

## COUNTY COUNCIL

### COUNCIL MEETING - 13 OCTOBER 2015

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 13 October 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		Yvonna Lay
Ben Carasco		Ms D Le Gal
Bill Chapman		Mary Lewis
Helyn Clack		Ernest Mallett MBE
* Carol Coleman		Mr P J Martin
Stephen Cooksey		Jan Mason
Mr S Cosser		Marsha Moseley
* Clare Curran	*	Tina Mountain
* Graham Ellwood		Mr D Munro
Jonathan Essex		Christopher Norman
Robert Evans		John Orrick
Tim Evans	*	Adrian Page
Mel Few		Chris Pitt
Will Forster	*	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
Mrs P Frost		Denise Saliagopoulos
Denis Fuller		Tony Samuels
* John Furey		Pauline Searle
Bob Gardner		Stuart Selleck
Mike Goodman		Michael Sydney
David Goodwin		Keith Taylor
Michael Gosling		Barbara Thomson
Zully Grant-Duff		Chris Townsend
* Ramon Gray		Richard Walsh
Ken Gulati		Hazel Watson
Tim Hall		Fiona White
Kay Hammond		Richard Wilson
Mr D Harmer		Helena Windsor
Nick Harrison	*	Keith Witham
Marisa Heath		Mr A Young
Peter Hickman		Mrs V Young
Margaret Hicks		
David Hodge		

\*absent

### **58/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Coleman, Mrs Curran, Mr Ellwood, Mr Furey, Mr Gray, Mr Hussain, Mr Johnson, Mrs Mountain, Mr Page, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mr Skellett and Mr Witham.

### **59/15 MINUTES [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 14 July 2015 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

### **60/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- The untimely death of Councillor Robert Watts, Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council, in a house fire last weekend. She informed Members that she had written to Councillor Mark Francis, Mayor of Spelthorne, to express her sympathies.
- That Surrey County Council had been awarded the Defence Employer Recognition Silver Award for demonstrating and communicating the Council's supportive behaviour towards the Armed Forces. She presented the award to David Munro, the Armed Forces Champion for Surrey County Council.
- The Summer Reception for volunteers - more than 50 of Surrey's unsung heroes were recognised for their work within their communities. Each volunteer was presented with a certificate and a specially commissioned voluntary medal struck at the Pobjoy Mint in Tadworth.
- The appointment of a new Lord-Lieutenant for Surrey - Mr Michael More-Molyneux of Loseley Park replaced Dame Sarah Goad, who retired after eighteen years of dedicated service.
- That, earlier this month, she had taken part in the civic procession from the Guildhall to the Holy Trinity Church, Guildford for the annual service for the Judiciary in Surrey.
- She reported on the following Royal Visits to the county, which had taken place since 1 September 2015:
  - (i) HRH Duchess Gloucester visited King Edward's School in Witley;
  - (ii) HRH Duke of Gloucester visited the Archaeological excavations at Woking Palace, McLaren Technology centre and opened the new sixth form block at Glyn School;
  - (iii) HRH Princess Royal had visited the Rural Housing Conference hosted at Loseley Park and presented two Queen's Awards for Enterprise: one for Innovation, and one for International Trade to Hallmarq Veterinary Imaging in Merrow.

- University of Surrey, had been recently awarded two University of the Year titles by the Times and the Sunday Times, achieving top spot overall and also being recognised for Student Experience.
- That the resignation of Mrs Stella Lallement as a county councillor be noted. She informed Members that a notice of vacancy has been published on the Council's website.

#### **61/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]**

1. Mr Forster declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 (the motion standing in the name of Mr Robert Evans) because he works for a Member of the European Parliament.
2. Mr Essex declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 (the motion standing in the name of Mr Orrick) because he was a trustee of Furnistore, a reuse charity.

#### **62/15 APPROVAL OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR ABSENCE [Item 5]**

The Chairman said that the Council was requested to consider whether Mrs Clare Curran may continue to be absent from Council by reason of ill health, and on behalf of the Council, sent Members' good wishes to her.

It was:

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Mrs Clare Curran may continue to be absent from meetings by reason of her ill health until May 2016 and the Council looks forward to welcoming her back in due course.

#### **63/15 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 6]**

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Devolution – this was generally welcomed but the Leader was asked what opportunities would the public have to comment on the proposals and how would it be finalised before it was submitted to Government.
- That a significant amount of work would need to be undertaken to develop the governance arrangements for Devolution.
- Assurance was requested from the Leader that he would arrange for a cost benefit analysis, relating to Devolution proposals, to be undertaken, following his meeting with Greg Clark, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.
- Devolution should lead to increased efficiencies and value for money for residents and should be supported.

- That a £1.9m reduction of this year's youth service budget would have a detrimental effect on the provision of this service for young people.
- That Epsom had recently been named as the top town in the country for courtesy.
- A request for details of the formulation of the Devolution bid in relation to Local Enterprise Partnerships which spilled over into other counties.
- Whether the decision making process would become less transparent with Devolution.
- Could Devolution result in the County / Boroughs and Districts moving toward a unitary model for Local Government?

#### **64/15 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]**

Notice of 10 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix B.

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

**(Q1) Mr Robert Evans** asked the Leader of the Council whether he, or any of his colleagues, had any discussions with Surrey's Police and Crime Commissioner. The Leader referred Mr Evans to the first paragraph of his written response.

**(Q2) Mrs White** asked the Leader of the Council if he agreed that Government changes to planning laws would not help Surrey and requested that he write to the Prime Minister. She also considered that 'affordable housing' was still likely to be beyond the reach of key workers in Surrey. The Leader considered that the Government was right to encourage builders but said that he would raise the issue with the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government at his meeting with him later in the week.

**(Q4) Mrs Watson** requested that a survey of all County Council roads be undertaken so that all county roads were included on the asset register. In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding, the Leader agreed to ensure that the Cabinet Member was aware of her request.

**(Q5) Mr Kington** queried the response to the first part of his question because there was no direct link to the Ofsted reports or any search engine. The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience reiterated (as stated in her response) that she had asked officers to review the importance of clear and accurate tagging when putting information on the website.

**(Q6)** In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding, **Mr Selleck** asked the Leader of the Council why the County Council had recently received a cheque from Kier. The Leader agreed to make enquiries and to share the response with Members after the meeting.

**(Q7) Mr Essex** asked the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience if it was possible to publish what the cost of the introduction of the National Living Wage on the Council would be and whether Central Government could be asked to provide additional funding to lessen the impact of its introduction. The Cabinet Member said that the budget figures produced in November, as part of the Medium Term Financial Plan refresh, may include an estimate and she

confirmed that the Leader of the Council continued to lobby Central Government in relation to fairer funding for Surrey.

**(Q8) Mrs White** asked the Leader of the Council if it may have been financially prudent to appoint a new temporary Cabinet Member rather than a fifth Cabinet Associate Member. The Leader referred to the Scheme of Members' Allowances and said that he was satisfied with his decision to appoint an additional Cabinet Associate Member.

**(Q9) Mr Beardsmore** expressed concern about the timescales involved for re-negotiating SITA Surrey's contract with the Allington Waste for Energy Plant in Kent. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning said that he had nothing to add to his written response already provided.

**(Q10) Mr Essex** asked if the answer already provided to part of his question, before the meeting, could also be circulated to Members. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning agreed to this request.

### **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 was asked for her comments on the scrutiny process for Orbis at both East Sussex and Surrey County Councils and whether there would be political support for any possible difficult decisions.
- Flood Forums – a request for more information to be provided to local committees within the next three months.
- Community Recycling Centres and proposed changes to the service – a plea to 'keep it simple' in order to continue to increase recycling rates in Surrey.
- A request for information on the cost of fly tipping and how much of that cost was attributed to the County Council – it was agreed that this information would be provided outside the meeting. Also whether the numbers provided in the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning's update included waste tipped on private land - the Cabinet Member said that those figures would be impossible to determine. However, he advised Members that the County Council would be working with landowners and other key partners to develop a fly tipping strategy.
- Enterprise M3 Growth Hub and the impact in the Guildford area – concern was expressed that little was known about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), their decision making processes and what they do. The Deputy Leader referred Members to the LEP's website and confirmed that the County Council was working with businesses and institutions so that the partnership developed and would provide support to businesses across the Enterprise M3 area.
- MIPIM UK – a request for more information on this and whether Surrey was unique in being the only Local Authority taking part at this conference.

## **65/15 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]**

There were three local Member statements:

- Mr Robert Evans in relation to the bus provision in Stanwell Moor
- Mr Chris Townsend in relation to the Youth Service, Sure Start and School provision in Ashtead
- Mr Bill Barker in relation to Pigeon House Bridge, Wisley

## **66/15 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 Robert Evans moved the motion which was:

"This Council views with sorrow the on-going migration crisis on mainland Europe and expresses its deep regret at the tragic loss of lives and deeply distressing images that have resulted.

Surrey County Council notes that the international community has failed to come up with credible policies to manage this humanitarian disaster, but recognises that the UK has a proud history of offering sanctuary to those who are fleeing from dangerous and desperate situations in other countries.

Notwithstanding the economic pressures that Surrey is facing, Council resolves to work with its eleven boroughs and districts to support initiatives to help migrants who may seek refuge in the United Kingdom, and for the County to take its fair share of refugees.

Surrey calls on the British Government to ensure adequate funding and resources are made available to all local authorities involved."

Mr Robert Evans made the following points:

- That over 4 million people were now displaced and there was no end to this crisis and that each day, approximately 5000 people were still leaving Syria.
- Huge numbers of migrants were anticipated across the European Union this year, it could be up to 1 million people.
- The refugees were not just from Syria, they were coming from many countries including Iran and Afghanistan.
- Many people were fleeing from countries where the UK had some previous involvement.
- Britain / Surrey had a proud record of helping and some Surrey Boroughs and Districts were offering support to refugees.
- Reference to previous refugees crises where people had settled in Surrey and had played a part in life in the county.
- That there were 3000 empty homes in Surrey and this resource could help alleviate housing needs.
- The importance of Surrey making a statement on this issue and that the county would be willing to work with Government and Surrey's Borough and

Districts to offer help where possible but that he had no magic solutions to this crisis.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Hodge who thanked Mr Essex for allowing him to second this motion. He also made the following points:

- That all Members were appalled with the on-going recent migrant crisis.
- Surrey residents had responded with generosity and he believed it was right for the County Council to work with Government to help migrants.
- He was pleased that Government had committed to extend funding for Syrian refugees beyond one year and he hoped that there would be long term sustainable funding.
- The importance of working together to have a co-ordinated multi-agency approach to helping with this crisis.
- That Members and the public would receive regular updates on the County's response.
- Finally, he said that both he and the Conservative Group were happy to support this motion.

The Chairman informed Members that, as there appeared to be a general consensus that this motion would be agreed, there should only be a short debate on it and said that Mr Essex, as the original seconder of this motion, should be the only speaker. He made three points:

- The importance of being pro-active in dealing with the migrant crisis
- Reference to the detention centres near Heathrow and Gatwick and the unfair burden on the Councils in those areas
- Action was required and that he would like to see Surrey County Council joining with Kent County Council to assist them with the large number of refugee children coming to the UK.

Following Mr Essex's comments, the motion was put to the vote.

It was:

**RESOLVED (unanimously):**

That this Council views with sorrow the on-going migration crisis on mainland Europe and expresses its deep regret at the tragic loss of lives and deeply distressing images that have resulted.

Surrey County Council notes that the international community has failed to come up with credible policies to manage this humanitarian disaster, but recognises that the UK has a proud history of offering sanctuary to those who are fleeing from dangerous and desperate situations in other countries.

Notwithstanding the economic pressures that Surrey is facing, Council resolves to work with its eleven boroughs and districts to support initiatives to help migrants who may seek refuge in the United Kingdom, and for the County to take its fair share of refugees.

Surrey calls on the British Government to ensure adequate funding and resources are made available to all local authorities involved.

## ITEM 9(ii)

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

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

'This Council:

### Notes:

1. that the consultation on the future of Recycling Centres ended on 30th September;
2. that the consultation sought views on four options - charging for non-household waste disposal, reducing opening hours, closing some centres for one or two days, and closing some centres altogether but failed to include an option to reject all four;
3. that consequently the consultation was flawed since its conclusion could only favour one of four unacceptable options.

### Resolves:

to recommend to the Cabinet that all four options are rejected because the implementation of any one of them would lead to a significant reduction in service, adversely affect recycling rates and increase fly-tipping.'

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

- That, as part of the consultation process on the future of Recycling Centres, he had spoken to many local residents
- A belief that the options presented were flawed and may result in increased costs, partly due to increased fly tipping
- Currently, recycling rates were increasing but this could change if Recycling Centres opened for fewer hours and started charging for non-household waste disposal
- That many residents who had responded to the consultation had praised the Recycling Centre staff
- Introducing charges would cause some issues for staff, with residents possibly haggling over any charge being made and also that providing a credit / debit service would incur costs.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Cooksey, who reserved his right to speak.

Mr Goodman moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting. This amendment was formally seconded by Mr Harmer.

The amendment was as follows (with additional words underlined and deletions crossed through):

'This Council:



### Notes:

1. that the consultation on the future of Recycling Centres ended on 30 September;
2. that the consultation sought views on four options - charging for non-household waste disposal, reducing opening hours, closing some centres for one or two days, and closing some centres altogether but failed to include an option to reject all four;
3. that consequently the consultation was flawed since its conclusion could only favour one of four unacceptable options.

### Resolves:

to recommend to the Cabinet that all four options ~~are rejected because the implementation of any one of them would lead to a significant reduction in service, adversely affect recycling rates and increase fly tipping.~~ plus any other options that the Cabinet considers to be relevant are considered, before arriving at its decision.

During the debate, this amendment was further amended, with the consent of Council and point 3 was deleted.

The amendment was not accepted by Mr Orrick and Mr Goodman spoke to his amendment, making the following points:

- That this consultation had followed a similar process to that used in the Transport Review earlier this year
- The consultation had received over 4500 responses
- The County Council had invested several million pounds in some of the Recycling Centres
- Officers were currently reviewing the consultation information and would compile recommendations which would be shared with the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board before going to Cabinet in November for discussion
- That there may be a need for further consultation in certain aspects of the changes, as happened in the Transport Review
- Where other authorities had introduced changes to Community Recycling Centres (CRCs), it had not resulted in an increase in fly tipping
- A Surrey wide strategy to reduce fly tipping was being worked on and would be introduced
- Surrey had excellent recycling rates at its CRCs – in 2014/15 it was 64.1% and its kerbside performance was 54%, the fifth best in England and landfill at 6%, the 6<sup>th</sup> best in England
- Finally, he said that the County Council would never be complacent about this issue, would continue to work in partnership with Boroughs and Districts and urged Members to support this amendment.

Seven Members also spoke to the amendment and made the following comments:

- Discussion of the proposals at the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board would provide Members with ample opportunity to suggest changes

- Savings targets, as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan, needed to be met
- There was greater choice for household recycling at CRCs and the County Council should provide more investment for them
- Recycling rates had stalled
- Disposal costs for fly tipping were twice as expensive as planned recycling
- That the amendment would now include any other options that Cabinet considered relevant
- The County Council had some very good CRCs but some in the county had proved difficult to upgrade so the Council needed to commit to upgrading all its CRCs, although it was acknowledged that this could be very challenging
- There had been a long and constructive debate at the last meeting of Surrey Waste Partnership. However, concerns about possible fly tipping issues had been raised by Boroughs and Districts.
- The amendment was counter-productive and there were concerns about less recycling and the 'knock-on effect' of increased costs for Boroughs and Districts
- The reason for the consultation was to make £1.8m savings
- Some CRCs may be closed but to date there had been no indication which ones were vulnerable.

The amendment was put to the vote with 48 Members voting for and 16 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

Two Members spoke on the substantive motion before it was put to the vote with 50 Members voting for it. 15 Members voted against it and there was 1 abstention.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

'This Council:

Notes:

1. that the consultation on the future of Recycling Centres ended on 30 September;
2. that the consultation sought views on four options - charging for non-household waste disposal, reducing opening hours, closing some centres for one or two days, and closing some centres altogether but failed to include an option to reject all four;

Resolves:

to recommend to the Cabinet that all four options plus any other options that the Cabinet considers to be relevant are considered, before arriving at its decision.

### **ITEM 9(iii)**

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

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

'This Council notes with significant concern the most recently released road injury statistics for 2014 showing that:

- (i) The number of people killed or seriously injured on Surrey's roads increased by 23% from 2013 (up from 599 to 735) – the third worst performance of any police force area across England and Wales.
- (ii) The number of casualties on Surrey's roads has increased in 2014 compared with 2013 as follows:
  - Total road casualties increased by 3.5% from 5,223 to 5,408.
  - Fatal injuries more than doubled (111% increase) from 18 to 38.
  - Serious injuries increased by 20% from 581 to 697 - the highest number since at least 2005.
  - The number of children injured on Surrey's roads grew by 14% from 305 to 348.
  - The number of car occupants killed or seriously injured (KSIs) increased by 36% to 268 - the highest figure since 2008.
  - Cyclists KSIs increased for the sixth consecutive year by 14.5% to 166.
  - Pedestrians KSIs remained at 98 for a second year running - the highest number since at least 2005.
  - Motorcyclists KSIs increased by 32% to 185 to reach the highest recorded numbers since at least 2005.

In the light of Surrey's adverse and worsening road safety record, this Council requests the Cabinet to give a much higher priority to improving road safety including more funding for services such as Drive SMART, road safety outside schools and highway improvements, and establish a Road Safety Task Group in order to reduce the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on Surrey's roads.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Beardsmore.

Mr Forster made the following points:

- Highlighted the statistics, as detailed in the motion
- The increase in the number of children injured on Surrey's roads
- That many residents had contacted him since he had submitted this motion
- Surrey County Council was not doing enough to improve road safety on its roads
- The increased number of road casualties in 2014, in the South East
- Proposal of a Road Safety Task Group to enable a step change to reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured in Surrey
- Promotion of cycling and walking was important and therefore he considered that this motion was good for safety, health and the environment.

Mrs Hammond moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting. This amendment was formally seconded by Mr Harmer.

The amendment was as follows (with additional words underlined and deletions crossed through):

'This Council notes with significant concern the most recently released road injury statistics for 2014 showing that:

(i) The number of people killed or seriously injured on Surrey's roads increased by 23% from 2013 (up from 599 to 735) – the third worst performance of any police force area across England and Wales.

(ii) The number of casualties on Surrey's roads has increased in 2014 compared with 2013 as follows:

- Total road casualties increased by 3.5% from 5,223 to 5,408.
- Fatal injuries more than doubled (111% increase) from 18 to 38.
- Serious injuries increased by 20% from 581 to 697 - the highest number since at least 2005.
- The number of children injured on Surrey's roads grew by 14% from 305 to 348.
- The number of car occupants killed or seriously injured (KSIs) increased by 36% to 268 - the highest figure since 2008.
- Cyclists KSIs increased for the sixth consecutive year by 14.5% to 166.
- Pedestrians KSIs remained at 98 for a second year running - the highest number since at least 2005.
- Motorcyclists KSIs increased by 32% to 185 to reach the highest recorded numbers since at least 2005.

~~In the light of Surrey's adverse and worsening road safety record, this Council requests the Cabinet to give a much higher priority to improving road safety including more funding for services such as Drive SMART, road safety outside schools and highway improvements, and establish a Road Safety Task Group~~

(iii) Though acknowledging the need to place 2014 data into the context of long term improvement.

This Council requests that the Drive Smart Board consider the 2014 data alongside the previous years' data and any other National information available, including the current 2015 data, in order to make recommendations to the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board as to how best to promote road safety in a holistic way, in order to reduce the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on Surrey's roads.'

The amendment was not accepted by Mr Forster and therefore Mrs Hammond spoke to her amendment, making the following points:

- That there had also been increases in casualties in other counties, although she acknowledged that every fatality or serious injury was a tragedy
- Uncertainty why there had been a comparatively large increase in the number of fatal / serious collisions in Surrey in 2014

- Analysis undertaken by the Department for Transport suggested a number of contributing factors including: (i) the effect of adverse weather, (ii) general increase in cycling participation especially in Surrey, following the success of the Olympic cycle races, (iii) random fluctuations in road safety statistics from year to year
- Emerging data was suggesting that the number of road casualties in 2015 would be much less than in 2014 but this still left no room for complacency
- Continued need to support road safety campaigns such as Safe Drive Stay Alive
- The Drive Smart Board had already considered the casualty data and commissioned and funded a media and publicity campaign on cycling safety.

Ten Members also spoke to the amendment and made the following comments:

- The necessity of reviewing safe routes to schools, including lower speed limits at school crossing points
- Congestion and its impact on Surrey's roads
- Obesity
- Drivers' use of Surrey's roads – there should be zero tolerance to going through red lights and speeding
- Footpaths should be regularly cleared to enable safer walking routes
- Elimination of inconsiderate parking outside schools
- Promotion of the safety campaigns, including wide dissemination of Drive Smart videos, particularly for young drivers
- Enforcement and the lack of officers to do it
- Many of these issues were matters for local committees
- Difficulty of recruiting school crossing patrol staff
- Drive Smart Board was not a decision making body, the responsibility for Road Safety sat with the Cabinet and the Council should be giving road safety a higher priority and not relying on the Drive Smart Board
- Signage encouraged slower driving
- A need to look at the statistics over the last 20 years, which showed a dramatic improvement, rather than just one year's data
- Utilising the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board to consider how best to promote road safety was a better option than establishing a Road Safety Task Group.

The amendment was put to the vote with 46 Members voting for and 18 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

Three Members spoke on the substantive motion before it was put to the vote with 46 Members voting for it. 16 Members voted against it and there were 2 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

This Council notes with significant concern the most recently released road injury statistics for 2014 showing that:

- (i) The number of people killed or seriously injured on Surrey's roads increased by

23% from 2013 (up from 599 to 735) – the third worst performance of any police force area across England and Wales.

(ii) The number of casualties on Surrey's roads has increased in 2014 compared with 2013 as follows:

- Total road casualties increased by 3.5% from 5,223 to 5,408.
- Fatal injuries more than doubled (111% increase) from 18 to 38.
- Serious injuries increased by 20% from 581 to 697 - the highest number since at least 2005.
- The number of children injured on Surrey's roads grew by 14% from 305 to 348.
- The number of car occupants killed or seriously injured (KSIs) increased by 36% to 268 - the highest figure since 2008.
- Cyclists KSIs increased for the sixth consecutive year by 14.5% to 166.
- Pedestrians KSIs remained at 98 for a second year running - the highest number since at least 2005.
- Motorcyclists KSIs increased by 32% to 185 to reach the highest recorded numbers since at least 2005.

(iii) Though acknowledging the need to place 2014 data into the context of long term improvement.

This Council requests that the Drive Smart Board consider the 2014 data alongside the previous years' data and any other National information available, including the current 2015 data, in order to make recommendations to the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board as to how best to promote road safety in a holistic way, in order to reduce the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on Surrey's roads.

## **67/15 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]**

The Leader presented the Report of the Cabinet meetings held on 29 July and 22 September 2015. Members had an opportunity to comment on the report.

### **Reports for Information / Discussion**

The following reports were received and noted:

- Annual Report of the Shareholder Board
- Quarterly report on decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 July – 30 September 2015

### **RESOLVED:**

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 29 July and 22 September 2015 be adopted.

**68/15 APPOINTMENT OF A VICE-CHAIRMAN OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 11]**

**Vice-Chairman of Education and Skills Scrutiny Board**

It was:

**RESOLVED:**

That Mrs Moseley be appointed as Vice-Chairman on the Education and Skills Scrutiny Board for the remainder of the council year 2015/16.

**69/15 PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE [Item 12]**

Mr Hodge, as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee introduced the committee's report.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Constitution be amended to institute a formalised arrangement for the appointment of senior managers to the Orbis Joint Partnership, where Surrey County Council is the authority paying for the post, to allow a Member of East Sussex County Council to sit on and participate in the Appointments Sub-Committee as a co-opted Member without the ability to exercise voting rights.

**70/15 AMENDMENT TO SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015 - 2016 [Item 13]**

This item was withdrawn and will be brought back to the next County Council meeting in December.

**71/15 CONSTITUTION UPDATE REPORT [Item 14]**

This report sought Council's approval for changes to the Scheme of Delegation relating to a change in name for the Surrey Pension Fund Board (now to be known as the Surrey Pension Fund Committee). Also, in line with Article 6.04 it also formally reported the appointment of a new Cabinet Associate.

Mrs Watson wished it to be noted that she was opposed to an additional Cabinet Associate post because she considered Cabinet Associates were an unnecessary, additional expense to the Authority.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the changes to the Constitution regarding the name change of the Surrey Pension Fund Committee (formerly known as the Surrey Pension Fund Board) be approved.
2. That the appointment of a new Cabinet Associate by the Leader of the Council be noted.

**72/15 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 15]**

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

[Meeting ended at: 12.50pm]

---

**Chairman**



**Leader of the Council's Speech to County Council  
13 October 2015**

Madam Chairman, when I speak to local residents, one of the questions they ask me is:

We work hard, we pay our taxes so what do we get from the Council in return?

As Councillors, it is a question that we all have at the forefront of our minds especially when times are tough because we have a duty to make every pound count.

Since the economic crash, public services have become leaner, more transparent and more accountable and rightly so. We have had to ask ourselves tough questions about what we do, how we do it and how can we continue to change and find new savings.

In a recent speech the Prime Minister outlined his vision for a smarter state:

- where we spend less and deliver more.
- guided by the insights of successful businesses.
- underpinned by 3 key principles – reform, devolution and efficiency.

It is a vision that I share for Surrey. I want to use my speech today to demonstrate how this Council is already working towards realising this shared vision and how Government and local councils can work smarter together.

Starting with the first principle of reform. The Prime Minister suggests that reform is essential in a smarter state and it is something that we have long embraced here in Surrey. Whether it is introducing new providers or promoting new ways of doing things, we have never shied away from change where we can see benefits for our residents.

Take our Youth Services as an example. Back in 2009, Garath Symonds, Assistant Director for Young People approached Members with plans to reform youth work in the county. These plans were far-reaching and ambitious. We considered the options, assessed the benefits and risks and took the decision needed.

What have we seen since?

- The number of young people that are not in education, employment or training down to just 1.7%
- The number of apprenticeships up by 12%, bucking the trend across the rest of the country
- The number of first time entrants to the youth justice system down to the lowest rate in the country

And all this whilst saving £4.7m and we are set to save another £1.9m this year.

Proof that it can be done. improving lives and saving money, delivering more for less.

The Government has said it wants us to do more of this. I believe we can but only if we work smarter together.

Let me give you another example. Some of the transformation work we have done so far has only been possible through applying for funding from Government but access to this funding is complex, involving too many hurdles, too much bureaucracy and too many Whitehall departments.

I believe that a smart state requires a single pot of transformation funding which would ensure that money is spent where it is needed. It is an idea that we have put forward as part of our devolution prospectus. Devolution is the Prime Minister's second principle.

The Prime Minister states that money spent closer to people is often money spent wiser and I could not agree more. As part of its spending review preparations in July, the Government invited local areas to submit their ideas for Devolution deals. It set an ambitious deadline for their submission – 4 September - just a matter of weeks and in peak holiday period. Of course, with such a tight timeframe to develop a proposal, it would have been tempting to put this in the 'too difficult' category, and some did, but this Administration could not allow Surrey residents to miss out on all the opportunities that Devolution holds.

That is why we have worked around the clock this summer – to put forward a Devolution prospectus with East and West Sussex, under the name of 3 Southern Counties. This is a partnership not just between the 3 County Councils but also with all 23 District and Boroughs across the area, the three Local Enterprise Partnerships, 12 Clinical Commissioning Groups and the Police, and that is just for starters.

Our offer to Government is simple:

Work with us, invest in us, we will increase productivity and embed strong economic growth.

Growth that not only reaps benefits for hard working local residents and businesses in Surrey but also for London, the wider South East and for the UK as a whole. That is why the Chancellor's announcement last week that all business rates will come to Councils is so welcomed. We must wait to see the details but the principle of allowing Councils to take control of the levers for local growth is fantastic news.

As I have said before in this Chamber - in Business, you always 'back your winners' - by investing in your most successful product line or branch, with the profits supporting the business to grow. That is real business sense. We need to apply that real business sense to the delivery of public services too.

The Government is expected to say more about how it will be taking forward the Devolution proposals in next month's Spending Review. I am proud of the prospectus that we have put in. Feedback from Government has been positive and just yesterday, we received a letter from Greg Clark, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, inviting us to discuss our ideas further with his team.

And finally, the third principle – Efficiency

Improving efficiency is something that I am personally passionate about. Here in Surrey,- we recognised early into the financial crisis that we needed to do things differently if we were going to meet the challenges ahead. That is why one of my first actions as Deputy Leader was to launch a programme of Public Value Reviews – looking at every single service in the Council and understanding how we could deliver more for less. Through those reviews we identified savings of £239m by improving and changing how we did things, a fantastic result!

However, we did not stop there, rather than treating this as a one-off exercise, we have made delivering efficiencies part of our business as usual and that is why, over the past five years, we have saved £329m and we are set to save £67m this year.

Whilst we have been successful in making efficiencies, we are of course faced with some significant pressures too:

- more and more children needing a school place
- more elderly people requiring care
- roads - getting busier and more congested each year

These pressures are beyond our control and add huge burdens to our budget. The cost of providing school places alone is estimated at £285m over the next 5 years. That is equivalent to an extra 2% on council tax bills for the next 40 years.

I know that the government is looking at the local government finance funding system as part of the Spending Review and I have raised our concerns with Greg Clark. I am keen to work with Whitehall to tackle this issue and I believe that we have some workable solutions which would allow Councils to provide the services that residents need, whilst at the same time supporting further efficiencies.

So, to conclude:

- This Council supports the Prime Minister's vision for a smarter state.
- This Council already uses business insights
- This Council has proven we can deliver more for less.
- This Council is ready for Devolution.

But the simple truth is that we have more children, more older people, more people with learning difficulties and if we are unable to support them effectively, it could have a catastrophic impact on our health and police services.

So my message to Government is simple:

- Work with us to continue to work smarter in partnership,
- Trust us with devolution agenda
- Work with us to find solutions to the considerable demand led challenges we face.

That way we can continue to be a smarter Surrey, leading the way in a smarter state for the benefit of many.

**David Hodge, Leader of the Council**  
**13 October 2015**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**TUESDAY 13 OCTOBER 2015**

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

**MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

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

What discussions have taken place with Surrey's Police and Crime Commissioner regarding the possibility of him taking joint responsibility for both the Police and the Fire and Rescue Services?

**Reply:**

Under current legislation it is not possible for the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to take on the responsibilities of the local fire and rescue authority and I have not had any discussions with Surrey's PCC regarding this matter.

On 11 September 2015, Government published a consultation looking at ways to enable closer working between emergency services. One of the proposals under consideration in the consultation is whether Government should remove this barrier and legislate to enable Police and Crime Commissioners to take on the responsibilities of the fire and rescue authority in their area which can be implemented if there is a good case and local will for this to happen.

The Council will be responding to the consultation, and the Resident Experience Board (which Mr Evans is a member of) will have the opportunity to feed into this response at their meeting on 16 October 2015.

**MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

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

In view of the difficulties this Council has in recruiting staff, especially in the areas of social care, and the impact of high housing costs on people living in Surrey and their children, would you agree with me that there is an urgent need for a house building programme in the county of affordable housing both to rent and to buy? Would you tell Members what actions this Council is taking in partnership with Districts and Boroughs across Surrey to identify the need and to help to meet it?

**Reply:**

We have invested in a raft of measures over the last two years and continue to refresh this on a regular basis. Initiatives include a Social Work Academy, new Career Grade for Children's Social Workers, a nation-wide recruitment campaign for Assistant Team Managers and experienced Social Workers (currently on-going), help with resources for new workers who move into Surrey to help them settle in.

And the latest initiative is a “Refer a Friend” scheme which pays a modest finder fee to anyone who refers someone to work for Surrey as a social worker or occupational therapist (OT).

As regards help with housing, there are a number of government “Help to Buy” initiatives, as follows:

- Shared ownership: new-build and re-sales
  - Maximum household income of £60,000 (up to £85,000 for London area)
  - Normally first time buyers
- Rent to buy: rent 20% below market value with option to move to shared ownership
  - Maximum household income of £60,000

Priority to existing serving forces and social housing tenants or those with a local priority

- Equity loans: 5% deposit, 20% Govt equity loan, 75% mortgage
  - New build only
  - Maximum house price of £600,000
  - Not just first time buyers

Other support we are currently exploring is as follows:

For new staff appointments re-locating to the area:

- Signposting to access private rented sector options
- Affordable rent options
- Help with rental deposit/first month’s rent due before salary payment
- Further help with childcare costs e.g. nursery deposits
- Additional support for overseas/long range candidates
- Partnership with local estate agents and Registered Providers (RPs)
- Encouraging staff to buy/access long tenancies in the area as then more likely to stay with Surrey
- Temporary short term options to support short term project work and specialist locums
- Engaging regularly with local Boroughs and Districts to encourage them to recognise the need for affordable housing for public sector staff who provide public services to local communities in their housing policies and local plans
- For developers and registered providers to see public sector staff as good targets for successful mixed use developments
- Promoting existing help to buy schemes through recruitment and internally

The devolution prospectus for the Three Southern Counties identifies that one of the major contributors to the economy of the area realising its full potential is to increase housing delivery and land supply and in particular to address the need for affordable

and starter homes. The rationale is precisely to enable more people to move into jobs that use their skills and to live close to where they want to work. We expect that housing will be a priority issue in the devolution discussion with Government.

**MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**(3) MR IAN BEARDSMORE (SUNBURY COMMON & ASHFORD COMMON)  
TO ASK:**

Have the Surrey Leaders' group discussed housing supply and demand issues anytime in the last two years either in Surrey generally or in Spelthorne, specifically?

**Reply:**

Surrey Leaders have discussed housing supply on a number of occasions in the context of a strategic approach to planning for Surrey as a whole. There have been no discussions relating to individual boroughs.

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

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

I understand that there are gullies throughout Surrey that are not recorded on the County Council's asset register and are therefore not emptied as part of the cyclic gully cleansing programme. Will the Cabinet Member give a commitment that all drains and gullies on County Council roads will be identified and included on the asset register and thus included in the cleansing programme contract by 31 March 2016?

**Reply:**

Surrey has over 169,000 recorded gulley assets which are all programmed to be regularly cleaned. The programme is designed to clean those gullies prone to blockages more frequently and provides an appropriate level of cleaning to those gullies that do not get blocked, thereby using resources efficiently. Whilst we are confident that the vast majority of the gulley asset is known to us and included on the cleaning programme, it is perhaps un-surprising on an asset of this scale that we continue to identify new gullies on the highway network that haven't previously been cleaned. These are identified through two principle routes. The contractor is expected to record and clean any missing gullies found within roads included on the programme as part of their cyclical cleansing works. However, on the rare occasion that a road is found to be missing entirely from the cleansing programme, the Local Highways Team have a gulley machine made available to them that enables these assets to be mapped and cleaned. Once recorded, the assets are automatically included in the normal cyclical cleansing programme and will receive regular cleans thereafter.

It is important that any concerns about missing or blocked gullies are reported to the Local Highways Team, who will investigate and take appropriate action to ensure that the gullies are included in the cyclical programme. I am aware that concern has been expressed about several roads in the Dorking area, and these are expected to be attended to by the Local Highways Team. As identification of missing assets is

dependent upon them being raised through either of the routes described, I am afraid that no guarantee can be given that all assets will be included in the cleansing programme by the end of March 2016.

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

### **(5) MR EBER KINGTON (EWELL COURT, AURIOL & CUDDINGTON) TO ASK:**

In September, a resident contacted me and asked for a copy of the recent OFSTED Reports published in June and August which focussed on Children's Services and the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board. I visited the website in order to provide him with a link and typed the following into the search engine:

- Ofsted
- Ofsted Inspection
- Ofsted Inspection of Children's services
- Children's Services Ofsted Inspection
- Children's Social Care Ofsted Inspection
- Child Protection Ofsted Inspection
- Safeguarding Ofsted Inspection
- Surrey Safeguarding Children's Board
- Ofsted Inspection of Safeguarding

None of the searches took me direct to these major Ofsted Reports. Any mention of Ofsted took me to factual information on OFSTED's work and role, or educational information, or pages of listed items which contained one of the words I had typed in the search engine. In the end I abandoned my search.

I contacted the Surrey County Council (SCC) Web Team who, after their own search, confirmed that there is no direct link to the Ofsted Reports or any search engine access.

I was referred to the Communications Team who provided me with a link to the relevant pages but were not sure why the search does not come up with these links.

1. Would the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience agree with me that, for a Council committed to openness and transparency, this a serious failing in regard to the public accessibility of key information on a major public concern?
2. Would she also clarify with the Service Communications Teams that create content for the website the importance of tagging their pages with relevant keywords to ensure accurate search results?
3. Would she also arrange for a review of the front page of the website so that, alongside the dedicated sections directing residents to the most popular requests and pages, there is also a section on the most important and current service issues engaging the public, the Council and the media, with direct links to the relevant information?
- 4.

**Reply:**

1. Surrey County Council is committed to being completely open and transparent. A link to the Ofsted Report and the subsequent action plan have been sent to over 200 individuals including all Members, districts and borough leaders and chief executives, MPs, all schools in Surrey including independent schools, health and police contacts, the Health and Wellbeing Board, Safeguarding Board, Care Council, DfE, Ofsted, unions, chairs of governors and Further Education Colleges. It was also sent to Surrey media.

A wide range of channels have been used to communicate the report and action plan including Communicate (Surrey Members), Children's Schools and Families newsletter, Issues monitor (internal and external readers), Chief Executive's weekly email to the whole organisation and Schools Bulletin and the website.

There is a dedicated page on the County Council website including the report, action plan and improvement programme in the social care and health section. There is also a page under children's social care, "Children's social care Ofsted inspections 2015". If Ofsted or Ofsted Report is entered in the search it is clearly accessible as the third search result.

2. I will ask the appropriate officers to re-emphasise the importance of clear and accurate tagging when putting information on the website.
3. When designing web pages there is extensive testing and engagement with users to establish content and format of the pages, especially for the home page. We aim to ensure the information on the home page includes the most important and current service issues engaging the public, the Council and the media, with direct links to the relevant information. However, I will ask the web team to look at the way the home page information and signposting is structured to ensure more intuitive access to important information, such as Ofsted reports.

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

**(6) MR STUART SELLECK (EAST MOLESEY & ESHER) TO ASK:**

1. How much money did Kier pay to Surrey County Council in 2014/15 for underperformance against their set performance indicators?
2. How much money has Kier paid and how much money is owed to the Council for underperformance in 2015/16?

**Reply:**

Surrey Highways has not identified any significant underperformance issues with Kier contract in 15/16. In the last year they have delivered their key strategic objectives including:

- Project Horizon is on track with 50% of schemes complete and £7m savings delivered to date;
- Over 70,000 defects (mostly potholes) have been repaired in the last year, with over 85% repaired permanently within 20 working days of being reported;



- The 15/16 ITS programme is on track with 50% of schemes completed on-site and the majority on course to be completed by March
- The major transport improvement schemes in Redhill and Walton town centres have been completed on time, quality and budget expectations
- Winter gritting was delivered last year to standards and Kier are fully prepared for this year's winter programme
- New processes have been implemented for minor planned works and residents communications to improve overall delivery

To maintain operational performance, the Kier contract has two distinct control mechanisms:

#### **Task Completion Certificate:**

All schemes requested by Surrey Highways must have a formal written approval by an SCC engineer before the scheme invoice is paid. For all work funded by Local Committees this is approved by a local highways engineer, with any centrally funded schemes approved by a Works Delivery engineer. If the engineer is not happy with any element of the scheme they can withhold payment until quality issues are resolved. The contract allows the engineer to withhold 15% for snagging issues (such as signs not removed or minor defects), or 100% withheld payment if scheme has significant flaws. In the last 12 months approximately 5% of schemes have had their payment withheld, which is line with industry expectations. All issues have then been resolved to SCC satisfaction. Consequently there is no money "owed" to SCC as Surrey Highways does not pay any invoice until work is fully delivered to its satisfaction.

#### **Profit Allocation:**

Kier profit is paid separately from delivery of schemes. This ensures SCC senior management only approve Kier profit based upon achievement of 28 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). A monthly contract performance board, with equal representation from Local Highways and Asset Management, review Kier's monthly profit application. Based upon pre-agreed targets, the SCC board can award between 20% to 100% of Kier's monthly profit and overhead allocation. In the first quarter of this year, following board assessment, Kier achieved 76% of their available profit. The SCC Performance Board withheld the remainder due to failures in:

- a) Not permanently repairing damage to council property (caused by 3<sup>rd</sup> parties) within agreed timescales impacting on network condition
- b) Programming and communications issues impacting on resident experience of highways

The conclusions of the monthly performance board and overall delivery of Kier strategic target therefore indicate that Kier continues to meet pre- agreed SCC level of performance, However, as would be expected, there is always room for further improvement.

If you have any specific scheme or performance issues then please refer them to the Area Highway Manager. The Area Highway Manager cannot only investigate to confirm resolution but also informs the monthly Performance Board and consequently any identified ongoing performance issues would be reflected in any future profit assessment.

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

**(7) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:**

This question concerns Surrey County Council's assessment of the budget implications of the government's new "National Living Wage", particularly the costs of retaining the same level of staffing within social care provision in Surrey.

- Could you provide a breakdown of the number of people employed both directly by Surrey County Council and by companies contracted to Surrey County Council, by service area, who are currently paid below the new National Living Wage of £7.20 to be introduced from April 2016?
- Please provide a breakdown, again by service area, as to what the additional annual staff costs will be once the new £7.20 National Living Wage is introduced in the next financial year.
- As any increase in these costs has been required by changes to Central Government policy, could the Council assure its residents that the Council will be seeking additional funding from Central Government to meet these increased staff costs?

**Reply:**

The introduction of the National Living Wage, which was announced by the Chancellor in his first budget of a majority Conservative government, will significantly improve the pay of many workers in this country, and is an important part of the direction of travel to move the UK to a high pay, low tax economy. As has been widely reported in the press, this will have a significant impact on the public services, particularly providers of social care.

Currently the council's minimum grade point is above the national minimum wage of £7.20, and this is likely to be the case for a number of years. Therefore the council does not directly employ any staff under this rate. However, we are aware that some of our providers, especially in the area of social care may do so. We do not know the number of staff this will affect as we cannot know our suppliers pay rates for individual employees, nor their age. Remember the National Living Wage only applies to employees over the age of 24 years.

Officers have analysed the council's contracts with care providers to estimate the potential impact on the council, and used a model developed with other local authorities. On the basis of the key assumptions in this model, the council could be facing a multi million pound budget pressure from 2016/17, which would grow in future years as the national living wage rate increases. The council will continue to work hard to manage budget pressures.

**MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**(8) MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK:  
2<sup>nd</sup> question**

The Leader has recently appointed a fifth Cabinet Associate member. What is the additional cost per annum for this post and from which budget will it be funded? Does the Leader have any plans to appoint any more Cabinet Associates?

**Reply:**

As Members are aware Clare Curran, Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Wellbeing, is currently on long-term sick leave. Linda Kemeny, Cabinet Member for Schools, Skill and Educational Achievement has been covering Clare's responsibilities and I appointed Mary Lewis to the position of Cabinet Associate in order to provide temporary support for Linda. During this time, Mary Lewis will receive an allowance as per the Member Allowances Scheme agreed by this council, which will be funded from the same budget as existing allowances.

Given the importance of our Children's services and the need to provide strong leadership in order to drive improvements in this area, I trust that Members will agree that this is a prudent appointment.

**MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

**(9) MR IAN BEARDSMORE (SUNBURY COMMON & ASHFORD COMMON) TO ASK:  
2<sup>nd</sup> question**

Even after the completion of the Charlton incinerator there will still be a significant amount of Surrey's waste going to Kent for disposal. What is the long term solution for dealing with this waste?

**Reply:**

SITA Surrey's contract with the Allington Waste to Energy Plant in Kent expires in March 2019. Now construction of the Eco Park is underway we will work with SITA Surrey to consider what options might be available to deal with this waste following expiry of this contract.

**MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

**(10) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:  
2<sup>nd</sup> question**

1. Could you confirm how the Waste Budget item in the Surrey County Council Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) is currently split between:
  - (a) waste reduction, reuse, recycling, composting and anaerobic digestion, and:
  - (b) waste disposal, via landfill and incineration.

Please could you provide a breakdown of each of these numbers, including setting out how much is included within the annual sum paid through the long-term waste contract with SITA (Surrey Waste Management Ltd).

2. Could you provide a breakdown of the planned savings in each of year of the current MTFP on:
  - (a) waste reduction, reuse, recycling, composting and anaerobic digestion, and:
  - (b) landfill and incineration.

Please can you provide a breakdown of each of these numbers, including setting out how much is included within the sum paid through the long-term waste contract with SITA (Surrey Waste Management Ltd).

3. Could you confirm how much is planned to be saved through the consulted changes to the Community Recycling Centres across Surrey.

**Reply:**

Officers have already provided you with answers to your first question. With regard to your second question, savings are against the budget as a whole, not against these individual headings. For example much of the savings activities relate to working with districts and boroughs to increase the amount of material that is reused, recycled and composted. If this is achieved, our expenditure on reuse, recycling and anaerobic digestion will increase and our expenditure on landfill and incineration will decrease, resulting in an overall net saving. It is therefore not possible to provide a breakdown of these numbers.

With regard to your third question our savings plans include reducing the cost of running the CRC service by £1.8 million.

**MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME**

**CABINET MEMBER UPDATES TO FULL COUNCIL**

<b>NAME:</b>	<b>Peter Martin</b>
<b>PORTFOLIO:</b>	<b>Deputy Leader and Cabinet Lead for Economic Prosperity</b>

**Update on the Enterprise M3 Growth Hub**

Surrey County Council are part of the delivery partnership for the Enterprise M3 Growth Hub which will provide support to businesses across the Enterprise M3 area. The partnership is working towards a full launch at the Enterprise M3 Conference in November 2015. The Growth Hub will have two key elements:

- An online information portal, which will be open to all businesses, offering information, resources and suppliers on key business topics. The online service will be supported by the National Business Helpline.
- A dedicated growth service, which will support up to 200 high growth companies per year. This service will include support from an experienced Growth Champion, development of a detailed action plan and the use of expert resources.

Test trading is currently underway so that the partnership develops the service in a way that best meets the needs of businesses in Surrey and other parts of the EM3 area.

SCC is also working with partners in the Coast to Capital area to develop a bid for European Regional Development Funding for business support services. The Expression of Interest was submitted in September 2015, with the full application expected early in 2016.

**Visitor Economy Work**

Surrey County Council have provided a grant of £50,000 for the development of a new Visit Surrey website which will significantly enhance the way that the county can be marketed to potential visitors to help grow the value of the visitor economy. Alongside this investment the county council is working with Visit Surrey on a new business plan and enhanced collaboration with other organisations across Surrey with the aim of being better able to support their development plans.

**MIPIM UK 2015**

Surrey will for the first time have a stand at MIPIM UK (21-23 October 2015) and will showcase opportunities for investment in the county. MIPIM UK is the UK's largest exhibition and conference for property professionals. It provides a marketplace for UK and international investors to meet, discuss opportunities and do business.

MIPIM UK provides an opportunity to raise the profile of the county and market Surrey to a national and international audience. The Surrey team will include Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council, Spelthorne Borough Council, Runnymede Borough Council and Mole Valley District Council as well as a number

of Surrey businesses. A launch reception for Surrey's involvement at MIPIM UK is being held on 15 October at the Houses of Parliament for Surrey MPs, partners and private sector sponsors.

**NAME: Mel Few**

**PORTFOLIO: Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence**

As an update from the earlier report where additional pressures were placed on the service mainly Deprivation of Liberty (DOLS) and individual pension contributions, two new pressures have arisen due to changes in the law:

- Travel Time Directive
  - Travel time will now need to be included in the basic pay of employees who work from home.
- National Living Wage
  - The likely financial impact of this piece of legislation is to increase pricing pressure from providers such as Care Homes and Home based Care staff.

#### New IMT system for Adults. (Liquid Logic)

- The contract for the new computer system for the service has been signed and a team has been assembled to oversee the implementation with guidance and support from colleagues in the IMT service.
- Work is currently underway to ensure that all data to be transferred to the new system is updated and checked including ensuring that consent to share information, such as NHS numbers is obtained where such information is currently not on record.

#### Living and Ageing well awards

Nominations for the Living and Ageing well awards closed on 7 October and it is expected as for last year that there will be a number of well deserved volunteers who will receive their awards at the presentation on 18 November.

#### Co-operating with the library service

Under the requirements of the Care Act 2014, Adults Social Services have a duty to provide information and advice to all residents seeking such support. Too date in partnership with the Surrey Disabled Peoples Partnership (SDPP) information HUBS have been opened and operated by SDPP in nine local high streets across the County. The next phase in extending the provision of information to our elderly residents is currently being explored with the County's Library service to use Libraries to add to the locations where information can be provided to those residents seeking such advice.

#### Adults Contact centre wins a silver award and national recognition

The Contact Centre Adult Social Care Team had recently been short listed in the 'Government Services and Not for Profit' Category of the UK Customer Experience Awards. These awards recognise and celebrate best practice in the delivery and improvement of outstanding customer service. The submission was based on how the provision of information and advice is providing creative and personalised solutions to residents and meeting the requirements of the Care Act.

**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 & 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.

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, more detailed analysis has now be undertaken indicating savings of at least 12% are achievable by 2019/20.

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. To this end ongoing dialog has continued with two potential future partners.

Key achievements since July include:-

- The Business Plan has been developed and reviewed at the Joint Committee on 28 September. It has also been scrutinised within both sovereign authorities and by a joint scrutiny committee on 5 October.
- The Business Plan will go to Cabinet in East Sussex on 13 October and Surrey on 27 October.

Separately, Surrey has continued to develop its capabilities and the opportunity around its data centre and in the last quarter has secured provision of services to three districts and boroughs.



**NAME: Mike Goodman**

**PORTFOLIO: Environment and Planning**

### Rail

The three priority options identified in the 2013 Surrey Rail Strategy that have the potential to have a major impact in Surrey are Crossrail 2, the North Downs Line and access to airports. A scheme assessment for Crossrail 2 is due for completion in the next few days, the objectives being:

- To identify the optimum configuration of Crossrail 2 services for Surrey and the best use of released capacity; and
- To provide an evidence base for use when providing input and response to the Crossrail 2 design development, and subsequent consultation process.

This assessment work will inform our detailed response to a TfL led Crossrail 2 consultation in the autumn. It will also provide us with a clear evidence base that this Council can use when working with the scheme promoters on service routing, assisting us in the delivery of our agenda for growth and in lobbying government to increase capital infrastructure investment in the economic power houses of Surrey and London.

The Cabinet Member also addressed the Crossrail 2 Stakeholder Forum on 25 September. A Members' seminar on Crossrail 2 will be taking place in the Ashcombe Suite on 9 November 2015, starting at 10.30. At the session the scheme promoters will give an overview of Crossrail 2 and the project's ambition, followed by a presentation of the conclusions of our own assessment work, including the optimum configuration of Crossrail 2 services for Surrey.

### Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT)

The Review of the Agreement with SWT is nearing completion. SWT have produced a draft business plan that shows the budget reaching the nil contribution from SCC by 2020 and a programme of income generating plans to be worked up. The detail behind this is being checked by our Financial Team.

- Property Services have commissioned a report from Knight Frank which is still in draft but indicates that the plans now in place and the governance proposed will ensure that the property on the Countryside Estate is well managed.
- Indications from this report are that the Estate is currently in a reasonable condition for an Estate of its type and with further investment, as planned through the Business Plan, the Estate will not only improve but generate considerably more income.
- Early signs of the success of better joint working between SCC and SWT are the income generating plans that are being developed for the Estate to provide improved visitor facilities, for example, the improvements planned for Newlands Corner.

- The amended agreement will set out a clear process for producing the annual version of the rolling five year business plan and getting approval from the County Council as well as a new set of performance targets to give confidence that the Estate is being properly managed for the people of Surrey.

### Community Recycling Centres (CRCs)

Between 15 July and 30 September, the council undertook a public survey in relation to proposed changes to the service at our community recycling centres. A total of 4581 responses were received to the consultation. Details of the proposals and an analysis of the feedback received from residents will be considered by the EPEH board prior to cabinet decision. The consultation was advertised in the press, on social media and leaflets and posters were placed at libraries and council offices. Banners and posters were placed at the CRCs and paper copies of the consultation were also made available on request.

There has been particular feedback from residents asking why the questionnaire did not include a 'do nothing' option, particularly with regard to the question on whether we should either charge for non-household waste or not accept it. The reason this question was not included was because it was made clear that the purpose of the questionnaire was to deliver savings and a do nothing option would not deliver any savings. There were also concerns around the potential for an increase in fly tipping. In 2014/15 fly tipping accounted for 2,700 tonnes out of 572,000 tonnes of municipal waste and recycling collected in Surrey. Early indications in 2015/16 are that fly tipping may exceed 4,000 tonnes, which is a significant increase.

Officers will be carefully considering the results of the consultation and proposals to address the future provision of the CRC service, in the context of the requirement for savings to be brought to Cabinet in November.

I have, for some time now, been considering how we might strengthen our response to fly-tipping prevention and detection. Following discussions with the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey and district and borough council officers, I have tasked officers to bring forward a strategy, which will enable more effective working between key partners such as the district and borough councils, the Environment Agency and Surrey Police to deal with this crime which blights on our landscape.

I plan to bring forward a new strategy on fly-tipping later this year.

**NAME: John Furey**

**PORTFOLIO: Highways, Transport and Planning**

#### Contract negotiations with Kier

Senior highway officers are in the process of negotiating a four year contract extension to the Kier contract, enabling the contract to run its full term in April 2021. Negotiations are progressing well, with both parties agreeing solutions that can further enhance both the quality of service and reduce overall costs to Surrey tax payer. Negotiations are composed of 5 key objectives:

- (1) Commercial Value - exploring options to reduce overall costs and develop sub-contractors performance
- (2) Social Value - exploring options to improve Kier wider support for local suppliers and residents (e.g. apprentices, local employment)
- (3) Strategic Value - aligning Kier contract and culture to new SCC corporate objectives of Well-being, Economic Prosperity and Resident Experience
- (4) Business Integration - exploring opportunities to integrate structures, process and systems to reduce waste/inefficiency and improve resident experience
- (5) Level of Service Review - exploring opportunities to improve how reactive services (e.g. pothole repair) and planned works are delivered (e.g. improving programme management)

Officers are supported by a dedicated Member Task Group, composed of EPEH representation. Negotiations are expected to be concluded before the end of the year, with a final recommendation due to be submitted to Cabinet in February.

#### Recruitment campaign

Our high level recruitment campaign is now underway, recruitment specialists have been tasked with concentrating on our 'top twenty' priority roles. There have already been 2,000 hits on the website, and 40 applications logged to date. We are determined to ensure that staffing levels are at an optimum level at the earliest possible opportunity.

#### Asset Management Toolkit Consultation

Managing a highways network the size of Surrey is complex. The value of Surrey's highways assets is difficult to define, but if we had to replace everything it would have a Gross Replacement Cost of around £7.8 billion. To help us plan our maintenance work we need to understand the condition that is required to allow residents and service users to do what they need to do. To keep the network at a certain service level, for example the current condition, will cost more than £29 million per year over the next 15 years. However, this is not necessarily the level of services that Surrey requires.

We are in the process of developing a new Asset Management Strategy and to ensure it represents local needs and views we intend to undertake a member consultation. To do this we have developed a consultation toolkit which allows the user to choose and prioritise how we spend budgets across the different asset types (carriageways, footways, drainage etc.). The toolkit will also show the consequences of the decisions taken by describing how the asset condition will

change over time depending on the level of funding. The launch of the consultation will take place on 27 October when the use of the toolkit will be demonstrated to Local Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs.

### Flood Forums

Surrey County Council recognises the importance of building more resilient communities and to this end has been working in partnership with Districts and Boroughs and the Environment Agency to support approximately 55 flood forums and community resilience groups across the County. Flood forums present an opportunity for local residents to meet with risk management authorities and promote clearer lines of communication around flooding and drainage issues. To date, Surrey's participation and support for these groups has resulted in a number of positive outcomes including clearer lines of communication with partners including Thames Water, the Environment Agency and the County's Districts & Boroughs, and the resolution of local drainage issues thanks to the sharing of expert local knowledge between residents and agencies.

Outstanding areas which we consider support is required to local communities are: Central Guildford, Horley and Leatherhead.

£8,244,592 has so far been allocated in 2015/16 for the assessment and construction of flood alleviation schemes in Surrey by both the Environment Agency and the County. When complete these works will greatly reduce the risk of flooding for communities in the County.

### Winter Maintenance Packs

Members' winter maintenance packs will be available in County Hall pigeon holes from 13 October. This is essential reading in order that you and your residents have access to the arrangements in hand.

**NAME: Richard Walsh**

**PORTFOLIO: Localities and Community Wellbeing**

### Trading Standards

Our new joint service with Buckinghamshire, launched in April this year, has had a highly successful first six months. The new shared trading standards service is providing improved services for residents and businesses and is well on track to achieve our businesses objectives and income generation targets for the year.

Recent successes have included the rapid expansion of our “Primary Authority Partnerships” with businesses – supporting businesses growth, and providing confidence and certainty for businesses who trade regionally and nationally. We have seen a growth of 67% so far this year, increasing from 42 such partnerships in April, to 70 at the beginning of October.

Our enforcement work has continued to focus on protecting our most vulnerable residents, a central priority for the new service. In July a rogue trader and cowboy gardener who charged exorbitant sums for substandard work, preying on elderly and vulnerable victims who were unable to look after their gardens themselves, was convicted of numerous fraud and money laundering offences in relation to sums totalling £665,000.

In one case, a woman in her 90s who needed help with her garden and was charged £24,500 for work worth only £400. In another case £17,000 was paid for work worth £200. Victims felt too intimidated not to pay. Sentencing will take place on the 14 October and will be followed by a Proceeds of Crime application to use the trader’s assets to compensate his victims.

### Customer Services

**Resident Experience:** Our new Customer Promise is being used as a framework to improve Resident Experience and work is now underway to embed its principles throughout the organisation. The principles in the Customer Promise are being embedded into recruitment, induction, training and appraisal processes so that officers understand what is required and are recognised when they deliver excellent service to our residents.

**\*Customer Service Excellence:** A total of five services have now achieved Customer Service Excellence and a further nine services are working towards the standard. Customer Service Excellence is a framework which drives ongoing customer focused improvement and I think you’ll agree this is making tangible difference in Highways who started their journey in 2014.

**Tower Awards:** It’s important that we recognise and reward examples of excellent customer service, and I’d like to draw your attention to our latest Tower Award Winners. They include a Youth Worker at Shepperton Youth Center, a Library Assistant at Caterham Valley and Caterham Hill Library, and a Site Worker at Leatherhead Recycling Centre. If you’ve come across examples of excellent customer service, I encourage you to put forward a nomination – you can find the application form, as well as the winners’ stories, on the Surrey website.

**Contact Centre Adult Social Care Team:** I am very pleased to announce that the Contact Centre Adult Social Care Team has won national recognition at the UK Customer Experience Awards.

The team was recognised for providing excellent information and advice, and for finding personalised solutions to help some of our most vulnerable residents remain independent and safe. I'm sure you'll join me in congratulating the team for this excellent validation of the exceptional service they provide.

***\*For information***

***CSE achieved:*** Customer Services, Finance, Business Operations, Community Partnership Team, Highways.

***CSE in progress:*** Human Resources & Operational Development, IMT, Property, Adult Social Care, Democratic Services, Legal, Procurement, Libraries and Heritage.

**NAME: Linda Kemeny**

**PORTFOLIO: Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement**

### Schools and Learning

During the summer, our School Projects teams worked hard to have 3,579 new school places ready for the start of the Autumn Term last month: 2,534 new permanent primary places and 150 new permanent secondary places, and another 865 bulge places in primary and 30 bulge places in secondary, with only a few days' delay at one infant becoming a primary school.

A new School Admissions system 'Edge' developed with the University of Birmingham, was finally tested and installed over the summer and has been operating successfully. This will help streamline the process of allocating places in future, particularly those received 'in year' after the national closing dates for primary and secondary admissions, when waiting lists start to rise and fall as places are accepted and declined.

Initial results in Surrey at both KS1 and KS2 showed improvements over 2014, and at KS4, for 5+ A\*-C GCSEs including English and maths, there was a slight increase to 64.6%. The number of Surrey state maintained secondary schools has now risen to 55, with the opening last month of the Hoe Valley Free School in Woking, a 4 form of entry secondary school and the Cobham Free School Secondary Department, also a 4FE school which opened in September 2014.

Another new secondary school was announced for Surrey last month in the first wave of the Government's new free school programme, an East Surrey secondary school sponsored by the Glyn Learning Foundation, which will take the number of Surrey secondary schools to 57 by 2017/18.

### Special Educational Needs & Disabilities (SEND)

The number of children and young people with SEND is increasing while legislation introduced last year allows young people aged 19-25 with SEND access to continuing education if this is assessed to be beneficial. The national picture also reflects Surrey's experience of changing needs, especially more provision needed for Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD).

The Surrey SEND Governance Board, comprising representatives from Education, Social Care, Health, and Families, through a number of workshops and wider engagement over the past year, has been developing a vision, strategy and programme that helps respond to these challenges.

Four workstreams; Transforming the customer experience; Rebuilding the system around the customer; Reshaping our Local Offer; and Developing inclusive practice within schools and the wider community, are being managed with the aim of transforming SEND services and delivering our strategy of ensuring a positive experience of the SEND system for children, young people, and families. Significant investment in additional staff in the area quadrant offices will ensure that these new wider objectives can be met.

<b>NAME:</b>	<b>Helyn Clack</b>
<b>PORTFOLIO:</b>	<b>Wellbeing and Health</b>

### Health and Wellbeing Board

In September, the Health and Wellbeing Board sanctioned a significant revision of Surrey's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. Primarily, these changes will revolve around how the information in the JSNA is presented, for example, shorter and more accessible chapters as well as the adoption of a life course approach. In light of this, the Board has also agreed to make revisions to the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy which will be reviewed in September 2016 once work on the JSNA has been completed. In the interim, it has been agreed that the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy will be updated to reflect current data, membership and context before the end of 2015.

The Board's Communications Sub-Group is also in the process of co-ordinating efforts on two significant wellbeing and health campaigns in Surrey. These are the Stoptober campaign and the joint partners winter communications campaign. These are both national campaigns but have been adapted locally to meet the needs of Surrey residents. More information on the Health and Wellbeing Board and the communications campaigns is available on the Healthy Surrey website<sup>1</sup>.

Updates on the Better Care Fund have been provided to both the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Social Care Services Board. The Boards heard how the local joint commissioning groups are continuing to implement the Better Care Fund plans on the ground, some great examples of integrated care were showcased including integrated rapid response services and locality hubs. Surrey is surpassing targets in key areas including increasing dementia diagnoses, reducing delayed transfers of care and improving patient experience although challenges have been identified in reducing non-elective admissions.

### CCG AGMs

Over the past few weeks Surrey's CCGs have been hosting their AGMs. I was asked to speak at Surrey Heath CCG's AGM on 22 September which gave me the opportunity to outline my vision for the Health and Wellbeing Board detailing how it can continue to provide strategic direction for the integration of health and social care services in the county and provide a forum for engagement by residents, community groups and voluntary organisations. More generally, the AGMs have given me an opportunity to continue establishing strong relationships with those working in the healthcare community in Surrey, a process which I will continue by meeting with the Chief Executives of all of Surrey's hospital and foundations trusts over the next few weeks.

### Community Services Procurement

The Community Provider contracts commissioned by the Council in conjunction with the CCGs are set to expire over the next three years, Virgin Care and First Community Health and Care by March 2017 and Central Surrey Health in March 2018. North West Surrey CCG are leading on this process on behalf of the CCGs in Surrey in their capacity as lead commissioner for Virgin Care. The Council is



working closely with CCG colleagues to procure these contracts. The Council services particularly affected by this are Health Visiting, School Nursing, Sexual Health and First Steps along with some children's mental health services and paediatric therapies commissioned by the Children's Service. The overall value of the Community Health Service contracts over the course of five years is £500m.

### Health Visiting Services

On 1 October 2015 responsibility for commissioning 0-5 health visiting services was transferred from NHS England to Surrey County Council including an annual budget for commissioning these services of £13 million. Surrey Health Visiting services are key to supporting children and their families from the birth of that child up until they turn four years old. Working with children's centres, midwives, GPs and a wide range of family and early years support services, health visitors provide early intervention to help solve issues as they arise preventing the need for early help or more targeted services. The Public Health team have assumed responsibility for commissioning health visiting services on behalf of the Council which complements their commissioning of school nursing services and joins up commissioning services for children under 5 years old with those for 5-19 year olds. As contracts for the three providers currently delivering health visiting services in the county approach renewal, Public Health will plan appropriate steps to ensure that interdependencies with existing services are fully considered during the re-commissioning process.

Healthy Surrey website (2015) <http://www.healthysurrey.org.uk/>