.

However, my biggest disappointment is that Government does not seem to have listened carefully enough to our calls for fairer funding for school places. Since I spoke about this issue at our last Council meeting, we have co-operated with the Department for Education and clearly demonstrated our funding gap. It really is hard to ignore the evidence – 13,000 extra school places are needed over the next five years as a result of Surrey's highest ever birth rate – that is equivalent to 30 new primary schools.

We are faced with a stark reality – without a fairer funding settlement soon – we can no longer guarantee school places for every school child in Surrey. Today, I call for Government to show that they have listened to the clear case that we, and Surrey MPs, have made and to confirm the investment for school places in Surrey that are so desperately needed by children and families across our county.

Of course whatever funding announcements we receive, we know all too well that they will only provide a short-term fix to our demand-led challenges. Because as demand for our services continues to rise, we need to look for longer term solutions and I believe that we have those longer term solutions here in Surrey – what we need is the freedom and flexibilities from Government to put them in place.

You will already be aware that as the Chairman of the County Council's Network, I've been leading the call for greater devolution to county areas over the past year.

At our last County Council meeting I presented you with our 'Plan for Government' – 'One Place: One Budget' which I believe will ensure better services for residents at a lower cost. However, the Scottish Referendum has really brought this issue of devolution to the fore. Opportunities for real change are in our grasp, as proved by the recent Devo Max Deal in Manchester.

The Chancellor said in his Autumn Statement that his 'Door was open to other Cities who wanted to follow in Manchester's lead.' But what about the 23 million people who live in Counties? I believe the door should be left open for EVERYONE. I strongly believe that the case for greater local devolution is as strong here in Surrey as it is in the big cities. After all, Surrey has a bigger economy than Birmingham and Liverpool combined – indeed, it also has a bigger economy than Leeds and Sheffield combined!

So my challenge to Government is this:

- If devolution makes sense for the people of Bolton – why not Guildford?
- If devolution makes sense for the people of Wigan – why not Woking?
- If devolution makes sense for the people of Leeds – why not Reigate and Banstead?

Chairman, in my mind it is simple - if devolution makes sense for Manchester, it also makes sense for Surrey! The UK's economic recovery needs a successful Surrey economy. We are the fastest growing part of the UK economy and we already contribute £6bn, in income tax to the Exchequer every year – second only to London. Think how much more we could do if we were able to invest money where it's really needed and find local solutions to local problems.

In business, you always 'back your winners', by investing in your most successful product line or branch, and the profits support the business to grow – that is real business sense.

That real business sense should also apply to both central and local government as well as other public sector organisations.

Chairman, Government needs to invest in Surrey and support it to grow! This will then allow us to provide even more money for the exchequer and for the benefit of UK PLC. I firmly believe that the doors to No 10 and No 11 should be left open to everyone who is ready for devolution.

But in the meantime we will continue to invest sensibly so that we continue to support the people who need our services the most, as we have done throughout my Leadership, in important areas such as Adult Social Care, Children's and Youth Services, improving school standards and apprenticeships.

We are of course, still in the process of agreeing the five year Medium Term Financial Plan that begins in 2015, which I will present to Council at our budget meeting on 10 February 2015.

However, I would like to take the opportunity today to announce an investment in a key area. Two years ago we established a reserve fund that could be used if we continued to see the growth in demand for services for vulnerable children and young people. That demand has continued to grow particularly for Children in Need – the group whose needs fall below the threshold for child protection. Today I am announcing an additional £1million investment for each of the next two years to increase the support to these children in need.

From the outset of my leadership I have always been clear that vulnerable young people are a key priority for us and despite the huge pressures on us, I am adamant that we should always prioritise work to ensure children are safe as possible. That is why I want to make this investment now and I hope all Members will support this important investment decision.

Mr Chairman, let me end by saying that we have had a tough but rewarding year. We all know that the years ahead will present us with further challenges and difficult decisions. At the centre of everything we do for our residents; is our dedicated and loyal officer team and all of you; Surrey's front line Councillors. I would like to thank all of our staff and you, the Members for your hard work and commitment you have provided to our Surrey communities during 2014. May I wish everyone a very Merry Christmas and a very happy, healthy and peaceful New Year.

Thank you.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
9 December 2014

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 9 DECEMBER 2014

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

CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

**(1) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO
ASK:**

Since the route of the 441 bus was changed earlier this year, such that it no longer goes through Stanwell Moor village, passengers have to cross a busy dual carriageway to reach the bus stop.

If or when someone is injured or possibly killed negotiating this traffic, whose responsibility will it be?

Reply:

The removal of bus service 441 from Stanwell Moor village was a commercial decision taken by the bus operator Abellio. As the service is not operated under contract to the County Council, this is their prerogative within national legislation, as well as the timing and nature of the advance notification they provide to their customers. It is estimated that the County Council would have to pay Abellio over £100,000 per year for an extra bus to be put back onto the 441 service, to allow a reliable schedule with a detour to the village, or to fund an additional bespoke replacement beyond what has already been introduced. In the current financial climate and with the on-going Local Transport Review underway, we sadly do not have this funding available.

It was recognised that the 557 service was not a like for like replacement for the 441 in terms of accessing Staines, but the changes to 557 were made in April without additional cost to the public purse, and this allowed the retention of a link from Stanwell Moor village itself to a Heathrow Airport access point - in this case Terminal 5.

An initial assessment has been undertaken of the best way to cater for pedestrians crossing the A3044 dual carriageway to access bus services on the east side of the A3044 Stanwell Moor Road. The preferred solution would involve providing a new bus stop on the eastbound side of the B378 Park Road. The new bus stop would be located a short distance from the traffic signal junction of the A3044 Stanwell Moor Road with the B378 Park Road. The traffic signal junction would be redesigned to incorporate "Toucan" pedestrian and cyclist signalised crossing facilities. Further work and cost estimates will be developed in due course for presentation to the Spelthorne

Local Committee, though it is expected that this would cost well over £100,000. It will be then for the Spelthorne Local Committee to decide whether to invest part of their budget allocated to them for highway improvements on this scheme as opposed to other potential highway improvement schemes across the Spelthorne area. This will include an assessment of passenger demand for the new bus stop and an assessment of the wider benefits to the community of improving crossing facilities at this junction.

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

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

- (a) Does Surrey County Council now accept responsibility for the Thames Water Aqueduct in Staines as a flood risk feature under the Flood Water Management Act (FWMA) 2010?
- (b) Does this Council accept that the residents of Staines deserve to be protected from the risk of the Thames Water Aqueduct and that physical measures are needed to prevent water flooding out of it?
- (c) Will this Council now make plans under section 3 of the FWMA 2010 to require physical barriers to be built to protect the residents of Staines, such as raising the height of the aqueducts levy banks, permanently fixing the sluice gate and raising the height at which it can operate?
- (d) Can Surrey County Council explain why exactly ten months after the totally preventable extensive and destructive flooding of the River Ash into Staines, it has failed to meet its obligations under the FWMA 2010 despite being the lead flood agency?

Reply:

- (a) Under section 21 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 the County has a duty to set up and maintain an asset register for any feature that may have an impact on flooding.

All Risk Management Authorities have been invited to nominate any feature which in their view should be added to the list. We are reliant on Risk Management Authorities (RMAs), which include Thames Water, to bring such structures forward. The aqueduct will only be placed on the asset register if it is so nominated.

- (b) The Council supports any flood alleviation measures and looks to those with duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 to carry out those duties
- (c) The County has no power to require these actions and has no plans to do so. The Environment Agency is doing modelling work here and

further discussions will take place once that is done with Thames Water to decide on options.

- (d) The County does not agree that it has failed to meet obligations under the Act. It has set up an Asset Register and is undertaking a Section 19 investigation which will be published on our website in due course.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(3) MR DENIS FULLER (CAMBERLEY WEST) TO ASK:

The recent Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) 'Local Environment Quality Survey of England' reported that poor levels of cleanliness are associated with increases in other low-level crime and social disorder. This comes as no surprise to me, as one who has for many years suggested that if a litterer is not taught to respect his fellow citizens and can carry on littering without fear of prosecution or punishment, he or she will show disrespect in other ways. Commenting on the survey, Keep Britain Tidy Chief Executive, Phil Barton said that this should act as a wake-up call.

Earlier this year David Hodge, Leader of the Council introduced Surrey County Council's (SCC) anti-litter campaign. I regularly read of litterers being penalised in Hampshire, Essex, Lancashire, etc.

Should SCC use its' influence to encourage all of our Districts and Boroughs to introduce a policy of catching and penalising people who drop litter, cigarette ends or chewing gum? Further should they enforce the policy so efficiently that litterers will expect to be caught sooner or later?

Reply:

The Leader, alongside the Leaders of the District and Boroughs committed to working together to focus upon the issue of littering within our communities.

A residents survey in early 2014 indicated specific concerns over the levels of litter, particularly around fast food outlets and along roadsides and footpaths. Discarded bottles and cans, takeaway packing, cigarette butts and dog fouling were identified as the main annoyances. Following on from this, a communications campaign was run through April and into early May focussing on raising the awareness of the consequences and possible fines for littering.

The issue of enforcement is the subject of ongoing discussions with District and Borough officers. Surrey County Council coordinated training for enforcement and street scene officers that has been well received.

The Police and Crime Commissioner is supporting two enforcement pilot projects running in Reigate and Banstead and Spelthorne and Mrs Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate Member for Fire and Police Services, chairs

the Governance Board. The aim of these pilots is to strengthen enforcement capacity in localities, working in close conjunction with the Police.

Surrey County Council is also supporting a joint pilot initiative between Woking Borough Council and Public Health that targets cigarette butt littering. The initiative aims to reduce cigarette butt litter through targeted enforcement. During this enforcement period those who have been fined will be able to get a refund in Boots vouchers if they quit smoking, they are also offered support from the Public Health team to help them stop. If a success, this will be rolled out further.

Whilst enforcement is part of the solution to littering, education also plays a key role and Surrey County Council are supporting schools to achieve Eco-School status, which includes activities to reduce litter and raise understanding. Southern Railway have been supporting the campaign with an anti litter poster competition for young children. Judging will take place the week commencing 15 December 2014 and the winning designs will be displayed at Southern Railway stations in the New Year.

Surrey County Council have also worked with Districts and Boroughs to involve Parish Councils and Community groups in keeping Surrey Tidy by offering support and tools to allow local people to carry out litter picks in their own areas, which in turn spreads the message on littering. For example in Mole Valley, Parish Councils have been displaying anti litter campaign material and regularly use the District's depot to borrow litter picking equipment when organising local litter picks.

I hope this indicates the ways in which Surrey County Council are already working with our Districts and Boroughs to influence behaviour in our County to Keep Surrey Tidy.

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

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

In December 2013, I asked the following of the Cabinet Member:

'Has the County Council carried out a condition survey of its pavements and footways, and if so what percentage of Surrey's pavements were assessed as being in a poor condition? What percentage of Surrey's pavements and footways assessed as poor were resurfaced or repaved since 31 March 2013 to date?'

The Cabinet Member provided the following response:

'The County Council is currently progressing the fourth and final year of its initial Footway Network Survey (FNS) with 78% of the network finished. The remainder should be substantially complete by June next year.'

The FNS records each footway section in one of the following four categories; as new; aesthetically impaired; functionally impaired or structurally impaired. Functional and structural impairment are considered for maintenance and can therefore be considered in poor condition. Current information indicates that approximately 23% of the footway network is in this category.

The countywide footway programme for 2013/14 includes 3.4 kms of reconstruction and 21.5 kms of slurry seal. Reconstruction treatment is generally used where the footway condition is very poor and slurry may be used elsewhere to enhance an otherwise sound construction and prevent further deterioration. Current analysis indicates approximately 44% of the reconstruction programme addressed footways in a poor condition.'

Please could the Cabinet Member provide an update, in particular:

- Has the Footway Network Survey been completed?
- What percentage of footways are in each of the four categories referred to above?
- What percentage of those falling into the categories functionally or structurally impaired are being reconstructed in the 2014/15 programme?

Reply:

The Footway Network Survey (FNS) was completed on schedule this summer and included in the survey were all town paths that are maintained by the County.

The survey identified that Surrey is responsible for 4933kms of footways. The percentage of footways falling into each of the 4FNS categories are:

Category	% of network in each category
As New	1%
Aesthetically Impaired	66%
Functionally Impaired	27%
Structural Impaired	6%

The countywide capital footway programme for 2014/15 includes for 10.4km of functionally or structurally impaired footways to be reconstructed. This equates to 0.6% of the all of the footways that fall into the functionally or structurally impaired categories.

The Highways and Transport Service is currently developing a 15 year Asset Management Strategy which will inform 5 year plans for programmes of work. As part of this project, detailed analysis of the FNS data has taken place which has enabled us to develop a number of different models showing different outcomes for the condition of the footway asset over a 15 year

period dependant on differing budget allocations. We will be consulting on the models over the next couple of months and, following refinement of the models based on consultation feedback, we aim to make recommendations to Cabinet in the Spring regarding how maintenance of each of the 6 key highway assets (roads, footways, drainage, safety barriers, structures and traffic signals) should be managed for the next 15 years to provide the required outcomes.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

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

The report to the Cabinet which initiated the consultation on the future of Surrey's Care Homes contained inadequate data on the financial effects of the proposal. To assess the financial implications for Surrey County Council and others of the proposal will require that estimates are made of:

- the costs of providing for the existing elsewhere for the existing residents.
- the capital cost of improving or rebuilding each facility
- the potential receipts from the sale of the sites if the sites are sold.

Please could this information be provided and also placed immediately on Surrey County Council's website on the consultation page on the future of the six residential care homes owned and operated by the council so that Surrey residents may be better informed?

Reply:

The Council has per week fee guidance rates for general Older People residential care (£326.45) and residential dementia care (£374.31).

These costs are outlined below and were estimated by Holbrow Brookes construction consultants in January 2012, who have specialist expertise in residential health and social care. It must be recognised that these costs were estimated and do not take into account any increases in costs since that date. The table below therefore shows both the original costs estimated by Holbrow Brookes and an allowance to account for changes to costs since the analysis was completed.

PREMISES	Option 3A - Retain, refurbish, enhance, extend		Option 4 - New Build	
	As estimated by Holbrow Brookes in Jan 2012	Allowance for changes in costs	As estimated by Holbrow Brookes in Jan 2012	Allowance for changes in costs
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Brockhurst	5.2	6.2	8.6	10.3
Cobgates	6.2	7.4	8.3	10.0
Dormers	3.7	4.4	7.9	9.5
Longfield	5.7	6.8	6.8	8.2

Parkhall	4.4	5.3	8.3	10.0
Pinehurst	3.9	4.7	8.5	10.2
TOTAL	29.1	34.9	48.4	58.1

The refurbishment and extension costs illustrated above (option 3A) are the minimum required to bring the homes up to a suitable standard. Only full rebuilding of the homes (option 4) would enable the level of quality of service that the Council would want to provide.

Neither option represents value for money in the context of the borrowing costs the Council would have to incur and the fact that alternative provision can be commissioned at better value in the independent sector.

It should also be noted that option 3A above would involve moving current residents from the current homes whilst the refurbishment is undertaken, which will take over one year and then relocating them back to the current homes. In view of the age profile of the residents this option was deemed unsatisfactory

Once the results of the consultation process are considered and the alternatives for the sites are explored, a decision will be made on their future.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

There has been no report to Cabinet since before the last budget setting meeting in February 2014 of the levels of reserves and balances. What are the levels of all individual reserves (revenue and capital) and cash balances as shown on the most recent quarterly balance sheets?

Reply:

The budget monitoring reports to Cabinet for the three months to June 2014 and the six months to September 2014 included clear statements about reserves and balances. I have examples from the more recent report. However both reports covered the same ground.

- Under the heading:

Maintain a prudent level of general balances and apply reserves appropriately

Page 2 of Annex 1 states ‘...The council currently has £21m in general balances.’

(The report to June 2014 said the same)

- Under the heading: **Reserves**

Paragraph 60 of Annex 1 sets out the change in earmarked reserves in the quarter, drawn down as planned in the MTFP.
(paragraph 49 of report to June 2014 covered the same issue)

- Under the heading: **Earmarked reserves**

Table App 5 gives details of the council's earmarked revenue reserves as at 30 September 2014.
(Table App 5 also gave details of the same as at 30 June 2014).

Background information

Cabinet discussed the budget monitoring report for the six months to 30 September 2014 on 20 October 2014.

On page 2 of Annex 1, the last sentence in the paragraph under the heading:

Maintain a prudent level of general balances and apply reserves appropriately states

'...The council currently has £21m in general balances.'

Paragraph 60 of Annex 1 under the heading **Reserves** states:

'60. The council's earmarked reserves reduced by £26m in the quarter to 30 September 2014. This was mainly due to drawing down reserves as planned in the MTFP and outlined in paragraph 1. Table App 5 shows details of the council's earmarked reserves as at 30 September 2014.'

Paragraph 1 of Annex 1 (page outlines the planned draw down of reserves as follows.

'1. In line with the council's multi year approach to financial management, which aims to smooth resource fluctuations over five years, Cabinet approved the use of £20.1m from the Budget Equalisation Reserve (including £13m contribution from 2013/14's unused risk contingency) plus £5.8m from other reserves to support 2014/15, £14m to support the Adult Social Care budget in 2014/15 and £5.5m revenue carried forward from 2013/14 to fund committed expenditure.'

In the appendix to the annex, under the heading: **Earmarked Reserves**, Table App 5 shows details of the council's earmarked revenue reserves as at 30 September 2014 as follows.

Table App 5: Earmarked revenue reserves

	Opening balance 1 Apr 2014 £m	Balance at 30 Sep 2014 £m	Forecast 31 Mar 2015 £m
Investment Renewals Reserve	13.0	12.7	10.9
Equipment Replacement Reserve	3.4	1.4	1.7
Vehicle Replacement Reserve	5.4	6.0	2.9
Waste Site Contingency Reserve	0.3	0.0	0.0
Budget Equalisation Reserve	33.6	0.8	0.8
Financial Investment Reserve	1.6	0.6	0.6
Street lighting PFI Reserve	6.2	5.8	5.8
Insurance Reserve	8.8	9.6	9.6
Eco Park Sinking Fund	14.6	14.6	18.9
Revolving Infrastructure & Investment Fund	20.2	20.2	20.8
Child Protection Reserve	3.1	1.9	1.9
Interest Rate Reserve	4.7	1.0	1.0
Economic Downturn Reserve	6.0	4.2	4.2
General Capital Reserve	7.7	7.5	6.7
Pension Stabilisation Reserve	0.0	1.1	1.1
Business Rates Appeals Reserve	0.0	1.3	1.3
Total earmarked revenue reserves	128.6	88.7	85.8

Note: All numbers have been rounded - which might cause a casting error

Cabinet discussed the budget monitoring report for the three months to 30 June 2014 on 22 July 2014.

On page 2 of Annex 1, the last sentence in the paragraph under the heading:

Maintain a prudent level of general balances and apply reserves appropriately states

'...The council currently has £21m in general balances.'

Paragraph 49 of Annex 1 under the heading: **Reserves** states

'49. The council's earmarked reserves have reduced in the quarter to 30 June 2014. This was mainly due to drawing down reserves as planned in the MTFP. Table App 5 shows details of the council's earmarked reserves as at 30 June 2013.'

(the draw down was to provide £14m used to support ASC during 2014/15)

In the appendix to the annex, under the heading: **Earmarked Reserves**, Table App 5 shows details of the council's earmarked revenue reserves as at 30 June 2014 as follows.

	Opening balance 1 Apr 2014 £m	Balance at 30 Jun 2014 £m	Forecast 31 Mar 2015 £m
Investment Renewals Reserve	13.0	12.8	10.7
Equipment Replacement Reserve	3.4	3.8	3.6
Vehicle Replacement Reserve	5.4	6.1	3.0
Waste Site Contingency Reserve	0.3	0.3	0.0
Budget Equalisation Reserve	33.6	20.9	0.9
Financial Investment Reserve	1.6	0.6	0.6
Street lighting PFI Reserve	6.2	5.8	5.8
Insurance Reserve	8.8	8.8	8.8
Eco Park Sinking Fund	14.6	14.6	14.6
Revolving Infrastructure & Investment Fund	20.2	20.2	20.8
Child Protection Reserve	3.1	1.9	0.4
Interest Rate Reserve	4.7	4.7	1.0
Economic Downturn Reserve	6.0	4.2	1.7
General Capital Reserve	7.7	7.7	6.7
Pension Stabilisation Reserve	0.0	1.1	1.1
Rates Appeals Reserve	0.0	1.3	1.3
Total earmarked revenue reserves	128.6	114.8	81.0

The list of earmarked revenue reserves shown above are those the council has earmarked for specific purposes.

The council holds other usable revenue and capital reserves as follows:

- schools' balances (£26m brought forward at 1 April 2014);
- revenue grants unapplied reserve (£46m brought forward at 1 April 2014);
- general fund balance (discussed above) (£21m brought forward at 1 April 2014);
- capital receipts reserve (£20m brought forward at 1 April 2014); and
- capital grants and contributions unapplied (£37m brought forward at 1 April 2014).

The quarterly budget monitoring report does not cover these as they are either:

- outside our discretion to decide or vary spending (schools' balances and revenue grants);
- restricted to capital spending; or
- maintained as a safety net (general fund balances).

CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

The Coalition Government has committed £100 million of funding during this 'Road Period' to an Air Quality Fund. The Government has stated it wants

interactions with local authorities to help shape how this fund is used.

Please will the Cabinet Member agree to bid for funding from the Air Quality Fund in order to combat poor air quality in Surrey?

Reply:

As part of the Road investment strategy produced by the Department for Transport and Highways Agency, published 1 December 2014, £100 million of funding is committed specifically to target improvements in air quality. Interaction with local authorities will help shape how this fund is used and inform how this difficult but vitally important issue is addressed. It is expected that this fund could tackle a number of locations and the Government is already in the early stages of pioneering this approach in Manchester, working with the local transport authority.

Surrey County Council intend to contact the Department for Transport to learn what opportunities there are for Surrey to bid for funding within this new national allocation to improve the air quality within the County. It is worth noting however that in a two tier local authority areas such as Surrey, it is the borough and district councils who monitor air quality in their areas, declare Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and prepare the action plans.

It is likely that funding from this source will focus on primarily on motorways and trunk roads where air quality is an issue rather than on local roads.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Why has Surrey County Council not started a policy review on the cumulative impact of mineral extraction in Spelthorne?

When are they going to start such a review?

Reply:

A review of minerals policy relating to the cumulative impact of extraction is not required for the following reasons:

- The issue of cumulative impact needs to be seen in the context of the historic production of sand and gravel in North West Surrey. The trend over time has been declining production over many decades from a high of over 3 million tonnes per year in the late 1970s to only some 10% of this figure in recent years.
- Successive plans have taken into account the question of cumulative impact as well as the acceptability of working individual sites. The North West Surrey Minerals Local Plan 1985 looked at all potential working sites

and catalogued them according to constraints with a designation in favour or against working. Those designations have remained largely unchanged and we have seen the less constrained sites worked and progressively restored.

- We have a recently adopted Minerals Plan 2011. A thorough assessment of potential sites in the plan included looking at cumulative impact - an issue debated at the Public Examination in 2011. Hence one of the reasons why some allocated sites in the SMP are phased.
- Our adopted Minerals Plan policy requires that the cumulative impacts of minerals development are taken into account before planning permission is granted. This is often the best time to look at the cumulative impact of minerals extraction as only then can other development taking place in the vicinity be taken into account in the determination process.

To conclude – no policy review is considered necessary because cumulative impact is already appropriately addressed in the recently adopted Minerals Plan 2011. This is the County Council’s adopted policy position. Cumulative impact is also considered each time individual planning applications for mineral extraction are determined.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

(9) MRS HELENA WINDSOR (GODSTONE DIVISION) TO ASK:

The stated aim of both health and social care is to allow people to remain as independent as possible in their own homes with the support of family, friends and local community services. Adequate respite care is an essential requirement to enable family members, or friends to continue providing care, without adversely affecting their own health and wellbeing.

There is an urgent need to reduce the demand on acute care beds in our hospitals and prevent “bed blocking” where patients are unable to leave hospital as their recuperative needs cannot be met in their homes or the community.

The six residential care homes run by Surrey County Council (SCC) currently under review have provision for both respite care and re-enabling, services which are likely to be in increased demand in the foreseeable future.

Could the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care please advise us of the plans for the future provision of the following services:

- What provision for cost effective respite care, to compensate for the loss of these beds, will be made if a decision is made to close all, or any of the six homes?
- What provision for convalescent care, or re-enabling, will be made to compensate for the loss of the facilities currently available if all or any of the six homes are closed?

Reply:

Should a decision be taken to proceed with the closure of one or all the six SCC older peoples' homes:

- We will work with all residents individually to secure suitable alternative respite services that best meet their needs and choices. Active engagement with the wider market around alternative services would commence should such a decision to close a SCC home result. Implementation of closure would be phased to enable alternative arrangements to be put in place prior to closure. No resident will be moved until the spring of 2015.
- For bed based re-ablement alternatives, work continues with Clinical Commissioning Groups to develop integrated models of reablement and rehabilitation, reducing the need for bed based options. We will commission services, as required, that can deliver the appropriate access to suitable multiagency rehabilitation/ reablement. We have already been approached by providers who could offer this option across Surrey.

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

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

Kwasi Kwartang, MP called for an enquiry into the terrible flooding from the Thames Water Aqueduct that occurred in Staines on the 8, 9 and 10 February 2014 in an adjournment debate on 12 May 2014, but has since failed to effectively pursue the matter.

Surrey County Council, the supposed lead flood authority have the statutory authority to conduct an enquiry under section 19 of the Flood Water Management Act (FWMA) 2010.

What progress, if any has been made with that enquiry?

If no progress has in fact been made, then why has Surrey County Council failed to conduct an enquiry that could result in measures preventing similar, calamitous events, occurring in the future?

Reply:

The Section 19 duty is to investigate. Surrey County Council in collaboration with Spelthorne Borough Council is undertaking a Section 19 investigation in accordance with the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. A Section 19

investigation will look into who the Risk Management Authorities are in relation to the flooding, what duties they have under the FWMA and their actions or proposed actions in relation to those duties. We will have an update at the next Working Group meeting on 8 December 2014. If it is ready, it will be circulated to the Partnership Board before being published on our website.

CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES

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

How many buildings, excluding schools, does Surrey County Council (SCC) currently occupy and, of those buildings how many have solar panels installed?

Reply:

There are currently around 160 sites across the County from which five or more SCC staff members are predominantly working. This includes hospital sites such as Epsom or St Peters Hospital, District & Borough buildings and other sites for which we are minor occupiers, tenants or have hot-desking arrangements.

Over 40% of SCC (non-school) staff work out of four corporate buildings: Consort House, Redhill, County Hall, Kingston Upon Thames, Quadrant Court, Woking and Fairmount House, Leatherhead.

There are two Surrey owned buildings and one Surrey owned site with solar panels installed. These include a Community Home, a Corporate office building in Redhill and a Waste Recycling Centre. All three installations are Photovoltaics (PVs) which generate electricity.

CABINET MEMBER FOR CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

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

My division is struggling with the effects of a 6 month closure of Vicarage Road, a key B-road in Kingfield. Officers of the County Council have said that this road closure has been difficult to manage as some motorists are regularly ignoring the road closure signs.

Would the Cabinet Member agree with me that motorists should always follow the road closure signs?

Reply:

We all recognise that temporary road works can be frustrating and impact journey times, however they are necessary to enable essential work to infrastructure.

In this particular case, Thames Water are installing a wider water main in Vicarage Road. As this involves excavation of nearly the width of the road it has had to be closed. This work is necessary to reduce pressure in the pipe, which is causing it to leak, and also to increase capacity (there is a new housing development nearby). The closure of Rosebery Crescent and Loop Road (at their respective junctions with Vicarage Road) has also been necessary in order to control the flow of traffic.

It can be challenging managing traffic when a key road is closed for this length of time. Thames Water have installed hard road closures, and also have security at the site 24 hours a day. We are not aware of any specific problems with drivers not complying with the signs at the site.

To assist residents, there are three signs indicating 'road closed, access only' at the junction of Westfield Road, as well as an informative sign to indicate that the local shops are open.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

**(13) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:
(2nd question)**

In the light of his most recent conviction for a further two road traffic offences, does the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding still retain the full confidence of the Leader and the whole Cabinet ?

Reply:

Yes.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

**(14) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST)
TO ASK:
(3RD question)**

On Monday morning 1 December, twenty fire crews and engines, 100 firefighters in total from across Surrey and London and as far away as West Sussex battled furiously to control a fire on the Renshaw industrial estate in Staines to save the lives and property of the local residents.

This incident clearly demonstrates the need to retain the current crew capacity in Spelthorne, in particular - a borough with specific and greater risks.

The Option 5 model adopted by this Council is deeply unpopular with local residents for obvious reasons and only slightly less unpopular than the Council's preferred option 4.

Option 5 is now proving near impossible to implement, as the Council was warned. The response time of the 'On Call' crew has had to be extended from the normal 4 minutes to 13 minutes in order to even find 18 applicants capable of fitting the totally unrealistic criteria; and the likelihood is that the response time will have to be extended again. The operational start date has already been moved back from April 2016 to September 2016.

This is a deeply flawed, shambolic policy and the people of Spelthorne need and deserve what they have always asked for: two fire engines with two whole time, fully trained permanent crews, before the unthinkable happens and in an incident like the one on Monday and someone dies, because when you cut vital emergency services to save a bit of cash, that is the reality you are talking about.

Will the Council finally concede that what Spelthorne needs is two fire engines with two fully trained permanent whole time crews?

Reply:

It is important to understand that the emergency response cover provided by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service is not based on borough or county boundaries.

This means that whilst there are proposed changes to how the fire cover is provided from the stations that are located in the Borough of Spelthorne, the cover for the area will continue to be provided from where ever is most appropriate, regardless of the borough boundary.

This was the case at the incident at Renshaw Industrial Estate, the initial attendance of two pumps were sent from Staines Fire Station and Egham Fire Station.

It should also be noted that the resources required to resolve an incident of this scale will always need to be drawn from a wide area. In the case of this incident, crews attended from across Surrey and surrounding services including London, Royal Berkshire and West Sussex.

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING – 9 DECEMBER 2014

MEMBERS QUESTION TIME

CABINET MEMBER UPDATES

NAME: MARY ANGELL

PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

All Members will have recently received a detailed information pack outlining the key work undertaken in Children's Services. At the request of several Members, I will concentrate on the specific area of Early Help as the Early Help Governance Group met for the first time on 17 November 2014.

Early Help

The Surrey Children and Young People's Partnership Plan sets out the strategic direction and goals of all partners, covering all services for children and young people. The Partnership Plan, which sets out the priorities for the next three years, has also been agreed by the Health and Wellbeing Board. The five key areas identified are:

- Early Help, which includes healthy behaviours
- Complex Needs, including paediatric therapies
- Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health
- Safeguarding
- Shared understanding of need

Our early help work has been shaped by three key national drivers:-

- The Munro Review of Child Protection
- The Report Early Intervention: Next Steps by Graham Allen
- Working Together to Safeguard Children 2013 - which is the guide to the legislative requirements and expectations of inter-agency working to ensure that all children are safeguarded.

The above guidance calls for greater local authority ownership of how needs are identified and how the assessment process is conducted. Munro also argues that where children and young people's needs do not meet social care thresholds, then practitioners must be able to identify need, and work with other partners who can provide appropriate support.

In response to this guidance Surrey County Council has collaborated with its partners to develop the Early Help Strategy 2013-2017. The strategy has been developed over the last 12 months by and with partners through working groups, workshops, conferences and training events during 2013. All the work has passed through the governance boards of all partners involved, and has been agreed as a working model. This has necessitated changes to Surrey's Social Care Model.

Children's Services revised its Area-Based Social Care Model in order that it could:

- Discharge its duties under the Children and Families Act 2014
- Respond to the new timescales set out in the Family Justice Review recommendations
- Implement the key recommendations of 'Working Together 2013'
- Support and promote the Early Help Strategy
- Support and promote partnership working.

Four area-based Referral Assessment and Intervention Services (RAIS) have been created.

The Referral Hub has replaced the contact centre and acts as the 'front door' into each area.

If a detailed Child and Family Assessment is required then this is undertaken by a social worker in the assessment and intervention hub. If the threshold for a Child and Family Assessment is not met, then Children's Services and the Early help Partnership Services will support partners with the early help approach. So if early help is deemed the appropriate way forward, then a holistic early help assessment is undertaken with the whole family, a family action plan is written, and a lead professional is identified as part of the team around the family.

Following the implementation of the RAIS, a Multi-agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) was developed in which five agencies are co-located in Guilford Police Station. The MASH ensures a whole system approach to safeguarding whereby information is shared, risk is understood and decision making is quicker and more effective. If early help services are needed, the MASH assigns the contact to the relevant RAIS referral hub for follow up.

I know that some Local Committees have invited their Area Heads of Children's Services to their meetings to gain a greater understanding of the changes. These have been a success and enjoyed by Members and staff alike.

NAME: HELYN CLACK

PORTFOLIO: COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CABINET LEAD FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Website Award

Surrey County Council's website has been named the best in local government across the UK by the Society of Information Technology Management. This is the most prestigious web award there is to win and we were compared against 433 other local authorities. Surrey was particularly praised for embracing the growing public demand to access information on mobile devices. Having a good website helps to provide value for money to Surrey taxpayers and as the site handles a large volume of transactions annually this helps to save hundreds of thousands of pounds each year. Designing and implementing our new website has been a huge team effort and has included staff from Web authors, IMT, Communications and Customer Services Web and Digital Team.

While winning this award is a fantastic achievement, our aim is to make further improvements so residents continue to get the support and advice they need.

Trading Standards

I am pleased to advise the Council that the plans recently agreed by Surrey and Buckinghamshire to create a new joint Trading Standards Service are progressing well. I was delighted to attend a joint staff meeting with the teams from both counties on 21 November, and to see first-hand the progress to date. The various elements, including finance, legal, HR and IT are all on track to enable the new service to be operational from 1 April 2015. The new management team is already operating jointly and working very well together. The new service is an exciting step forward for both local authorities and will enable the service to provide an even better protection for residents, remain locally focused and give enhanced support for local businesses and all at a reduced cost for local taxpayers. It is a great example of innovation in action.

Surrey's Library Direct Team

Surrey's Library Direct Team along with four of our longest serving volunteers, have won the Living and Ageing Well award 2014 for the Help at Home Category. This award is to recognise individuals / projects / initiatives that help people to live the life they want at home, with the help they need, so they can remain as independent as possible. The team worked incredibly hard and have been recognised for developing the service, producing fantastic work and bringing huge benefit to service users.

NAME: MEL FEW

PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

Older people residential care homes consultation

In line with the Cabinet paper, a consultation process is currently underway to decide on the future of the remaining six Surrey County Council older people residential care homes.

The homes in question are:

- Brockhurst – Ottershaw
- Dormers- Tandridge
- Pinehurst- Camberley
- Cobgates – Farnham
- Park Hall - Reigate
- Longfield –Cranleigh

Three options were outlined in the consultation paper, the results of which are expected by December with a paper being presented to the Cabinet for decision at the February 2015 meeting.

Charging policy consultation

In light of the Care Act 2014 which comes into effect from April 2015, it is necessary for the charging policies currently in force to be updated to reflect the changes laid out in the act. The consultation will be available until December 2014 with the recommendations arising being presented to Cabinet for decision at the February 2015 meeting.

Realignment of senior roles

The 'Better Care Fund' has £25m allocated to Surrey for the year 2015/16. To achieve payout under this fund, Surrey Adults services need to work closer to achieve savings by reducing admissions to the Acute Hospitals. To achieve this objective it was felt the right time to realign our organisation to ensure maximum joined up working with the six CCGs in Surrey. It is too early to gauge the outcomes of this change which could result in some form of pooled budgets going forward.

NAME: JOHN FUREY

PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

Thames Regional Flooding and Coastal Committee

From September I have been attending this committee (TRFCC), in preparation for the funding programme allocations for the region.

The programme is for six years, and indicative sums are £283.8m through the gift in-aid (GIA) and £63m from the levy. The GIA is government allocated, and the levy is contributions from all Local Authorities throughout this local region.

Subject to agreement our contribution over the six years will be £5.9m, which will produce £72.7m for the work programme. Eighteen borough schemes have been tabled at a value of £1.69m, and over the six year programme £370m is allocated to capital works. This includes design and preparation work for the Lower Thames scheme.

The indicative programme is now confirmed and local details will be communicated as soon as possible.

Further to the Chancellor's Autumn Statement on 3 December, the Government have now indicated a further £60m to the Lower Thames scheme. The gap now remains at £40m, which following the Leader of the Council's intervention with the Local Authorities concerned is achievable.

This will also be taken to the EM3 LEP and Thames Water in order to assist in funding this gap.

Kier / SCC Winter Resilience

- Winter Maintenance (Gritting and Snow Clearance)

A team of winter gritter drivers have been fully trained and are ready to be deployed to the 36 gritting routes across the County. Additional resilience measures are in place for snow clearance with the wider Kier supply chain committed to assisting in snow conditions. During October dry runs were undertaken in order to acclimatise all of the drivers to their relevant routes. To date the fleet were successfully deployed three times in November.

- Flood Mitigation

We have ordered 12,000 filled sandbags to be held across the county in our depots to protect our infrastructure. We also have a stock of 19,000 unfilled bags in case of a declared emergency event similar to last year. A further order for 20,000 sandbags is currently being progressed for use by District and Boroughs in an emergency situation. 30 high risk flood sites are being surveyed to identify temporary flood defence measures, including temporary pumps should long term flooding occur at these sites. The cyclic gully cleansing programme is currently on target and the supply chain (FM Conway) has additional resources available if required.

NAME: MICHAEL GOSLING

PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Prevention

I would like to address prevention. With the transfer of Public Health to the county in April 2013 we took the time to look at how we could use the new influence that would come with this move. One of the things of the health strategy is prevention, this has been taken up in the annual report of the Director of Public Health.

Prevention can not only reduce the incidence of ill-health but also lead to a better life style for all residents in Surrey. Addressed in the report are the social factors that lead to ill-health and quality of life style. The report covers smoking, alcohol, diet, physical activity and air quality, all of which have a bearing on our lives.

We as a council are taking account of the consequences by the implementation of our policies which influence every decision that we take. We should never hinder the public's health, we should at least be neutral but at best influence those factors that determine a better life-style, I recommend that Members keep the annual report of 2014 in their minds when determining such things for the future.

NAME: DENISE LE GAL

PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND LEAD MEMBER FOR NEW MODELS OF DELIVERY

South East Business Services

On 15 September 2014 East Sussex and Surrey County Councils, in partnership, launched their ambition to create a shared business advisory and professional service. This service aims to combine the business service functions across both organisations to deliver economies of scale that will result in greater value for residents of both authorities. This partnership is called South East Business Services (SEBS).

A Member panel for SEBS has been established and will advise and support the development of the partnership. Members of the panel include Bob Gardner, John Orrick, Richard Wilson and me, along with Julie Fisher as the lead officer.

The business case will be reviewed by Cabinet in February 2015 and will outline the operating model for the partnership that will create a fully integrated service by 2018. With Member approval, South East Business Services will be created in April 2015.

NAME: MIKE GOODMAN

PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

Waste update

- Eco Park

A local resident had recently applied to the High Court for permission to seek a judicial review of the decision taken by the Planning and Regulatory Committee on 24 September 2014. A further report will be presented to Cabinet in February 2015 which will include an update on affordability and value for money analysis.

- Community Recycling Centres

A number of performance improvement and efficiency savings activities have already commenced. In order to make further savings, more changes need to be considered, including charging for certain materials and rationalising opening times.

- Partnership working

Surrey authorities are currently revising their joint waste strategy and SCC is working with districts and boroughs to make a step change in performance and efficiency. This includes:

- Capturing more material for recycling.
- Improving the efficiency of kerbside collection systems.
- Recovering more value from the material collected.

Maximising the benefits from these initiatives will require a new approach that ensures all authorities are committed to making savings against the total costs of waste management in Surrey, thereby delivering best value to the Surrey tax payer.

Local Transport Review

A wide ranging consultation with residents and stakeholders on the proposed approach to make savings in local transport in Surrey commenced on 8 October 2014.

The online campaign for the consultation launched initially via our website and has been communicated via emails to stakeholders, e-newsletters, social media and online advertising. The printed campaign went live mid-November and this is now appearing in libraries, local council offices, community centres, village halls, GPs, sixth form colleges, supermarkets, at selected bus stations, on buses, at our busiest bus stops and at many other locations across the county.

An extensive stakeholder engagement campaign is currently underway, which includes engaging directly with local area committees, parish and town councils, empowerment boards, disability alliance networks and community transport groups (23 engagement sessions so far, out of a total of 43 planned). Further events planned for the next two months include thematic workshops for businesses, youth, disabled/older people and a roving bus event across Surrey

The consultation has so far received over 1800 (online) and 200 (written response) responses and will be open until 14 January 2015, but this will be possibly be extended to the end of January to maximise the response rate. Recommendations based on the consultation will be taken to a Cabinet meeting in May 2015.

NAME: LINDA KEMENY

PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING

School Place Planning

At the last County Council meeting, Members debated the county's forecasting and planning of school places and I am pleased that this important service received strong support. Since then, Cabinet approved the expansion of 3 more primary and secondary schools, with another 4 being considered at its meeting next week. By 31 October, a record number of over 11,000 applications for secondary school places in 2015 were received, 400 more than for this year and more than 1 in 10 from parents in bordering London boroughs, who have clearly heard that 92% of Surrey secondary schools are rated 'Good' or 'Outstanding' by Ofsted. I held meetings last month with residents in Ashted, Woking, Reigate, and Milford, who all understood our pressing need for more school places although concerns always remain over traffic congestion and inconsiderate parking which we will continue to work hard to address. Schools in Maybury, Womersley, Reigate and Hersham celebrated the opening of new permanent buildings and facilities which I attended with county officers and contractors, just a few of the 51 school expansions which were completed in time to open in September across 10 of the 11 Surrey boroughs and districts. Also the first brand new school commissioned in Surrey on behalf of the local authority for some years, Trinity Oaks C of E Primary School in North East Horley, held its official grand opening last month. Based on current projections, Surrey County Council needs to invest £84 million to deliver an additional 3,000 places next September, yet the Council is only scheduled to receive £30 million in government grant funding, so we are keeping up the pressure on Government for a fairer funding settlement to keep pace with this continuing unprecedented demand.

Surrey Educational Trust

The Surrey Educational Trust (SET) which I chair was established to distribute a proportion of earnings generated through the joint venture between the Council and Babcock 4S. Last month the SET agreed the next bidding round to fund projects focused on leadership development, extending educational opportunity, increasing young people's resilience and personal growth, modern foreign languages, English as an additional language (EAL), and promoting Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) subjects. Flyers picturing a flashing light bulb, with the caption 'Do you have a bright idea?', have been distributed to Surrey schools and educational organisations. For the many Members who are school governors or close to your local schools, we need applications for projects from £500-£25,000 by the closing date of 15 January 2015. Some really worthwhile projects have been funded by the SET, including a creative arts programme for EAL students, the GASP motor project to deliver a qualification for young people at risk of becoming Not in Education, Employment and Training (NEET), and the excellent Chelsea's Choice production to educate children about the dangers of sexual exploitation. More information is on our website, so please encourage applications and the winning projects will be announced in February.

NAME: PETER MARTIN

PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR THE ECONOMY AND PROSPEROUS PLACES

Local Growth Fund

Work is underway at various levels with both Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) to ensure that Surrey receives its fair share of funding through the Local Growth Fund (LGF).

Round 1

Local Growth Deals were announced in early July 2014. These deals set out LGF allocations to the LEPs and the schemes on which these allocations will be spent. Almost £50 million will be spent on projects in Surrey starting in 2015/16, with most of the funding allocated to transport schemes. Agreed projects include Epsom Plan E (sustainable transport improvements), improvements to Runnymede roundabout and investment at Brooklands College (Ashford).

We are working hard with both LEPs to ensure that the agreed transport and non-transport projects are delivered. This involves the rapid completion of business cases, working in close collaboration with districts and boroughs. Delivery is vital if the LEPs are to be successful in receiving further funding.

Additional LGF funding ('Round 2')

In summer 2014 the Government also announced an accelerated process for making further bids for the LGF. The LEPs had to submit by 6 October, a short list of priority schemes that could make use of further funding in 2015/16 or 2016/17. Detailed business cases for these schemes were submitted November 2014. In Surrey, this included bids for additional resilience schemes in the Coast to Capital area (along the A22) and initial works on the Lower Thames Flood Defence Scheme in the Enterprise M3 area, amongst other schemes. We understand that the amount of funding for round 2 projects is likely to be limited. The announcement of successful projects is expected in the New Year.

Pipeline projects

Both LEPs have also been asked to provide Government with a list of potential projects for delivery in 2017/18 and 2018/19 by early December. It is possible that the Government will announce support for these schemes before the election, although funding is unlikely to be committed. As in previous rounds we have been working at various levels to ensure that projects in Surrey are included in submissions. Projects submitted include Kiln Lane Link and Staines Bridge widening.

Further information is available in Cabinet Reports, most recently 'Supporting Economic Growth – implementing the Local Growth deals', 21 October 2014.

Fredericks Foundation

I have agreed a grant of £50,000 from the Surrey Growth Fund for the Fredericks Foundation (a Surrey based charity). The Foundation provides loans to new and established micro enterprises. The grant will fund a Surrey co-ordinator and the development of a Surrey hub - a lending panel of private sector representatives.