

COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING - 14 JULY 2015

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 14 July 2015 commencing at 10.00 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Sally Marks (Chairman)

* Nick Skellett CBE (Vice-Chairman)

*	Mary Angell	Saj Hussain
	W D Barker OBE	David Ivison
*	Mrs N Barton	Daniel Jenkins
	Ian Beardsmore	George Johnson
*	John Beckett	Linda Kemeny
	Mike Bennison	Colin Kemp
	Liz Bowes	Eber Kington
	Natalie Bramhall	Rachael I Lake
	Mark Brett-Warburton	* Stella Lallement
	Ben Carasco	Yvonna Lay
	Bill Chapman	Ms D Le Gal
	Helyn Clack	Mary Lewis
	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	Mr D Munro
	Robert Evans	Christopher Norman
	Tim Evans	* John Orrick
	Mel Few	* Adrian Page
	Will Forster	Chris Pitt
*	Mrs P Frost	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
	Denis Fuller	* Denise Saliagopoulos
	John Furey	Tony Samuels
	Bob Gardner	Pauline Searle
	Mike Goodman	Stuart Selleck
	David Goodwin	Michael Sydney
*	Michael Gosling	Keith Taylor
	Zully Grant-Duff	Barbara Thomson
	Ramon Gray	Chris Townsend
	Ken Gulati	Richard Walsh
	Tim Hall	Hazel Watson
	Kay Hammond	Fiona White
	Mr D Harmer	Richard Wilson
*	Nick Harrison	Helena Windsor
*	Marisa Heath	Keith Witham
	Peter Hickman	Mr A Young
*	Margaret Hicks	Mrs V Young
	David Hodge	

*absent

45/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Angell, Mrs Barton, Mr Beckett, Mrs Curran, Mrs Frost, Mr Gosling, Mr Harrison, Miss Heath, Mrs Hicks, Mrs Lallement, Mr Martin, Mr Orrick, Mr Page, Mrs Saliagopoulos and Mr Skellett.

46/15 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 19 May 2015 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

47/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (i) South East Employers Member Development Charter Award – Cllr Rory Love, Chairman of South East Employers presented the Chairman of the Member Development Steering Group with the Award. He was invited to say a few words.
- (ii) Surrey Fire and Rescue Service – the Chairman presented an award, received from the Princess of Wales' Royal Regiment (The Tigers) to the Chief Fire Officer, in recognition for the service's sterling efforts in rescuing artefacts from the Surrey Infantry Museum, including the regimental colours at the recent Clandon Park House Fire.
- (iii) Her Majesty the Queen's Birthday Honours List 2015 and the Queen's Awards for Voluntary Service – the full lists were included within the agenda. However, she drew attention to the honours received by:
 - Lynne Owens, Chief Constable for Surrey Police
 - Mrs Perdita Hunt, Director of Watts Gallery
 - Mr Nick Sealy, past High Sheriff
 - Ms Kate Orrick, Head of DifD Libya
- (iv) On behalf of the Council, she congratulated David Hodge on being elected as Leader of the Conservative Group at the Local Government Association (LGA) and also at the same time being installed as one of the LGAs four Vice-Chairmen.
- (v) Magna Carta event, Runnymede Meadows on 15 June 2015, she said that this was an outstanding event, and that she was honoured to receive HM the Queen and other senior members of the Royal Family, the Prime Minister and other VIPs to the event. She thanked all those involved, including Surrey County Council staff, volunteers and the Police, for making it a memorable occasion.
- (vi) Armed Forces Day on 27 June 2015 had been marked with celebrations across the UK, with a focus on Guildford where there was a service at Guildford Cathedral, a High Street parade, a Red Arrows fly past and entertainment in Stoke Park. She also thanked the volunteers and Surrey Police.

48/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

49/15 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Congratulations on his new appointments at the Local Government Association (LGA)
- A request to utilise his new position at the LGA to explore 'best practice' in Children's Services amongst other authorities
- A request for more information in relation to the Devolution agenda and how it applies to Surrey, both the County Council and Boroughs / Districts
- The impact and cost, particularly to Adult Social Care Services, of introducing the 'living wage'
- Confirmation of investment in recycling waste
- Continue to lobby Central Government for a better settlement for Surrey
- Details of where the £67m savings required in this financial year would be coming from.

50/15 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROGRESS REPORT: JANUARY - JUNE 2015 [Item 6]

The Leader presented the Surrey County Council Progress Report – January – July 2015, the twelfth of the Chief Executive's six monthly reports to Members.

Members made the following comments:

- Disappointment that the emphasis of the report has changed so that there was not as much attention given to scrutiny
- Also, there were only four key areas set out in the report which, for scrutiny purposes, were not specific or measurable and therefore, the Leader / Chief Executive were requested to review the report and its target audience
- There was no reference to financial targets or the Medium Term Financial Plan
- The report was considered at a recent meeting of the Council Overview Board (COB), where Members were impressed with the achievements of staff and partner organisations
- The correct priorities were outlined in the report and did not minimise the forthcoming challenges for the Council. However, the Board considered that the report would benefit from inclusion of some targets
- The report was optimistic, upbeat and provided an opportunity to highlight the County's achievements to residents.

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.

51/15 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Notice of 15 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 Sydney asked the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience – (i) when the Department for Education changed their policy on Bio-mass installations, and (ii) why had the original wood fuel installation at High Ashurst been removed. The Cabinet Member said that she would respond outside the meeting.

(Q2) Mr Robert Evans extended an invite to Mr Ivison to visit Stanwell Moor to see what the impact of proposed expansion at Heathrow would have on this community. **Mr Beardsmore** asked the Leader of the Council if he was aware that an additional 9000 homes would be required in the Spelthorne / Runnymede area if further expansion at Heathrow went ahead – this would also put more pressure on the Green Belt in Surrey.

Mr Forster requested that issues relating to air quality in parts of Spelthorne were adequately addressed as part of the Council's debate on airport expansion.

Mr Munro informed Members that the Council Overview Board would be considering airport expansion at its meeting on 10 September 2015.

The Leader of the Council said that the County Council would only support airport expansion if it was beneficial for Surrey and that expansion could not take place until the necessary improvements to infrastructure had taken place. He also confirmed that he was aware of the issues re. housing and the pressures for Stanwell Moor and agreed to visit the area.

(Q3) Mr Goodwin asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding if he was aware that there had been recent articles in the press relating to the programme for re-surfacing Surrey roads and that all Members should have been informed prior to it appearing in the press. The Cabinet Member said that the information used in the article was three years old and that under the Horizon programme, Surrey was performing well.

(Q8) Mr Robert Evans asked the Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing to expand on the information provided in his response concerning emergency access to and from roads closed due to the Prudential Ride London event. The Cabinet Member agreed to provide a response outside the meeting.

(Q9) Mr Essex questioned whether the figure of an average 160 passengers being negatively affected by the proposals and recommendations arising from the Local Transport Review were accurate. He also queried the carbon emission data and asked what would be environmental impact of the changes in Surrey. The Cabinet Member considered that the Local Transport Review had been thorough, and had included two extensive consultations. He said that the '160' figure had not been challenged previously, and concerning the carbon data, he said that the figures were

projections, it was not an exact science but the County Council was fully aware of carbon issues and were addressing them.

(Q10) Dr Grant-Duff asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding if he was aware that the Police had powers to take action against illegal and anti-social activities of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs). The Cabinet Member confirmed that the Police did have the powers but did not necessarily utilise them and that ultimately it was the Police and Crime Commissioner who made the decision on where to target their resources.

(Q12) Mr Robert Evans asked the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience why the cost of this project remained commercially sensitive when the land had already been purchased. The Cabinet Member said that it was part of the Property Asset Management Programme and therefore she was unable to provide more information in a public meeting.

(Q13) Mr Essex requested details from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning on what action the County Council would be taking to address and reduce carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which could arise from further airport expansion at Heathrow. The Cabinet Member said that they would be discussing any mitigating actions with Heathrow later in July.

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

Members made the following comments:

- The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience asked Members to note a name change: that the Surrey Pension Fund Board be re-named as the 'Surrey Pension Fund Committee' with immediate effect. This name change would be formally included in the report – 'Updates to the Constitution' which would be reported to the next County Council meeting in October.
- Asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to confirm that the County Council would continue to offer support, beyond the setting up phase, for Community Transport. The Cabinet Member said that the next phase of the Local Transport Review would include engaging with and looking at Community Transport.
- Now that the assessment study was complete, assurance requested for the County Council's continued support for the North Downs Line.
- Also continue to lobby for Oyster Card use in Spelthorne.
- Several questions relating to the Ofsted inspection of Children's Services from Mr Kington, which he agreed to put in writing to the Leader of the Council who agreed to respond outside the meeting.
- That there would be an opportunity at a Member seminar, scheduled for later this year, for Members to input into the Surrey Infrastructure Plan and other infrastructure studies, including Crossrail 2 (CR2).

- A suggestion that future Local Transport Reviews should show a net effect of those passengers who would be negatively affected by any proposals.
- School building projects – concern where projects overran, resulting in children being taught in temporary rooms. However, assurance was given that the quality of teaching and learning was not jeopardised if / when alternative temporary rooms were used.

52/15 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were no local Member statements.

53/15 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]

ITEM 9(i)

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

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

‘This Council notes with delight the success of the many Magna Carta celebrations and in particular the historic event which took place on Runnymede Meadows on 15 June 2015 celebrating the 800th anniversary of its sealing.

This Council thanks all of the many people, partners and organisations that helped make the celebrations so successful and which enabled the county of Surrey to showcase a unique event of world significance.

This Council wishes in particular to thank its own staff and Members, many of whom went way beyond the call of duty, in the successful organisation of these celebrations.’

Mr Few made the following points in support of his motion:

- It was a brave decision, taken by Surrey County Council, to celebrate the 800th anniversary of the sealing of the Magna Carta on the Runnymede Meadows in Surrey
- The event has heightened awareness of Surrey and the county will benefit from increased numbers of visitors
- There had been dedicated teams from the County Council and National Trust working on the event – organising traffic management plans, coach transport, security checks and ensuring that guests would be fed and watered
- With VIP guests, including several senior members of the Royal Family, the Prime Minister and other international guests, the organisation of the event was challenging and its success was achieved with the help of partnership working
- 200 people were presented to Royalty and other dignitaries
- The event culminated in a fly past from the Red Arrows
- It was a very well organised event.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Clack, who made the following points:

- Continuation of thanking the people who had key roles in bringing the event to fruition, in particular: Susie Kemp - Assistant Chief Executive, Peter Milton – Head of Cultural Services, Katie Brennan and the Magna Carta team and also the Civic team
- She also thanked Surrey Police, Surrey Highways, Surrey's Emergency Planning team, Surrey Social Services, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, the Ambulance Service, Runnymede Borough Council, Surrey Performing Arts Service, National Trust, Dame Sarah Goad and the Chief Executive
- That the vision of the Leader of the Council in relation to this event had placed Surrey on the 'world map'
- The magnificent artwork, The Jurors by Hew Locke which was commissioned by Surrey County Council and the National Trust
- That art interpretation volunteers were on site at weekends and since the event the car park takings had increased by 50%
- Finally, she said that it was a perfect day and that she was proud to be a part of the Magna Carta celebrations.

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

- The event had highlighted the reputation of Surrey and put Runnymede and Spelthorne on the map
- The Jurors artwork was a good legacy
- The perception that the event was for 'the great and the good' and not for ordinary people – perhaps more could have been done for local people on the day
- The TV coverage was limited
- It was an amazing day and Members were proud to be part of it
- Praise for the Police
- Concern about the cost of the event, when there were cuts to services being made
- That the artwork could have been funded by public subscription rather than Surrey County Council
- Thanks to those staff who worked so hard to make the event a success
- That the County Council was responsible for the wellbeing of its residents and this event was good for morale and businesses
- Thanks to all the school children who designed the flags for the event
- The Red Arrows flypast at exactly 12.15
- This was not a Conservative event, it was a Surrey County Council event.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote with 61 Members voting for it. No Members voted against it but there were three abstentions.

Therefore it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council notes with delight the success of the many Magna Carta celebrations and in particular, the historic event which took place on Runnymede Meadows on 15 June 2015 celebrating the 800th anniversary of its sealing.

This Council thanks all of the many people, partners and organisations that helped make the celebrations so successful and which enabled the county of Surrey to showcase a unique event of world significance.

This Council wishes in particular to thank its own staff and Members, many of whom went way beyond the call of duty, in the successful organisation of these celebrations.

ITEM 9(ii)

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

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

‘This Council agrees to prioritise the recruitment and retention of Social Workers including by ensuring that the County Council's social worker pay is competitive with neighbouring councils, carrying out recruitment campaigns, recruiting social work graduates from universities, providing key worker housing and relevant training, in order to:

- provide sufficient qualified, trained and experienced Social Workers to support and protect vulnerable children and adults in Surrey,
- reduce the council's over-reliance on costly agency staff
- reduce the workload of social workers.’

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

- The recruitment and retention of social workers in Surrey was a longstanding issue
- Continuity of social worker care was very important
- The use of technology was no substitute for the personal approach
- Established social worker teams that worked closely with one another were needed
- Acknowledgement that Surrey's proximity to London Boroughs, where social workers were paid higher rates, made it more difficult to recruit social workers to Surrey
- The cost of agency staff
- The importance of tackling the issues and to think ‘outside the box’ for solutions i.e. key worker housing
- A need to address Surrey County Council's reputation with social workers
- That social work was a vocation for most social workers and that money was not a prime consideration

- Possible consideration of utilising some of the money paid to agency staff to pay enhance wages for social workers
- Surrey County Council needed to be good employers to attract and retain social workers

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Watson, who reserved her right to speak.

The Leader of the Council thanked Mrs White for her timely motion and said that this was a national issue. He said that the County Council faced fierce competition in recruiting social workers and had made some progress in recent years but recognised that there was more to do. He confirmed that the Conservative Group would be supporting this motion.

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

- The number of Surrey residents requiring social care services
- The affect of a Supreme Court judgement in relation to Deprivation of Liberty issues, which had resulted in an increase in applications from 57 last year to over 3000 this year – this was a budget pressure for the County Council because experienced social workers had to assess these applications
- Everything that had been suggested by Mrs White was being considered plus a number of strands of work to progress the issue had been identified, including looking at retention and also co-operation with London Boroughs
- There had been some good points made, where officers and Members had been commended, in the Children's Services Ofsted report i.e. Adoption processes
- The importance of tying any possible provision for key worker housing to specific jobs
- It was vital that the County Council attracted a good calibre of people with the right skills into social work positions
- That there were similar problems in the NHS and the County Council needed to work together with the Health Service to prevent duplication.

Mrs Watson, as seconder of the motion, said that she was delighted with the response and considered that there had been a positive and constructive debate. She said that the high vacancy rates were due to the proximity of the county to London but the Council needed to do everything it could to attract people to apply for social worker posts in Surrey.

Mrs White, as proposer of the motion, referred to the point made by Mr Witham in relation to the number of Deprivation of Liberty applications and also the obligations to the Council arising from the Care Act and said that this made the need for social workers positions to be filled even more critical.

Finally, she thanked all Members for supporting her motion.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council agrees to prioritise the recruitment and retention of Social Workers including by ensuring that the County Council's social worker pay is competitive with neighbouring councils, carrying out recruitment campaigns, recruiting social work graduates from universities, providing key worker housing and relevant training, in order to:

- provide sufficient qualified, trained and experienced Social Workers to support and protect vulnerable children and adults in Surrey,
- reduce the council's over-reliance on costly agency staff
- reduce the workload of social workers.

ITEM 9(iii)

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

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

‘This Council requests the Cabinet to allocate additional funding to all Local Committees to enable them to introduce 20 mph speed limits outside schools where requested by both the school and the local community in order to reduce traffic speeds and to improve road safety.’

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

- She called upon the Authority to provide additional funding to local committees to enable the introduction of 20mph speed limits outside schools where requested
- Made reference to a trial at three schools in Mole Valley where the reduced speed limit had now been made permanent
- That the safety of all children was paramount and many parents wanted a 20mph speed limit outside schools
- Any 20mph speed limit would need enforcement
- There was evidence across the country that drivers did slow down when 20 mph speed limits were in place.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Cooksey.

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

- That speed limit assessments were already delegated to local committees for decision and this motion was a request for additional resources for local committees
- Not all problems that occurred outside schools related to speed
- That it was the County Council’s policy to undertake an assessment of safety outside schools and that report was then considered by the relevant local committee
- There were only 15 out of over 500 schools in Surrey that were near accident black spots and these schools had been fully evaluated and some road improvements made
- Local people should make local decisions on local issues
- Where would the extra funding requested come from?
- The motion said that introduction of 20mph speed limits would only happen if requested by the school and the local community
- The motion went against any devolution principles for increasing responsibility locally

- Whilst local committees had the power to introduce changes to speed limits, they did not have sufficient resources to implement them
- Many other local authorities throughout the country had implemented 20mph speed limits outside schools.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote, with 12 Members voting for it. 52 Members voted against it and there were no abstentions.

Therefore the motion was lost.

54/15 ELECTED MEMBER DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY [Item 10]

The authority was awarded Charter status in October 2011, this was renewed in April 2015 and the Member Development Steering Group intend to achieve Charter Plus status before the end of 2017.

As Chairman of the Member Development Steering Group, Ms Le Gal introduced the revised Elected Member Development Strategy. She highlighted the following points:

- (i) That the induction of the new Council in 2017 would formalise processes for using feedback from newly elected councillors
- (ii) The introduction of a 180 feedback process for Members.

When asked about the protocol for elected Members attendance at external courses and conferences, Ms Le Gal confirmed that the Member Development programme was tailored to each Members individual needs and that all requests should be agreed by the Assistant Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairman of the Member Development Steering Group.

RESOLVED:

That the Elected Member Development Strategy be approved.

55/15 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 11]

The Leader presented the Report of the Cabinet meetings held on 26 May and 23 June 2015.

Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Joint Commissioning Strategy for Speech and Language Therapy for children and Young People
- The Agreement with Surrey Wildlife Trust for the Management of the County Council's Countryside Estate
- Confident in Surrey's Future: Equality, Fairness and Respect Strategy 2015 – 2020
- Quarterly report on decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 April – 30 June 2015

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 26 May and 23 June 2015 be adopted.

56/15 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 12]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee introduced the report and commended the updated strategies against Fraud and Corruption and Risk Management, plus the updated Code of Corporate Governance to Members.

RESOLVED:

1. That the updated Strategy against Fraud and Corruption, attached as Annex A to the submitted report, be approved, for inclusion in the Constitution.
2. That the Risk Management Strategy, attached as Annex B to the submitted report, be approved, for inclusion in the Constitution.
3. That the updated Code of Corporate Governance, attached as Annex C to the submitted report, be approved, for inclusion in the Constitution.

57/15 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 13]

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

[Meeting ended at: 12.45pm]

Chairman

Leader of the Council's Speech to County Council:

14 July 2015

Just over one week ago, the Chancellor delivered his second budget of 2015. I know that my Members were delighted that he was able to deliver this budget as part of a majority Conservative Government. However, we must never lose sight of the fact that this country is still facing a huge public sector deficit - a deficit that George Osborne is committed to eliminating.

Local Government spending has already reduced from 4 to 2% of public expenditure in the last 5 years. It has been a huge challenge but local councils have stepped up to the plate, with Surrey being a great example.

Over the last 5 years, we've been expected to save almost £70m each year - meaning that by the beginning of this year - we had saved £329m - an astonishing sum, an astonishing achievement.

It should not be taken for granted that we can do this again and again but clearly Government expects us too.

Of course, this Conservative administration supports the Government's efforts to reduce the national deficit for the long term benefit of all and this Council is committed to making savings and being as efficient as possible. However, Government needs to understand that there are pressures on us beyond our control, factors which make our position more difficult than ever before.

I know that every Member in this chamber will now be well-versed on the significant demographic pressures this Council faces:

- We have more and more children needing a school place
- More elderly people requiring care
- And roads - getting busier and more congested each year - which are essential to people living in Surrey and beyond.

But these are simply the headlines - as in reality, the issues that we face are far more complex.

For example, our demographic pressures are also being felt in other areas, such as waste management. Surrey residents, on average, produce nearly half a tonne of waste each year. Recycling this waste costs the Council over £50 per tonne. However, waste that is not recycled costs us double that amount - £100 per tonne!

As the population is increasing - it means that our costs for managing waste are getting higher each year, contributing to a potential funding gap of up to £14m.

We are also faced with a significant funding issue in the shape of the Care Act which places a number of new requirements and responsibilities on local government. Whilst these responsibilities have been funded for 2015/16 - Government has not given a clear indication as to how they are going to be funded in the future, leaving us with some big uncertainties.

In fact, we've estimated we could be left with a significant funding gap – in the region of tens of millions of pounds.

Our Children's social care teams are also experiencing increasing demand as a result of new and more complex threats to young people's wellbeing. This is not just a challenge for Surrey, but a challenge for social care teams up and down the country.

Members will be aware that late last year, an Ofsted inspection highlighted that more needs to be done to protect children who, whilst they may not be in immediate danger, need support and help. We take these concerns very seriously and, since November, officers have been working flat out to make the improvements required, with progress being monitored by a cross-party improvement board led by the Deputy Leader.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Group Leaders for their support and willingness to work together on this vitally important issue – and stress once again that the protection of children will always be a priority for this Council.

Of course, safeguarding children is a responsibility for all of us and our partners – not just Children's Services. However, like us, our partners are also under significant pressure. They are all trying to deal with falling budgets and, reductions in one service can often create demands in another – adding further pressures on our already stretched budget.

Therefore, the pressures on this Council are three fold:

- Increased demand as a result of demographic pressures.
- Increased demand as a result of new responsibilities passed to us from Government.
- And in some cases, increased demand as a result of service changes elsewhere – creating additional pressures across the public sector.

So what can we do about it?

Savings on this scale require transformational change – and working as One Team with our partners to deliver more, for less. We have started this process through our Public Service Transformation programme. Projects such as Family Support, Emergency Services and Transforming Justice are just three examples of what we are achieving.

But it is not enough, this year alone we must save another £67m, that is over £180,000 every single day and savings of this magnitude mean that, whilst we will continue to prioritise:

- finding school places,
- protecting the vulnerable
- and maintaining our roads

We must also acknowledge that, in order to balance the books, we will need to make some really difficult choices. In the meantime, I want to assure Members that I will continue to lobby Government for a fairer funding settlement for Surrey.

My message is simple:

- This council supports hardworking tax payers.
- This council has always believed in finding the best value from every pound.
- This council has reviewed every service we deliver - making £329 worth of savings over the past 5 years.

But what this council cannot do is stop demographic demand pressures beyond our control. This council needs Government to recognise that higher demand leads to higher costs.

- That is why this Council needs a fairer funding settlement now.
- That is why it is absolutely vital that the Government's spending review in the autumn takes into account the demand pressures on Local Government.
- And that is why I will keep making our case to the Secretary of State – week in, week out.

Of course, in these times of reduced public finances, if we are to fully meet the demand pressures upon us, devolution is vital. The Cities and Local Government Bill announcement was an important step in the right direction, meaning that devolution to counties is now firmly on the table, something that I fought tirelessly for as Chairman of the County Council's Network.

Surrey residents must not miss out on this opportunity to have greater say on what happens in their county. I have been working with partners such as the Leaders of our District and Boroughs, as well as the Leader's of East and West Sussex Councils to establish just how we could work together, so Government can allow us to make more decisions at a local level for local people.

This is not about more powers for me or for the County Council. It is about making the right decisions in the right places – taking them in partnership and investing money where it is needed most, for the benefit of our residents. It is about empowering local communities, allowing them to make the best use of every penny and every pound of public money spent in their area.

Given the challenges that I have set out today:

- I hope that I can count on the understanding of Members in this Chamber when Cabinet considers the refreshed Medium Term Financial Plan on 29 July 2015.
- I hope that I can count on their support as I continue to fight for a fairer funding settlement for Surrey.
- And I hope that I can count on their co-operation, as we work with our partners to develop a powerful case for greater devolution.

Finally I hope I can count on Whitehall and our MPs to listen to local Government in the run up to the Comprehensive Spending Review.

It's time to understand that our services are not just 'nice to haves':

- It is essential that our children are provided with a school place
- It is essential that there is support and care for the elderly
- And it is essential to keep our roads well maintained and our economy moving

Our public services are essential for local people and we cannot take them for granted but without fairer funding settlement and greater devolution soon, our services are at risk so that is why I will continue to make the case for Surrey.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
14 July 2015

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 14 JULY 2015

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

**MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND
RESIDENT EXPERIENCE**

(1) MR MICHAEL SYDNEY (LINGFIELD) TO ASK:

In 2010, the Chief Executive attended a meeting of the Surrey Hills Wood Fuel Summit at Cranleigh School. At the end of the meeting I, as Chairman, asked the Chief Executive for his comments on what he had heard and what had been discussed.

In the course of a very encouraging response, the Chief Executive stated that from then on "wood fuel would be the default heating element of any new building project undertaken by Surrey County Council, providing there was no business case which prevented this.

I would like to ask:

1. How many new buildings has the County commissioned and completed in the intervening period?
2. How many of these buildings have wood fuel as their heat source?
3. If the number in the answer to question 2 is less than the number in the answer to question 1, what were the business cases which prevented the use of wood fuel?
4. Why in the eight school planning applications currently being considered by the SCC Planning Department on behalf of the County are there no heating installations using wood as the fuel?

Reply:

The responses are in the same order as the questions:

1. There were 4 new buildings:
 - High Ashurst - Main build 2010
 - High Ashurst - Further accommodation block 2011
 - Trinity Oaks - New 1 Form of Entry School, Horley 2014
 - Guildford - New Fire Station 2015
2. High Ashurst - Main build 2010
High Ashurst - Further accommodation block 2011

3. That on completion of the business case analysis there is not a value for money benefit due to a number of site specific challenges. Biomass is not a requirement of the DFE's baseline standards.

Trinity Oaks

- The capital funding by the DFE does not provide for the significantly higher capital cost of Biomass installations, where the revenue benefit is to the school and not SCC.
- This site was severely restricted in terms of fuel storage and access.

Guildford - New Fire Station 2015

- This site was severely restricted in terms of fuel storage and access, which negated the ability to install a Biomass system storage and access.

4. Firstly all applications / proposals are considered based against a business case before a decision is made.

There are in fact 14 applications being considered these are as follows:

- **2 new schools:** The capital funding by the DFE does not provide for the significantly higher capital cost of Biomass installations, where the revenue benefit is to the school and not SCC.
- **4 building extensions:** Two are Academy and Voluntary Aided Schools. In all instances the existing gas installation is being extended and therefore it is not cost affective to install Biomass.
- **6 small modular units:** All with their own modest self contained heating systems.
- **2 temporary modular units:** Planning applications to become permanent and all have their own modest self contained heating systems.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(2) MR DAVID IVISON (HEATHERSIDE & PARKSIDE) TO ASK:

In congratulating the Leader on his election as Conservative Group Leader of the Local Government Association (LGA), will he use his new position (along with the supportive Labour Councillors) to assist our national Conservative Government to speedily approve the unanimous and unequivocal recommendations of the Airport Commission to maintain the international important hub status of Heathrow Airport with the construction of a third runway?

While recognising the overwhelming support for a third runway at Heathrow from British business, international airlines, UK regional airports a significant number of supporters in both the Gatwick and Heathrow areas - and even support from the Labour Party, will we as Surrey County Council now have the early opportunity, as primary economic and employment beneficiaries of the long-overdue Airport Commission proposals, be given an early debate to revise our present equivocal position 'on the fence' and vote to support our Conservative Government in their decision-making later in the year?

Such endorsement by us of the recommended Heathrow option will not only assist the Government (at long last) to make a decision, it will also enable us to concentrate and focus on our long-held reservations over infrastructure and environmental concerns related to the expansion proposals.

Can the Leader indicate an early date for our debate on this vital issue and his undertaking to promote this project with his LGA colleagues?

This long-awaited decision is vital to our County, our Region and our Nation.

Reply:

I welcome the publication of the Airports Commission final report.

The Commission has set out a package of measures which it considers will address the environmental and community impacts of its recommended option for expansion at Heathrow.

We welcome the additional jobs and economic growth that airport expansion could bring to Surrey residents and businesses.

However, many important issues remain unanswered.

We do not know whether the Government will accept all the recommendations set out by the Airports Commission. For example, a ban on scheduled night flights and the introduction of predictable periods of respite.

What does the Airports Commission mean by southern access to Heathrow?

How will surface access improvements on local roads and rail links be funded?

So in my view the position that the Council adopted in July 2013 remains the right position. Expansion at either Heathrow or Gatwick requires the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed

Before backing expansion at Heathrow, the county council needs to be fully satisfied that the infrastructure is in place to make the airport work properly and that everything has been done to mitigate the impact of expansion on local communities.

I am already lobbying Government and the aviation industry, including in my new role as Conservative Group Leader of the Local Government Association, to ensure that these issues are addressed.

I hope that the Government will move as quickly as possible to respond to the recommendations, to end the uncertainty for Surrey communities.

The Government has said that it will respond to the Commission's recommendations before the end of the year. In my view, that is the point at which it would make most sense for this council to hold a further debate on the issue.

MR JOHN FUREY, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

(3) MR DAVID GOODWIN (GUILDFORD SOUTH WEST) TO ASK:

According to the Chief Executive's progress report, 14% of Surrey's highway network is in poor condition and is in need of repair.

After 3 years of investing in the resurfacing of Surrey's roads which has resulted in 3 % improvement from 17% to 14 % amounting to a 1% improvement per year. What plans are there to continue the road resurfacing programme beyond 2017 when Operation Horizon ends and to speed up the rate of improvement?

Reply:

We are responsible for 4,800kms of roads and the network is always deteriorating. The 14% condition relates to 2014/15 after nearly two years of Operation Horizon. We originally forecast that the Horizon programme would provide an annual improvement in the condition of the network of 1%, although this can be impacted by severe weather or other unexpected events. The higher % improvement actually achieved is due to the acceleration of the programme in the first two years.

Under the Horizon programme, we now have one of the best condition road networks in the South East. Looking forwards, the critical consideration given when determining investment in the network is the outcomes it provides against the Council's priorities, which needs to include all of our assets, including footways, structures and drainage as well as carriageways. We will be carrying out an extensive consultation with Members later in the year on our Asset Management Strategy, and this will be used to help us determine future budgets and the Capital programme beyond 2017.

MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

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

Please can the Council confirm how much money it spends printing and posting committee papers, meeting invites and other documentation to Councillors?

Reply:

The bulk of the printing for Councillors, including committee papers, is carried out by the central Reprographics team at County Hall, and the charge to Democratic Services for the 2014 calendar year was £42,225. This figure includes the cost of printing for Democratic Services which is not directly related to the work of Members, as well as the cost of committee papers circulated to officers involved in meetings, but these costs are not separated out. However, there will be additional Councillor-related printing costs incurred as a result of local printing by Democratic Services and by Councillors at home, as well as printing by other services through Reprographics or locally, but these costs are also not recorded or monitored.

The charge to Democratic Services for printing in Reprographics in 2014 was significantly higher than the previous year as a result of an overall increase in the number of copies and, particularly, an increase in the number of colour copies. The

figure fluctuates annually as a result of the number of meetings held and also the nature of the reports presented. Democratic Services has sought to reduce the number of paper copies produced by restricting distribution lists and by improving accessibility to electronic versions and providing Councillors with iPads. There is also a drive to ensure that the reports themselves are shorter and only have necessary attachments, and that colour copying is avoided whenever possible.

All post to Councillors is sent out via Members' Reception, but the cost of this is not recorded separately within the Council's overall postage costs. To give an indication, the cost of sending the agenda for today's meeting by first class post was £2.02, so the cost of sending it to all 81 Councillors would be £163.62. However, the reality is that a proportion of these agenda would have been collected in person by Councillors already at County Hall, so those postage costs would not have been incurred.

Members' Reception seeks to keep postage costs to a minimum by only sending post to Councillors once a week, unless requested to send documents immediately (for example copies of agenda). They will also hold on to post where the Councillor is expected to be coming to County Hall the following day. Therefore Councillors can play an important part in keeping postage costs to a minimum by ensuring that they call to Members' Reception each time they arrive at and leave County Hall.'

LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

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

Last year the Leader of the Council announced an additional £2m for Children's Services. Can a breakdown be provided showing how this additional funding has been spent?

If the funding has not been spent, can a breakdown be provided showing how the funding will be spent?

Reply:

Team	Post	Total FTE	Total Budget (£000)
Area Teams (Referral, Assessment and Intervention Service)	Senior Family Support Worker	16	480
Administration (Area Teams)	Senior Team Administrator	8	217
Administration (Safeguarding)	Senior Team Administrator	2	54
Care Services (Placement Team)	Placement Officer	1	36
Care Services (Leaving Care Team)	Assistant Team Manager	1	48
Total Allocated		28	835

The £2m will be spent by Children's Services over two years, with £1m being spent in each year. The funding will be spent on additional staffing, with each post being filled for two years. Recruitment is currently underway.

The Referral, Assessment and Intervention Service (RAIS) in each of the four areas will each have four additional Senior Family Support Workers, and there will be additional capacity added to the Administration Teams to support the increasing workload being seen in the Area Teams and the Safeguarding Unit.

In addition, two posts will be added in Countywide Services - a further Placement Officer in the Placement Team and a further Assistant Team Manager in the Care Leaver's Team.

The total annual cost of these additional staff is £835,000.

The remaining funding will be used to cover the post of the Independent Principal Social Worker and Social Work Reform Manager both of whom have key roles to play in driving forward the practice improvement agenda. Additional monies will be used to address and enhance support required to improve work flow and business process and/or further capacity within the RAIS to address additional tasks and a significant increase in caseloads. Ongoing review of the RAIS capacity and structure will form part of the formal improvement process. This will therefore ensure future review and inform realignment of resources, if necessary.

MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

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

What action does Surrey County Council (SCC) take when Japanese Knotweed is reported on its land, especially along the edges of roads?

What action does SCC take when it is reported on any Right of Way that is not in its ownership?

Given that there is no statutory requirement for landowners to remove these plants from their property but it is an offence to allow them to spread to adjacent land, how does SCC prevent this pernicious weed from spreading?

Reply:

The County Council has processes to ensure Japanese Knotweed (and any other poisonous weeds) are dealt with in the most appropriate manner. These differ slightly between the highway, Rights of Way and Estates to reflect the nature and usage of the land.

In ten out of the eleven Surrey Districts, agreements are in place with the District Councils to deal with highway land weed control on our behalf. Tandridge District Council are the exception having chosen not to work with us, hence highway weed control is managed by the County Council in this district. There is a proactive approach with all known problem areas benefiting from twice yearly preventative spray treatments. Stem injection methods of control supplement this when required. If additional reports are made to the Council, they will be investigated and treated as appropriate by either the County Council or the relevant District Council.

Rights of Way do not operate a preventative programme but will treat Japanese knotweed on a reactive basis, with an appropriate treatment, when they identify or are told of an occurrence. They will not enter adjoining private land or property to treat the weed but will notify the landowner.

Estates undertake periodic inspections of land under their control. Through this process (and reports from third parties) they will deal with and treat Knotweed accordingly.

This comprehensive approach minimises the risk of the weed spreading from County land to other areas.

MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER ADULT SOCIAL CARE, WEKKBEING AND INDEPENDENCE

(7) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH & ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK:

In light of the fact that Ofsted's report into Children's Services in Surrey has been recently released finding Surrey to be inadequate in its duty of care, what assurances can be given that where a similar inspection to be taken of Adult Social Care the same finding would not be made, especially with regard to those suffering from mental health issues.

Reply:

Adult social care services are not subject to an inspection regime in the same way as Children's Services, but regulated adult social care services are monitored and inspected by the Care Quality Commission. This applies to all regulated services regardless of what type of organisation delivers them. Surrey County Council currently delivers some adult social care services which are inspected by the Care Quality Commission: Residential homes for older people, people with learning disabilities and reablement. The majority of the council's adult social care services, as with most other councils, are commissioned from external providers.

Surrey Adult Social Care has robust quality assurance processes in place to ensure that the care and support provided to Surrey residents is appropriate and of good quality. Through our partnership agreement with Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, this includes people with mental health issues.

As part of our approach, we are proactive in seeking 'Peer Reviews', which provide independent feedback on our performance. These have included reviews by Hampshire and Buckinghamshire County Councils. Where lessons are learnt we adjust our processes accordingly. We also publish a 'Local Account' of our performance against quality standards, informed by partners and people who use services.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

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

With respect to the Prudential RideLondon on Sunday 2 August, what measures will be in place to allow emergency access to and from homes in roads that are closed?

Reply:

The access for the emergency services and other critical services such as health and social care workers has been a critical part of the planning for this event following on from our learning from the Olympic planning.

To ensure access for the emergency services the following arrangements have been made:

- Emergency and Local Access points have been identified across the route. The locations of these have been identified in liaison with the emergency service.
- All crews and officers from the emergency services will be briefed by their organisations and be given details of the route and Emergency and Local Access Points by the event organiser
- To manage any issues that arise during the event there will be officers from Surrey's emergency services working alongside the event organiser at the event control room on the day of the event.

These arrangements have been developed over the last 5 years where we have run this type of event. Every effort is made to ensure that all eventualities are addressed in the planning for the event, but we have built in the flexibility to the event arrangements to ensure that residents will continue to receive the normal levels of emergency response while the event is being delivered.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(9) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:

The Surrey Transport Plan vision and objectives states that it aims to provide an integrated transport system that protects the environment, keeps people healthy and provides for lower carbon transport choices. This is consistent with Surrey County Council's Climate Change Strategy for the Surrey Transport Plan which has an objective to increase the proportion of travel by sustainable modes such as walking and cycling, maintain public transport patronage and increase vehicle occupancy. This is a commitment to increase the percentage of journeys in Surrey that are made by sustainable modes, including buses. However, the Surrey County Council review of bus services appears to be based on a baseline of keeping the same amount of total transport each year by bus across the county – just over 29 million passenger-km journeys each year. Please can you confirm:

- why a baseline that leads to a continual lowering of the proportion of travel in Surrey made by buses was chosen, when the overall commitment is to make travel more environmentally sustainable.
- what progress Surrey County Council is making towards meeting the Surrey County Council target of a 10% reduction in absolute [carbon] emissions by 2020 increasing to 25% reduction by 2035 on 2007 levels of 2,114,000 tonnes (1.9 tonnes per capita), and how bus travel is contributing to this reduction.

Reply:

In light of the current funding pressures faced by the Council, the Local Transport Review has been tasked to deliver a funding arrangement with partners that is more financially sustainable in the long term. There has been no baseline set in terms of lowering the proportion of travel in Surrey by bus, but to make the required savings needed from the review; this has resulted in some service compromises on routes, frequencies, days of operations and changes to timetables.

The overall result of these changes is that an average of 160 passengers could be negatively impacted; some of whom in theory could switch to some form of car transport. However most of these passengers will still retain access to some form of local transport. Furthermore, some of the changes lead to enhancements. The review also aims to grow the commercial value of the network through investment in capital infrastructure. Both of these measures will encourage an increase in patronage.

Surrey County Council is currently exceeding its target of a 10% reduction in carbon emissions by 2020. The most recently published Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC) data from 2013, indicates a level of 1,849,200 tonnes of carbon emissions, which represents a 12.4% reduction.

At this stage, it is difficult to quantify what contribution bus travel, or any other specific mode of transport, is making to this change. However it is widely thought that the single biggest contributory factor is the increase in vehicle fuel efficiency.

MR JOHN FUREY, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

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

I understand that the Greater London Authority and the Welsh Assembly have enhanced powers to take enforcement action against illegal and anti-social activities of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs). Please will this Council agree to lobby Central Government for these powers?

Reply:

We are aware that the Greater London Authority and the Welsh Assembly have been handed powers to enforce lorry weight and width restrictions and issue fines to lorry drivers break the law. The Local Government Association is calling on the Government to give similar powers to councils across the country. A key

consideration for the County Council is that any such additional responsibilities should not impose an additional financial burden on the authority.

LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

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

The County Council introduced a number of skillcentres to improve the skills of Surrey's young people. I understand that the skillcentres have been discontinued. What was the reason for this decision and was an evaluation of the skillcentres initiative carried out and if so, what did it conclude?

Reply:

In response to Raising of the Participation Age legislation, Services for Young People has developed a number of commissions aimed at preventing young people from becoming NEET (Not in Employment, Education and Training) and encouraging their participation in education, employment and training. These commissions have been very successful, achieving a 62% reduction in NEET young people between March 2012 and March 2014 and leading to Surrey having the joint lowest NEET percentage in England in 2013-14. Other authorities are seeking to learn from Surrey's approach, following national coverage in Local Government Association publications. The number of young people currently NEET in Surrey stands at 1.93%. Over the last three years we have supported over 1,600 Surrey young people to begin Apprenticeships through our employer grant. This, combined with other initiatives, has led to a year-on-year growth in the number of young people starting apprenticeships in Surrey over the last four years, in contrast to a trend of decline across the country overall.

The Skills Centre commission is due to end at the end of July 2015. When Education Funding Agency (EFA) funding of the programme started, from August 2013 and coinciding with the introduction of post-16 Programmes of Study, numbers began to drop off. This affected the viability of programmes. In 2013, Surrey County Council introduced the Ready for Work programme: a re-engagement programme for young people who are NEET and require additional support to prepare them for the demands of education, training and employment. Within this model, youth support officers from the Youth Support Service (YSS) deliver learning wrapped up within fun activities which allow for pastoral needs, including barriers to learning, to be addressed alongside developing the employability of young people. The more flexible Ready for Work programme is more suited to the most vulnerable young people and has attracted much higher numbers. There are currently 303 young people participating in the programme across the county.

An evaluation has been carried out for each year of the Skills Centres commission. The most recent evaluation, in May 2014, identified the following strengths, areas for development and recommendations.

Strengths

- 174 young people participated during the first phase of delivery, exceeding the overall target of 170.
- Seven of the eleven boroughs met or exceeded their engagement target.

Areas for Development

- A more flexible delivery model is needed, taking into account the need for roll-on, roll-off provision and different modes of attendance for young people according to their needs.

Recommendations

- Consider development of the Ready for Work model with providers, including using youth centres for Traineeship delivery, in recognition of the large proportion of NEET young people who aspire to enter employment.

In response to the changing context of the 14-19 policy and funding landscape, we are developing alternative solutions to meet local need. In North West Surrey, Services for Young People has a partnership in place with Brooklands College (the Skills Centre provider for one of the boroughs) which allows our staff to deliver education and training provision to young people, with funding and quality assurance provided by the College. This began with the very successful SPLASH (Surrey Partnership Learning Academy Surrey Heath) model in Surrey Heath and has now been expanded to form the LEAP (Learning, Employability and Progression) programme, covering Surrey Heath, Runnymede and Woking. In South East Surrey, a partnership is developing with East Surrey College and discussions are taking place regarding solutions for South West and North East Surrey, the latter of which currently has a European Social Fund sub-contract to deliver re-engagement and prevention work to young people who are or are at risk of becoming NEET.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

(12) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL & STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK: 2nd question

The Council is pressing on with the controversial plan to close two fire stations in Spelthorne and replace them with one new one. Why has it been decided that the cost of this project, which will be paid for by Surrey Council tax payers, should not be made public?

Reply:

The report contains information which is exempt from Access to Information by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government act which includes commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies. As we have not yet gone to the market to tender for these works releasing this information would compromise the competitive tender exercise.

Initially the up-front project costs will be funded by the tax payer but this will then lead to a saving to the taxpayer of nearly £900,000 per annum.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

**(13) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:
2nd question**

Now the Airports Commission has published its report, which recommends a third runway at Heathrow, does Surrey County Council feel the Airports Commission's recommendations on addressing environmental issues go far enough?

In particular, does the Cabinet Member agree that Surrey County Council and the UK government should be taking a lead to address climate change, and that the detailed modelling produced by the Commission highlights that expansion of either Heathrow or Gatwick airports is incompatible with an environmentally sustainable future?

Reply:

Our response to the acceptability of the environmental impacts of airport expansion at either Heathrow or Gatwick is focused on those issues with immediate local impacts which require mitigation measures in place, such as surface access, local air pollution and noise. We are currently concerned that the environmental impacts of airport expansion have not been satisfactorily addressed in the Commission's report, and we will expect these issues to be properly addressed. We have held meetings with the airport authorities and a further meeting is planned with Heathrow later this month.

The County Council is taking action to reduce carbon dioxide and other Greenhouse gas emissions from its own operations and other areas within its sphere of influence, such as sustainable local transport, domestic energy efficiency and waste management. Whilst the council clearly recognises the global contribution of aviation to levels of Greenhouse Gases, the council takes the view that a strategic national approach, led by government, is essential in deciding the acceptability of the overall expansion proposals in respect of emissions and climate change mitigation.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

**(14) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:
3rd question**

Please can the Council confirm how many Surrey families it is estimated might be impacted by the Government's proposed reduction in the benefit cap from £25,000 to £23,000?

Reply:

Thank you Mr Forster for this timely question.

The previous Coalition Government introduced a £26,000 cap on the total amount of benefits that working age people can receive. This ensured that out of work households no longer received more in benefits than the average wage for working families.

In last week's budget, the Chancellor announced that the benefit cap will be reduced to £20,000 outside London from April 2017.

Residents in receipt of Working Tax Credit, Disability Living Allowance and Personal Independence Payments are automatically excluded from the cap, as are pensioners.

We know that nationally 45% of households affected by the cap have been in London. In Surrey, the County Council and our partners, including District and Borough Councils, social housing landlords and advice bodies have taken a preventative approach to support residents to avoid the cap by providing support into employment and benefit advice.

In 2013/14, 298 households were affected by the benefit cap. Partners through the Surrey-wide welfare reform coordination group are currently compiling up to date figures in light of last week's announcement.

This Council will continue to work as One Team with our partners to support our residents affected by the Government's welfare reforms

MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS. SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

(15) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK: 3rd question

On 25 June 2015, the new Social Care Services Board considered an agenda item titled, "Ofsted Briefing and Update" which sought to provide the Scrutiny Board with an overview of the findings of the Ofsted report and the timelines for the improvement plans. This included a presentation and series of questions and answers tabled at the meeting.

Please can the Council confirm whether all public (as opposed to 'in private') agenda items tabled at other Council Committees/Boards are required to be published as amended report packs (as is the case for Cabinet reports) on the council website.

In particular, following this meeting please can the Cabinet Member confirm what additional budget and how many additional full-time social workers that Surrey County Council plans to deploy to reduce expenditure on agency staff and the high workload on existing staff, which appears to be a major factor contributing towards the Ofsted report findings.

Reply:

The main response to this question is articulated in the response to question 5. In addition, it is confirmed that public agenda items tabled at Council Committees or Boards are not required to be published as amended report packs. The Council's practice is to publish these papers with the minutes of the meeting.

We are always working towards recruiting permanent staff but still have a heavy reliance on locums due to regional challenges for Qualified Social Workers.

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING – 14 JULY 2015

MEMBERS QUESTION TIME

CABINET MEMBER UPDATES TO FULL COUNCIL

NAME:	Peter Martin
PORTFOLIO:	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Lead for Economic Prosperity

Development of the Enterprise M3 Growth Hub

Earlier this year, Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) launched a competitive bidding process to identify a supplier for their Growth Hub which will support businesses in the EM3 area.

Surrey County Council is a member of the successful consortium selected to deliver the Growth Hub. The partnership will be led by Business & Enterprise Group, a private sector company specialising in delivery of business support solutions, including the national helpline for the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills. The partnership also comprises:

- Aerian – developer of engaging and innovative business to business web portals and knowledge systems;
- Set Squared – a unique university collaboration providing access to the provision of innovation and growth services;
- Business South – a business engagement organisation, with an innovative Business Champion network providing SMEs (Small and Medium Enterprises) with mentoring services;
- Hampshire County Council.

The Growth Hub will offer two distinct services for businesses. Firstly, it will offer all businesses in the area the opportunity to access information, resources and suppliers on a wide range of business topics including skills, marketing, access to finance and international trade.

The second element of the Hub will be focused on high growth businesses with tailored advice on their growth plans and accessing specialist support to put them into effect including on developing new markets; product development; workforce planning and developing and accessing finance.

Implementation of the Growth Hub delivery model is currently underway, including recruitment of staff and engagement with key partners, such as the Chamber of Commerce, Federation of Small Businesses (FSB), Association of Learning Providers and enterprise agencies. The full service will be available from November 2015 with aspects of it coming on stream from July.

NAME: Mel Few

PORTFOLIO: Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence

Change in IMT systems

- A decision has been taken to move the current IMT system, known as AIS, to a new provider Liquid Logic
- The benefits of the new system are numerous including inter alia;
 - Same base system as currently used by the Children's Service;
 - It is an open system allowing interfaces with other systems, such as NHS;
 - It is a modern system used by other local authorities;
 - It opens the way to enable the front line workers to mobile working;
 - Places in a position whereby we will be compliant with the requirements of the Care Act.

Changes in legislation impose more demands on Adults Budgets

- Deprivation of Liberty (DOLS)
 - Following the Supreme Court decision on 19 March 2014, the number of cases requiring a DOLS assessment has risen from pre judgement of 57 to currently 3045.
 - This is an expensive process; the budget has been increased by £1.075m for this current year. To date, £426k has been received to offset some of the additional costs. A shortage of qualified assessors has inevitably led to a backlog of assessments and the service is actively recruiting for qualified "best interest assessors".
- Pension Requirements
 - New regulations require recipients of benefits paid by the service who employ carers or personal assistants to register for and pay contributions for their pension fund.
 - The Council will uplift benefit payments to compensate for this additional spend.

NAME: Denise Le Gal

PORTFOLIO: Business Services and Resident Experience

On 15 April 2015 East Sussex and Surrey County Council launched a joint public-sector partnership 'Orbis', to deliver business and support services to both authorities. This builds on the already successfully established partnership in Procurement where we have a joint head of service and also in joint Shared Services where the service is provided by what was formerly known as South East Shared Services.

Orbis is a transformative arrangement that will deliver affordable services to each council and deliver benefits to both parties. A savings target of 10-15% was reported to Cabinet earlier this year as the opportunity available from integration, from the adoption of common practices, technology and economies of scale.

As well as being a Partnership for East Sussex and Surrey we have the ambition to establish the Partnership as a "Compelling Alternative" for the wider public sector. This would mean that we would seek to bring on board other partners and customers in order to further increase opportunities through increased scale; lower cost of service provision to Partners and to ensure there is a sustainable and responsive public service ethos driven business infrastructure.

We are currently developing a Business Plan that will be taken to the Joint Committee (and then to both Cabinets) in October. The business plan will include the following:-

- 1) A new operating model for the Partnership (this is known as a Target Operating Model), including a detailed assessment of opportunities and implementation timeline in the HR service to give greater confidence for proposals in the other Partnership services, and identified target areas of scope for each service on where the integration opportunities should be explored and developed and areas where transactional services can be explored for moving into the transaction centre;
- 2) An updated business case;
- 3) A proposed timeline of activities for implementation of changes along with the savings profile;
- 4) A business growth framework for introducing new partners and customers.

The Joint Committee met for its inaugural meeting on 29 June 2015, where it approved the progress so far and the direction of travel.

NAME: Clare Curran

PORTFOLIO: Children and Families Wellbeing

Following the multi-agency inspection of Surrey County Council (SCC) and its partners (as part of the Surrey Safeguarding Children's Board) in October-November 2014 safeguarding improvement work was initiated. A SCC Improvement Board (with political cross-party membership) was established to oversee the response to the inspection findings.

Since the end of last year there has been a strong focus on moving quickly to make sure everything possible is done to protect young people. For example, to protect our children and young people from child sexual exploitation (CSE), alongside setting up a single CSE list of children deemed at risk, we have worked with partners to strengthen the systems and processes already in place and have a comprehensive staff training programme.

We have also set-up new multi-agency missing and exploited children groups across four areas of the county that will help to manage and oversee cases of children at risk of CSE and escalate those at high risk. They will share information and quality control our approach to tackling CSE.

In February 2015, we appointed a new principal social worker to independently oversee work being done on the frontline. There is now a specialist looked after children nurse in each of our four areas across the county.

Following additional investment agreed by Cabinet there has also been a strong focus on the recruitment and retention of Social Workers.

There is of course more work to do. This includes building on the priority improvements already made in order to achieve sustained and lasting improvements over the medium to long term, ensuring the required capacity and capability to deal with rising and changing demands.

This ongoing programme of safeguarding improvement will be focused on "getting to good" – and is itself one component of the overall programme of improvement and transformation being put in place across the Council's Children, Schools and Families Directorate.

The Council's Improvement Board will continue to oversee the work and the development of the Council's formal Improvement Plan which will be submitted to the DfE (Department for Education) and published by the deadline of 9 September 2015. The Improvement Plan will be finalised in partnership with Surrey Safeguarding Children Board.

I continue to welcome the input and support of all Members as we continue our work to improve our services and provide the best possible outcomes for children, young people and families.

NAME:	Mike Goodman
PORTFOLIO:	Environment and Planning

SWT

Surrey Wildlife Trust have agreed to the deadlines set by Cabinet for confirming the changes to the Agreement and producing a robust business plan for the Countryside Estate that will get us to zero annual contribution to its management by 2020/21.

The changes to the Agreement will be confirmed by the meeting of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board on 9 September 2015. In addition SCC will have in place the due diligence process for the property portfolio and a draft list of opportunities for investment and income generating on the Estate.

The current programme will be complete by the beginning of October to allow scrutiny by a Member Reference Group and to be reported to Cabinet in November for decision. Following this, the processes will be tested so that we are ready for the implementation of the new business plan in April 2016 as agreed with Cabinet in December 2014.

Local Transport Review

The Medium Term Financial Plan requires the Local Transport Review to make a saving of £2m. This is necessary as we continue to be subjected to severe financial pressures, requiring a review of the services we provide to our residents to ensure that they offer value for money.

On 23 June 2015, Cabinet approved proposals to change local bus services in Surrey that will deliver £840,000 savings in 2015/16, including over £300,000 in savings from renegotiating contracts. The proposals were also subject to scrutiny at the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board on 11 June 2015.

The project team has worked hard to reduce the number of residents affected by the changes. Iterative work with bus companies has resulted in only 160 passengers being impacted, a small number when compared to the 29.2 million bus passenger journeys undertaken each year on buses in Surrey. However, it is regrettable that any of our residents are affected and we will therefore continue to work hard to reduce the impact further.

The proposals were drawn up following two widespread public consultations in which thousands of residents and stakeholders had their say. We received over 6,800 responses to the first consultation and over 1,500 to the second. I am very grateful to everyone who had their say on the proposals. The feedback submitted in these consultations helped ensure that the council can make vital savings while maintaining the local transport services that residents rely on most. Work continues on refining the detail of the new bus timetables and we will be widely communicating this from mid July before the changes come into effect from 29 August 2015.

Turning to free concessionary travel for older people and disabled people, Cabinet agreed that the council should retain its policy to fund the two additional local

concessions in Surrey, ie free travel for disabled pass holders before 9.30am or after 11.00pm; and free companion passes.

Rail

Crossrail2 (CR2) is a priority with the Surrey Rail Strategy. We are completing an Options Assessment for CR2, building on a Baseline Report issued in April 2015. The objectives of this assessment are to identify the optimum configuration of CR2 services for Surrey and to provide an evidence base for providing input and response to the CR2 design development, and subsequent consultation process.

The assessment will also feed into the Surrey Infrastructure Plan / other infrastructure studies. The report will outline:

- Preferred options for the CR2 route will be identified;
- Recommendations on how released capacity on the SWML should be used;
- The most beneficial stopping patterns for CR2 and SWML services;
- Infrastructure modifications required to maximise benefits;
- Opportunities for new hubs or interchange points.

In terms of both stations and released capacity the county council and partners need to be satisfied that the final scheme is the optimal solution for the county; the scheme most likely to deliver economic and social benefits. To this end we are actively engaging with the scheme promoters.

A seminar for all SCC Members is to be scheduled for later this year, to help raise awareness and promote the scheme, whilst outlining the wider benefits to Surrey.

The **North Downs Line (NDL)** Assessment Study is complete and will be used to build upon and add value to the work being undertaken by the rail industry focusing on electrification. The work fed into Network Rail's Western Route Study and will feed into the DfT's High Level Output Statement for the next Control Period from 2019. The next key task is to turn the establish stakeholder forum (including the 3 LEPS) into a focused lobbying consortium.

The Further Devolution of Rail Services and the potential expansion of TfL's remit of over-ground rail services beyond the London boundary is subject to investigation by the London Assembly. The Cabinet Members addressed the London Assembly Transport Committee on this matter on 9 June, alongside Kent County Council and the rail industry.

NAME: John Furey

PORTFOLIO: Highways, Transport and Planning

Increased funding from gullies and drainage

I am pleased to confirm that the Local Committees have actively identified drainage improvements on the highway network, using their devolved budgets. It was suggested that Local Committees should aim to allocate 25% of their capital maintenance allocation (total value £500,000) in this manner, but most have chosen to exceed this amount. Further details on scheme specifics can be obtained from Richard Bolton on request.

Flood Risk Management

We are working closely with the Environment Agency and Boroughs & Districts to manage and deliver the Flood and Coastal Risk Management 6 Year Investment Programme within Surrey. The total investment in Surrey over the 6 year programme is currently £13.7m from Flood Defence Grant in Aid and £4.9m from the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee Local Levy. These figures do not include funding currently allocated for the development and delivery of the River Thames Scheme (RTS). There is now an opportunity to refresh this programme and to bring other schemes and studies forward. Through the Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board (SFRPB) we are identifying potential locations that may benefit from further investment.

We are supporting the Environment Agency to develop a number of major flood alleviation schemes in the County. These include schemes in Godalming, Guildford, Old Woking, Byfleet and Leatherhead and will require further contributions once the business cases have been approved and they move to the construction phase. We have also been supporting schemes to alleviate flooding in Whyteleafe as well as the development of the RTS.

In addition to this, we have developed a capital programme for addressing highway flooding "wetspots". Working with the Local Highway teams we have identified a number of locations that would benefit from capital works to improve drainage and reduce flooding. The headline figures are:

Wetspots	Number	Percentage
Active	363	34.6
Under Review	96	9.1
Resolved/Dormant	591	56.3
Total	1050	100

In April this year, we became statutory consultee regarding the management of surface water in planning applications for major developments. This role was previously carried out by the Environment Agency. We have been working with Local Planning Authorities to agree a process by which we are consulted and have produced guidance and advice that can be provided to developers. Where this advice may not be sufficient, we will be offering pre-application advice and the Planning and Regulatory Committee have agreed and approved the application of charges for this.

At the SFRPB meeting in June, it was agreed to review Surrey's Flood Risk Management Strategy with a view to bringing it up to date and making it more relevant to how we wish to manage flood risk over the coming years. It is envisaged that the revised strategy would be published in April 2016.

Restructure

Phase Two of the Directorate's new structure went live on 1 July. The changes made to Highways & Transport have focused on three key areas - stronger programme controls, improved communications and the empowerment of local decision making.

Changes to programme controls include increased resource and earlier programme setting with a "defined" window for requesting any changes. After "lock down" any change will move to the back of the queue, which means there will be no cascade of impact on the other schemes in the programme.

Communications with Members and residents has been brought back in house with an enlarged and dedicated team led by John Pateman. The team will ensure that communications across the service are joined up, consistent and timely, not only across the various programmes of work but also corporately.

The Area Teams have been strengthened and Highway Managers will be the face at Committee for most works. They have been given responsibility for more local works (drainage repairs, grass cutting etc) and are empowered to focus discretionary resources to tackle local priorities or concerns.

We are still recruiting to fill a number of vacancies, so will not be fully up and running in some of the new teams until we do. However [structure charts](#) with named officers to each filled post are available on the E & I pages of S-net.

NAME: Richard Walsh

PORTFOLIO: Localities and Community Wellbeing

CULTURAL SERVICES

Heritage Services summary of current projects–

Resident Experience: “Surrey in the Great War: A County Remembers” - a mass community research project commemorating the centenary of WW1, involving residents of every parish in the county is supported by a Heritage Lottery Fund award of £468,000.

Among many activities we are delivering two large scale community archaeology projects at Woking Palace and the site of the WW1 Army Camp at Witley Common (working with currently serving and ex-military personnel, and the Combat Stress charity).

Magna Carta 800th - delivering exhibitions, talks and educational events linked to the 800th anniversary of the sealing of Magna Carta – producing a touring exhibition via Libraries network, Magna Carta Study Day and Annual Lecture.

Volunteering – Heritage Services is supported by over 14,500 hours of volunteer time across all aspects of its work; Archives, Events and Education, Conservation and Archaeology.

COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND PROGRAMME TEAM

Repair and Renew Grant: Supported over 700 households and businesses that had experienced flooding in claiming a total of £2.6m for one off funding from central government under the repair and renew grant which the County Council administered on behalf of Defra. Whilst the scheme has now closed the County Council was successful in twice securing extensions from Government over the past 18 months to ensure that the maximum number of flood victims could access the funding available.

TRADING STANDARDS

I am delighted to say that our new joint Trading Standards service with Buckinghamshire was successfully launched on the 1 April 2015, on schedule and within budget.

We are already seeing benefits for residents and businesses of both counties, including sharing specialist staff and expertise, and as a result reducing costs. The new service will help us make an even greater contribution to achieving our corporate priorities.

Wellbeing and Resident Experience: The last three months has seen the successful fruition of several major investigations, generating very positive national and international media coverage. These have included tackling issues as diverse as potentially fatal cot-beds, a serial car “clocker”, large scale product counterfeiting, and a prolific doorstep rogue trader who targeted elderly and vulnerable residents across Surrey and defrauded them out of hundreds of thousands of pounds. One victim, an 89 year old war veteran was cheated out of £42,000, taking his savings, making him overdrawn for the first time in his life. Stopping rogue traders and

protecting vulnerable residents is a core priority for the new joint service. The new joint service, with pooled resources and expertise will enable us to be even more effective

NAME: Linda Kemeny

PORTFOLIO: Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement

While other local authorities have been slow to recognise that they still have a role to play in School Improvement and in ensuring the overall effectiveness of all maintained schools, the Council and its Education Partners, Babcock 4S, continue to maintain a School Improvement strategy delivering positive results in schools across the county.

Overall, 87% of Surrey children now attend a school which is rated by Ofsted as 'Good' or 'Outstanding', compared with 82% nationally and 80% in the South East.

A key focus of the Surrey School Improvement Strategy particularly in primary schools is narrowing the gap between low attaining pupils entitled to the support provided by pupil premium, and other pupils. This has been driven through our 'No Child Left Behind Campaign'. The impact is beginning to be seen in improved outcomes at most key stages. At all key stages, Surrey is narrowing the gap between disadvantaged pupils and that of all pupils nationally, although this is being achieved relatively slowly.

Schools are highly supportive of and engaged in this project. The culture of high expectations and no excuses for all is increasingly being embedded in schools. Schools are required to report on their websites about their use of pupil premium and Ofsted focuses on outcomes for disadvantaged pupils in their school inspection reports. This work is a continued priority for the next academic year. The focus as we move forward is to develop a workplan with all vulnerable groups, in particular:

- Disadvantaged pupils at Early Years regardless of the setting;
- Pupils who are both disadvantaged and have special educational needs;
- Looked after Children.

The risk assessment process for identifying schools includes alerts based on a range of measures for disadvantaged/vulnerable groups, and judgments regarding the school's capacity to develop effective inclusive provision for all learners. Babcock 4S works in partnership with schools to monitor and measure the impact on outcomes, and challenge schools where outcomes for vulnerable groups need to be improved.

'Primary Vision' in Surrey was created in 2010 through a collaboration between the Primary Phase Council, Babcock 4S, and Council officers, to challenge our cohort of almost 300 primary schools to raise overall performance, including that of vulnerable and disadvantaged children, improve partnership working between schools and with the local authority, and to encourage participation and engagement in the best primary education for all children in Surrey. Primary Vision in Surrey is being refreshed and re-launched in the Autumn term for 2015-2020, with the aim of securing an outstanding educational system for all primary children in Surrey.

NAME:	Helyn Clack
PORTFOLIO:	Wellbeing and Health

Magna Carta

On the 15 June 2015, the 800th anniversary of the sealing of Magna Carta by King John and the English Barons in 1215 took place on the meadows of Runnymede in Surrey in the presence of Her Majesty the Queen, HRH Duke of Cambridge, HRH Duke of Edinburgh, HRH Princess Royal, The Prime Minister David Cameron, the Archbishop of Canterbury Justin Selby, the Lord Lieutenant of Surrey, the Chairman of the County Council. Her Majesty unveiled a plaque to commemorate the occasion.

The Duke of Cambridge revealed the new art installation in the meadows 'The Jurors' a sculpture by Hew Locke, to mark the celebration with an English memorial to Magna Carta and met hundreds of Surrey Children and Volunteers who had come to mark the day. This was managed by a partnership of Surrey County Council and the National Trust.

I would like to particularly thank Susie Kemp and her team for the tremendous work and enthusiasm brought to the day resulting in a perfect commemoration. The event was also attended by the United States Attorney General who re-dedicated the American Bar Association Memorial.

Other events taking place over the weekend supported by Surrey County Council included a Charter Festival at Royal Holloway and the opening of the bronze medal winning Chelsea Flower Show Magna Carta Garden installation at the Runnymede on Thames Hotel in Egham.

Wellbeing and Health Launch of Physical Activity Strategy

- 40% of people who live in Surrey do not move enough to meet the health guidelines and it is the fourth biggest cause of disease in our population. A more co-ordinated approach is needed in order to change this.
- The Surrey Physical Activity Strategy was launched at the Surrey Youth Games 2015.
- The vision of the strategy is “by 2020, Surrey will be the most active county in England.”
- The priorities of the strategy are:
 - o Start moving – supporting all children and young people to have an active start in life.
 - o Move every day – encouraging all adults to build activity into their everyday lives.
 - o Stay moving – supporting older adults to live longer and more active lives.

- Headline key performance indicators (further indicators and reporting processes will be developed at the Surrey Physical Activity Conference, 2015):
 - o By 2020, achieve a 2.5% increase in adults being active for 150 minutes per week (Target 62.9%)
 - o By 2020, achieve a 2.5% decrease in adults not being active for at least 30 minutes per week (21.0%)
 - o By 2020, achieve a 2.5% increase in adults playing sport once per week (43.6%)

- The Surrey Physical Activity Strategy has been endorsed by the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board and the following Boroughs and Districts (at Councillor level): Elmbridge, Epsom and Ewell, Guildford, Runnymede, Surrey Heath and Woking. Awaiting confirmation from the others.

- Next steps:
 - o Detailed delivery plans to be developed Apr – Oct 2015)
 - o Surrey Physical Activity Conference (Oct 2015)
 - o Regular reporting by lead groups, to enable production of an annual report from the Active Surrey Board.