

COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING - 8 DECEMBER 2015

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 8 December 2015 commencing at 10.00 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Sally Marks (Chairman)

Nick Skellett CBE (Vice-Chairman)

*	Mary Angell	David Hodge
	W D Barker OBE	Saj Hussain
	Mrs N Barton	David Ivison
	Ian Beardsmore	* Daniel Jenkins
	John Beckett	George Johnson
	Mike Bennison	Linda Kemeny
*	Liz Bowes	Colin Kemp
*	Natalie Bramhall	Eber Kington
	Mark Brett-Warburton	Rachael I Lake
	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	Karan Persand
*	Mrs P Frost	Chris Pitt
*	Denis Fuller	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
	John Furey	Denise Saliagopoulos
	Bob Gardner	Tony Samuels
	Mike Goodman	Pauline Searle
	David Goodwin	Stuart Selleck
	Michael Gosling	Michael Sydney
*	Zully Grant-Duff	Keith Taylor
	Ramon Gray	Barbara Thomson
	Ken Gulati	Chris Townsend
	Tim Hall	Richard Walsh
	Kay Hammond	Hazel Watson
	Mr D Harmer	Fiona White
	Nick Harrison	* Richard Wilson
	Marisa Heath	Helena Windsor
*	Peter Hickman	Keith Witham
	Margaret Hicks	Mr A Young
		Mrs V Young

*absent

73/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Angell, Mrs Bowes, Mrs Bramhall, Mrs Coleman, Mrs Frost, Mr Fuller, Dr Grant-Duff, Mr Hickman, Mr Orrick and Mr Wilson.

74/15 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 13 October 2015 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

75/15 ELECTION OF A COUNTY COUNCILLOR [Item 3]

The Chief Executive formally reported that Mr Karan Persand was duly elected as the new County Councillor for the Epsom West division following the by-election held on 19 November 2015.

76/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- The sad news of the passing of Richard Rothwell, former County Councillor for Epsom & Ewell North East from 1993-2001. Members stood in silent tribute.
- That Surrey Public Health Lead, Maya Twardzicki recently received a national award from the Royal Society of Public Health for outstanding and innovative contributions to Arts and Health practice and research. The award was presented by General the Lord Dannatt on 18 November at the Royal Society of Public Health in London, to all the Home Front project partners.
- That Denise Le Gal had been recognised as Elected Member of the Year at the Local Government Chronicle Investment (LGC) Awards. In addition, the Surrey County Council Pension Fund won 'fund of the year' for funds above £2billion.
- That Lynne Owens, who had been Chief Constable of Surrey Police since February 2012, had just been appointed Director General of the National Crime Agency. She informed Members that she would be writing to her to offer her congratulations.
- HRH Prince Edward, the Earl of Wessex's had recently unveiled the new peace garden at the Woking Muslim Burial Ground and said this was part funded by the Community Improvements Fund.
- That she had attended the Surrey Sports Awards ceremony at the H G Wells Centre last week to present a Disability Sport Award, on behalf of the County Council, to Paul Phillips of Frensham Pond Sailability in Farnham.
- SEND 2020 programme – she advised Members that officers working to improve the experiences of families, children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities were keen to hear from Members and there would be a team of officers outside the Ashcombe Suite at lunchtime.

- That she would be replacing David Munro as the Chairman of the Surrey Civilian Military Partnership Board, and thanked him for his work in this area.
- That Surrey had recently successfully hosted the County Council Network (CCN) Conference in Guildford.

77/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

There were none.

78/15 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:

- The 2% rise on council tax to help fund Adult Social Care in 2016 and that the system will operate differently in two tier authorities and therefore, it was requested this matter be brought to the Government Minister's attention.
- That acquisition of investment properties by the Council should be confined to purchasing properties within Surrey.
- Following the motion at the last County Council meeting in relation to the migration crisis, an update on the position relating to the number of Syrian refugees accepted by the County was requested.

79/15 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Notice of 14 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix B.

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

(Q3) Mrs Watson asked the Leader of the Council if the route for the Prudential Ride London event could be varied each year and was informed that the route would be agreed with the London Marathon company but that the County Council would take into account the best route for the event. He also reminded Members that the event had generated £1.2m for local sporting and recreational charities.

(Q7) Mr Harrison suggested that the threat of possible closures of some Community Recycling Centres (CRCs), as part of the proposals to make savings, was a sham and asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning if he agreed. The Cabinet Member said that possible closures had formed part of the consultation process. Details of all proposals for savings had been analysed and there would be a further report to the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Scrutiny Board in January.

(Q8) Mr Barker asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning why no data relating to Guildford Borough was included in the table. He was advised that this information had been requested but not yet received. It was also noted that

there was a problem with the tabulation of the table and the Cabinet Member agreed to re-issue it to all Members.

Mr Beardsmore drew the Cabinet Member's attention to the high pollution in the Sunbury Cross / Staines area of Spelthorne, where he said there was the highest concentration of schools in Surrey and said this was of concern to him.

(Q9) Mr Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health if she intended to lobby Government for fairer funding for public health in Surrey. She confirmed that this would happen, as she had stated at the last Cabinet meeting.

(Q10) Mr Robert Evans said that whilst a facsimile copy of the 1297 Magna Carta would be welcome, he was interested in pursuing and obtaining the original copy from the Australian Government and asked the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health for her views. She considered that the original would cost a great deal of time, effort and money and that the County's priorities were to concentrate on providing services for Surrey residents. However, she hoped that a facsimile copy would be possible and this could be displayed at County Hall in the future.

(Q12) Mr Sydney asked if this response could be shared with his local residents. This was confirmed in the verbal response from the Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing. Mr Sydney also considered that the Internal Audit team's report on the Community Partner Libraries (CPL) had contained a number of inaccuracies which he would be taking up outside the meeting. He also questioned the success of CPLs, saying that they were running at a lower footfall than before. The Cabinet Member considered that he had provided a factual response and assured Mr Sydney that he would continue to update him on the future arrangements for Lingfield library.

(Q14) Mr Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning what investment would be required to deliver the proposed £8m savings for Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP) and was advised that SWP did not normally invest in capital so the Council would be re-looking at how the budget was allocated to enable Surrey to achieve its recycling targets.

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

Members made the following comments:

- Good wishes and thanks to Dave Sargeant, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care, who had worked in the service in Surrey for 32 years and would be retiring at the end of December 2015. Members wished him a long and happy retirement. They also welcomed the appointment of Helen Atkinson as Head of the combined Adults and Public Health Services.
- Rail – three priority options identified in the 2013 Surrey Rail document were set out in the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning's briefing. He was asked if there was a similar document for South West trains and its on-going consultation. The Cabinet Member agreed to make this available to Members.
- Community Recycling Centres – the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning was asked about negotiations taking place to transfer these centres to Boroughs and Districts. The Cabinet Member informed Members that the matter was still being considered by the Strategic Director and that he had no updates to report at present.

- On behalf of the Spelthorne area, thanks were expressed to the local Highways team, who had responded to 8,000 calls since January, most of which had been satisfactorily resolved.

80/15 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were no statements from Members.

81/15 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 Cooksey moved the motion which was:

'This Council notes:

(i) the findings of the most recent Footways Network Survey, showing that a third of all the county's footways are either "functionally or structurally impaired".

(ii) that models produced by the Council's highways team show that the current low levels of capital investment in the county's footways will lead to a continued deterioration in their condition, with 40% of the county's footways expected to be "functionally or structurally impaired" by 2028.

In light of these worsening conditions, this Council requests the Cabinet to give much higher priority to the funding of footway resurfacing, re-paving and repair to improve the condition of Surrey's footway network for the benefit of pedestrians.'

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

- That most footways were in a deplorable state and little maintenance was undertaken to improve them.
- The County's footways were a hazard for residents to contend with on a daily basis.
- The Footways Network Survey provided data which demonstrated that one-third of the County's footways were in an unacceptable condition.
- There was insufficient funding in the highways budget for footway improvements and there would be a continued deterioration of their condition.
- Project Horizon focussed on highway and not footway improvements.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Goodwin, who said that footways were an integral part of the highways and should be a higher priority for maintenance and repairs. He said that although some Members, including himself, had used their local allocations for repairing footways in their divisions, there was insufficient funding for local committees to undertake this work in many instances.

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

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

'This Council notes:

(i) the findings of the most recent Footways Network Survey, showing that a third of all the county's footways are either "functionally or structurally impaired".

(ii) that models produced by the Council's highways team show that the current low levels of capital investment in the county's footways will lead to a continued deterioration in their condition, with 40% of the county's footways expected to be "functionally or structurally impaired" by 2028.

In light of these worsening conditions, this Council requests the Cabinet to give **as great a priority as it can** ~~much higher priority~~ to the funding of footway resurfacing, re-paving and repair to improve the condition of Surrey's footway network for the benefit of pedestrians **within the context of the Council's challenging funding circumstances.**

Mr Furey spoke to his amendment, making the following points:

- The highways network was used by most Surrey residents and businesses every day.
- There was a statutory requirement to maintain the highways network and the County Council had made a significant investment to both maintain and improve it.
- The amendment was the right approach for the County Council to take.
- The technical jargon used in the report to describe footway conditions was as required for formal returns to Government.
- That the Council's footway network was no worse than many other highway authorities.
- That a strategic approach was important to any investment and that the service was in the process of finalising a new 15 year Asset Strategy for the highway network, which included footways. This approach would complement the good work undertaken by local committees.

Nine Members spoke on the amendment and made the following comments:

- That there had been a major investment in improving the pavement in West Street, Dorking.
- As there were limited funds for footway improvements, it was requested that officers engage with local Members and also local residents to maximize the best use of resources.
- The modeling exercise, which had been demonstrated at a recent Member seminar was useful, this illustrated the 'cause and effect' of moving funding within the Highways Budget.
- That poorly maintained footways created difficulties for wheelchair users.
- Footways should be given a higher priority in the budget because poorly maintained pavements were a trip hazard which then impacted on the NHS.
- A balancing act was needed to decide the best way forward for funding footway re-surfacing, re-paving and repair – this would be discussed at the relevant Scrutiny Board and local committees.

The amendment was put to the vote with 56 Members voting for and 8 Members voting against it. There were two abstentions.

Therefore, the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

Two Members spoke on the substantive motion before, under Standing Order 23.1, Mr Kington moved:

'That the question be now put'.

The Chairman considered that there had been adequate debate, agreed to the request, with the support of the Chamber, and the debate was wound up.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 60 Members voting for and 7 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council notes:

- (i) the findings of the most recent Footways Network Survey, showing that a third of all the county's footways are either "functionally or structurally impaired".
- (ii) that models produced by the Council's highways team show that the current low levels of capital investment in the county's footways will lead to a continued deterioration in their condition, with 40% of the county's footways expected to be "functionally or structurally impaired" by 2028.

In light of these worsening conditions, this Council requests the Cabinet to give as great a priority as it can to the funding of footway resurfacing, re-paving and repair to improve the condition of Surrey's footway network for the benefit of pedestrians within the context of the Council's challenging funding circumstances.'

ITEM 9(ii)

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

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

'This Council warmly welcomes a new Conservative Government which is listening to the voice of Local Government and is now setting out an agenda of reforming business rates, devolving power and responding to the funding needs of adult social care.'

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

- There had been a shift in emphasis in the working relationship between Central Government and County Councils, due partly to the Government's engagement with local Council Leaders and also the changing world that we live in.

- Devolution of power would be good for the area because issues in the South East would be different from those in the north of England and resources could be targeted to specific areas of need.
- This County Council was making excellent progress in developing partnership working and new ways of working.

This motion was formally seconded by Mr Brett-Warburton who made the following points:

- A request that all Members supported this motion
- Surrey County Council's Leadership had played an active part in lobbying Government for reform of business rates, devolution and responding to the funding needs of Adult Social Care and Members should be proud that the Government had listened to the Council.
- There were many examples of collaborative work.
- The importance of standing together as Surrey County Councillors, regardless of political parties.

Under Standing Order 23.1, Mr Robert Evans moved:

'That the question be now put'.

Twenty Members stood in support of this request. The Chairman considered that there had not been adequate debate and refused the request. She said that she would allow the four Members who had indicated that they wished to speak to do so before taking the vote on the motion.

These Members made the following points:

- The importance of politicians listening to the needs of residents.
- The work undertaken to date and on-going by the Senior Management Team to drive forward the efficiency and value for money agenda.
- A need to wait for the detailed budget allocation for the Council because the 'devil could be in the detail'.
- That the Care Act reforms were now postponed until 2020.
- That there would be an additional 2% on all council tax bills next year to help fund Adult Social Care.
- The Leader should be commended for his successful lobbying of Government and should continue to lobby for fairer funding for Surrey for 2016.

The motion was then put to the vote with 49 Members voting for and 16 Members voting against it. There were 2 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this Council warmly welcomes a new Conservative Government which is listening to the voice of Local Government and is now setting out an agenda of reforming business rates, devolving power and responding to the funding needs of adult social care.

ITEM 9(iii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Essex moved the motion which was relating to:

Supporting LGA Climate Local Initiative

'Surrey County Council takes note of the International Climate Talks currently taking place in Paris and takes this opportunity to reaffirm the importance of its leadership role in this area by committing to sign up to the Local Government Association's Climate Local initiative, and call on other Councils to do the same.'

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

- The importance of focussing on what needs to be done today to combat climate change – he also referred to the terrible flooding in Cumbria.
- That violent conflicts had nearly doubled in the last ten years.
- Referred to the International Climate talks taking place in Paris and that investment and action was required to address the issues.
- Acting to address climate change was a shared responsibility, and also a shared vision.
- He considered that Surrey's flood defences were a higher priority than airport expansion because 20% of Surrey homes were at risk of flooding.
- Surrey should be prepared to take the voluntary lead in the Local Government Association's Climate Local Initiative and work together with the County's partners.

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

Four Members, including Mr Forster made the following points:

- Concern that if global climate change continued, one in six species would face extinction.
- Political will was needed to make the changes required to combat climate change and it was hoped that all Members would support this motion.
- The County Council investment to support schools in reducing their energy bills.
- That the County Council worked in partnership with Boroughs and Districts to reduce carbon emissions.
- Encouraging residents to insulate the least efficient homes.
- The Council's sustainable travel programme and also the commitment to reducing food waste.
- An invitation from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning for Mr Essex to partake in a working group, starting in January to look at various options.
- Climate change was a challenge that needed to be tackled now.
- A request that the Cabinet Member included regular updates on the County Council's progress in this area as part of his Cabinet Member briefings.

The motion was then put to the vote with 64 Members voting for it. No Member voted against it but there were three abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That Surrey County Council takes note of the International Climate Talks currently taking place in Paris and takes this opportunity to reaffirm the importance of its leadership role in this area by committing to sign up to the Local Government Association's Climate Local initiative, and call on other Councils to do the same.

ITEM 9(iv)

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council decided it wished to hear further before agreeing whether or not to debate this motion.

Mrs Watson made a short statement giving reasons why the motion should not be referred. She considered that it was an important motion because the surface dressing of roads caused them to become noisier, which then affected the quality of life for many residents across the county.

The Leader made a short statement stating that it would be inappropriate to debate this matter today because evidence needed to be gathered before the Council could have a debate on this issue and, therefore, he proposed referring this motion to the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board for detailed work and scrutiny.

The majority of Members voted against debating the motion today.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this motion be referred to the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Scrutiny Board for determination. Under Standing Order 12.6, the Scrutiny Board must report back to County Council at the earliest appropriate meeting.

82/15 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]

The Leader presented the Report of the Cabinet meetings held on 27 October and 24 November 2015. Members had an opportunity to comment on the report.

Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A School Organisation Plan

RESOLVED:

That the School Organisation Plan 2015/16 – 2024/25 be approved.

B Revision of Procurement Standing Orders

RESOLVED:

That the proposed changes to Procurement Standing Orders, as set out in Appendix 3 of the Cabinet report, be approved.

Reports for Information / Discussion

The following report was received and noted:

- Orbis Three Year Business Plan

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 27 October and 24 November 2015 be adopted.

83/15 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN FOR COUNCIL OVERVIEW BOARD [Item 11]

The Chief Executive announced that he had received one nomination, Steve Cosser, for Chairman of the Council Overview Board.

It was:

RESOLVED:

That Mr Cosser be appointed as Chairman of the Council Overview Board for the remainder of the council year 2015/16.

84/15 AMENDMENT TO SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015 - 16 [Item 12]

To comply with Section 40 of the Localism Act 2011 all local authorities are required to agree and publish an annual Pay Policy Statement. The Council's current pay policy statement was approved by Council on 17 March 2015 and is published on the Council's website. Pay policy statements may be amended during the course of the financial year to reflect changes or developments in an authority's pay policy.

Mr Hodge, as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee informed Members that, following the meeting of the committee on 27 November 2015, the committee had requested that the following two additions be included in the final Pay Policy Statement 2015-16 for Surrey. These were:

- a statement that makes clear that the Surrey Pay arrangements apply to support staff working in schools
- a recognition that there is an entitlement for payment for the County's Returning Officer during elections.

RESOLVED:

That, following the update from the Chairman of PPDC, the revisions to the Surrey Pay Policy Statement 2015–16, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report and including the two recommendations as set out above, be approved.

85/15 CONSTITUTION UPDATE REPORT - FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE AMENDMENTS [Item 13]

This report noted changes to the Scheme of Delegation (Cabinet and Officers) relating to fees and charges, academy balance transfers on conversion and the management of Trust Funds.

As a result of these changes to the scheme of delegation and after a short discussion in which the changes proposed to Fees and Charges were clarified and the management of Trust Funds, where the Council was a corporate trustee, were discussed, Members approved the amendments to the Financial Regulations.

RESOLVED:

1. That the changes to its Constitution regarding fees and charges, academy balances and trust funds be noted.
2. That the changes to the Financial Regulations, regarding fees and charges, be approved.

86/15 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 14]

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: 12.35pm]

Chairman

County Council - 8 December 2015
Leader of the Council - statement

I want to take this opportunity to welcome our newly elected Member for the Epsom West division, Karan Persand, to the Chamber. We are now the largest Conservative Group in any Council in the country.

I also welcome Nick Harrison, as the new Leader of the Opposition.

Karen is joining us at an important time as we enter the final decision phase of our budget planning process and at the heart of the budget process is our commitment to our strategic principles:

- the wellbeing of our residents
- the economic prosperity of our county
- and the residents' experiences of our services

All backed by sound, value for money principles in delivering a balanced and sustainable budget for our residents future. However, we know from the recent report to Cabinet that we still face a number of pressures.

Demand for our services continues to grow:

- Our ageing population is placing increasing pressure on Surrey's adult social care services
- Our children's services also face increasing demands
- Our schools require fairer funding
- And there is an ever increasing number of drivers on Surrey's roads.

These additional pressures mean that the £330m this council has saved have simply been soaked up by the huge increase in demand for our services. This means that despite all our hard work, despite all our efforts, despite all our efficiencies, despite saving £330m and despite our significant partnership working, we still find ourselves in the same place. We still have to make huge financial savings. The Chancellor made a number of important announcements in his recent spending review. A few of these examples are:

- Firstly, that Councils would be given greater flexibility to raise funds to meet adult social care demand pressures.
- Secondly, that local government will be able to retain 100% of business rates.
- And thirdly, a long-awaited consultation on the schools funding formula.

These announcements demonstrate that this Conservative Chancellor is listening and recognising the pressures Local Government faces and we particularly welcome moves towards greater local autonomy.

Turning to devolution...

Our bid is ambitious for our residents. We are asking Government to work with us, invest in us and we will increase productivity, improve skills and embed strong economic growth.

That growth will not only reap benefits for hard working Surrey residents and businesses but also for London, the wider South East and for the UK as a whole.

So far we have had a number of positive conversations with Ministers and we will be meeting with the Secretary of State early in the New Year to present our proposal.

Madam Chairman and Members, devolution is part of our longer term strategy but our immediate focus is setting the budget for 2016/17. We know from the Comprehensive Spending Review that there will be reductions to Local Government funding, whilst the Chancellor set out some promising opportunities - the simple fact is that Local Government has a mountain to climb.

We will need to study the Chancellor's announcements in greater depth, once we have the full details of the Local Government financial settlement later this month.

Of course – the devil is always in the detail but I know that I will have Members' support as we enter the final budget planning process. We know Surrey has always been a county that is not afraid to challenge the way things are done!

We recognised early into the financial crisis that we needed to do things differently if we were going to meet the challenges ahead. Over the last few years, we have built a national reputation as a council that leads the way on public service transformation.

That is why we must continue to innovate and strive for new and different ways to deliver our services for the long term benefit of our residents.

In April this year, we created ORBIS, a joint partnership with East Sussex covering back office services. This exciting initiative is set to save this council millions of pounds a year.

I am pleased to confirm that Brighton and Hove Council has indicated that they also wish to join the partnership and I am sure others will do the same.

And that's not the only example. At our last Cabinet meeting, we approved an investment for a new reablement Unit on the East Surrey Hospital site in Redhill. It is a great example of the health and social care systems working together – helping patients to move quickly from hospital into the reablement unit and then onwards to their own homes; saving public funds whilst providing better care for our residents.

All of this demonstrates that despite the challenges we face we are able to take the right decisions to make savings and improve services for our residents.

As 2015 draws to a close, we can reflect back on a year of hard work, success and achievement; but also some lessons to learn for the future. I know we will go forward into the New Year, together as ONE TEAM, to deliver more success for Surrey residents.

In all that we do, in all corners of the county, we are here for our residents.

Let me conclude by taking a moment to thank all Members and staff for their hard work and dedication over the course of the past year. As politicians we cannot achieve our goals without the commitment and devotion to duty of the staff. Especially those staff who will be working over the festive season delivering the essential public services our residents rely upon.

Let me end by wishing you all a very merry Christmas and a peaceful holiday season; ready for the challenges of 2016.

David Hodge, Leader of the Council
8 December 2015

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 8 DECEMBER 2015

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

**MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND
COMMUNITY WELLBEING**

**(1) MR MIKE BENNISON (HINCHLEY WOOD, CLAYGATE & OXSHOTT) TO
ASK:**

I led a team of about four Members about two years ago to look into the future and budget of the Department for "Births, Deaths and Marriages".

We came up with at least one full A4 sheet of ways to improve the Department but it was mainly full of revenue generating ideas.

How many of these ideas have been implemented?

How much third-party money or revenue has been generated by this department bearing in mind that virtually every man and his dog seems to make money out of the Marriage Ceremonies. According to one website I recently looked at, this can be upto £25,000.

Reply:

Income generated by the Registration Service has grown by 20% since 2011/12 and is due to reach £1,940,000 by the end of 2015/16.

Within this total, income for conducting ceremonies at outside venues is projected to reach £952,000 by March 2016 or almost 30% above income achieved in 2011/12.

Stronger links with Visit Surrey have led to some growth in the number of venues licensed to hold weddings and civil partnerships up from 104 to 110 and the service benefitted from marketing activities carried out by external venues to promote their premises as locations for weddings and civil partnership ceremonies. The Surrey Guide to weddings is paid for entirely by external advertising.

In recent years the service has centralised work on the production of copy certificates at the Guildford office. This has led to a more streamlined service and enabled the team to minimise costs. Income from certificates has risen from just over £500,000 in 2011/12 to £637,831 (projected for 2015/16).

The Registration Service cannot set prices for all costs as some are statutory fees set nationally by the General Register Office. Locally set prices are benchmarked against other registration services.

The service continues to actively explore other opportunities to provide additional services and opportunities to generate additional income, and is investigating charges for rehearsals for weddings and civil partnership ceremonies.

Regarding the suggestion that the service could offer weddings by telephone (as happens in the USA), or holding civil weddings in religious buildings, these would require a change in legislation.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

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

On 27 October 2015, Surrey County Council closed Camberley Library, the principal library serving around 80,000 people. The library is scheduled to be shut for over three months until at least mid February in order to repair the library's windows. What consultation, if any, did the Council undertake with the local Surrey County and Surrey Heath Borough Councillors?

Why was no notification of closure given in advance to Surrey Heath Borough Council itself? Is it acceptable that the first the manager of the local Citizens Advice Bureau knew of the closure was the notice appearing on the library door?

Is the Council aware that, for many people, the library is invaluable not just for borrowing books but also for access to computers for job searches and other important matters?

What priority does Surrey County Council put on the library service if the nearest alternative library, Frimley Green, involves a lengthy bus journey and no provision for a more local temporary or mobile library has been made?

Reply:

Firstly, may I thank Robert Evans the Member for Stanwell and Stanwell Moor for this question concerning the temporary closure of Camberley library in Surrey Heath.

Just a point of clarification, the library was closed for essential works - complete window replacement and asbestos removal - on 28 November, not 27 October as Mr Evans states. Careful consideration was given to whether or not there was an alternative to closure but the size of the windows and nature of the asbestos has meant it has been necessary for the safety of both users and staff to close during the works programme. Having had experience of providing temporary accommodation for much lengthier closures, the high costs, complexity and low level of service obtainable in such premises ruled that out for a closure of two months over the quietest part of the year.

I would like to assure Members that every effort has been made to advise Camberley library's 6,000 regular users and local residents of the forthcoming closure by every means available, giving six weeks notice and using posters, bookmarks, our website, social media, and an email sent to all library users of Camberley, Frimley Green, Lightwater and Bagshot - 12,000 emails in total. Additional IT facilities have been put into Frimley Green and its opening hours extended by 30%. I must also remind Members that many Surrey residents regularly use more than one library and also our excellent digital library services.

The library service was also in communication with Surrey County Councillors, the information was also shared on the Surrey Heath Local Committee twitter feed, and information on the closure emailed to all Surrey Heath Councillors.

The replacement glazing will vastly reduce heat loss in the winter months, saving on the Council's and therefore taxpayers' energy bills, along with reducing solar gain resulting in a much more comfortable environment in the summer months.

While any disruption in service is a concern, the long term investment in this library will be of benefit to local residents.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

The Prudential Ride London cycle event causes immense disruption each year for residents and businesses living or working on or near the route as a consequence of lengthy road closures on the day of the event itself and considerable numbers of cyclists practising on the route for several months in advance. In view of these problems and many requests by residents from the Dorking Hills Division, can the Leader of the Council state whether or not a decision has been taken to extend the event beyond 2017, and by whom, and can he ensure that the route for the Prudential Ride London event is varied each year to ensure that the same residents and businesses are not disrupted by road closures and practising by cyclists relating to the event each year?

Reply:

No decision has been taken to extend the Prudential Ride London event in 2018-2019. This item is scheduled to come to Cabinet in February 2016 for further discussion.

We are encouraged by the large numbers of Surrey residents who choose to take part in the event. The event has generated £1.2m for local sporting and recreational charities. This is new money and, in a time of austerity, more than welcomed in protecting the financial position of institutions and clubs that are valued by our communities.

It is always difficult to balance the needs of residents and visitors who wish to take part in the event and those who live in the area. The event organiser has been working with local communities to ensure as much access as far as possible is provided for residents whilst maintaining the safety of those taking part in the event.

Surrey County Council and its partners are continuing to work together through the Cycling Strategy Group and our Drive SMART partnership to manage the increase in cyclists on the road and the need to promote the need for all road users to share the highway as they go about their business and leisure activities.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

At its September meeting, the Cabinet agreed to introduce charges to park at its Newlands Corner car park to access the countryside. Since then, a petition opposing the introduction of car parking charges at Newlands Corner has been signed by over 6000 people. Is the Cabinet Member aware of this petition and will he commit to giving it due consideration when it is presented?

Reply:

I am fully aware of the petition and have already spoken to the person who set it up. Unfortunately the petition is based on some inaccurate information and we are keen to ensure that the public have the full story and can then judge for themselves. To this end I have arranged to meet the petitioner before Christmas and have asked our Media Team to produce articles for the press.

The Newlands Corner project is split into two phases to deliver improved visitor facilities and encourage visitors to stay longer and to enjoy the site. Currently visitors to the site generally only stay for less than an hour and the majority of those for less than half an hour. Newlands Corner offers huge potential to encourage people of all ages to explore the countryside and learn about the natural world.

Phase 1 of the project will provide a family play trail to encourage that exploration along with improvements to the toilets and cafe to improve the residents' experience. We will be working with the cafe owner, who is a tenant of the Albury Estate, to develop his business as the improvements are implemented.

The designers of the play trail are now working with members of the public to develop appropriate play pieces for the trail. Site users will have an opportunity to look at and comment on the play trail designs when outline designs go up on site soon. There will also be a website where people can comment.

Only once these improvements are in place will charges be made for parking at Newlands Corner. These charges are in line with those made at similar countryside sites across the County and neighbouring Counties.

Phase 2 work

Part of the Master Plan for Newlands Corner was to look at the opportunity for a new visitor centre, which will include a new undercover cafe area, new toilets, a visitor area and space to allow retail of local produce. This is still in a very early stage. Architects have been commissioned to sketch out three proposals on two locations within the site. We have only recently commissioned architects to look at potential concepts for a new facility. The designers will produce sketches that will be displayed on site and on our website early in the New Year. We will then invite comments from the public.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Is the Council aware that according to Heathrow's Director of External Affairs, Mr Nigel Milton, 70% of the flights leaving Heathrow are not following the legally agreed Compton NPR (Noise Preferential Route) flight paths, as defined in the Noise Abatement Legislation for U.K. Designated Airports? This is causing wide-spread noise problems for many people, including those I represent.

When challenged, Heathrow claim it is done to avoid safety problems and that Tactical Vectoring is used on a plane by plane basis to avoid the so called Safety Problems. The issue is not just noise but the fact planes are flying as low as 500m (1500ft) above communities where there should be no flights at all. This seriously increases the risk of pollution in what is already the most polluted part of the county.

It beggars belief that safety concerns are so common place that the rules have to be flouted many times a day, day in day out, each time at the risk of local residents. Given the direct risk to its residents, will the Council find out as a matter of urgency what is going on here and take whatever steps it can to stop it?

Reply:

The County Council has no remit for aviation operations or the consequent noise or air quality impacts from aircraft. However, as these overflights are clearly having an impact on the lives of Surrey residents, this matter is a cause for concern.

I am concerned about the issue raised by Ian Beardsmore and so I have written in the first instance to John Holland-Kaye, Chief Executive of Heathrow Airport Limited, and I have copied this letter to Nigel Milton and Cheryl Monk of the Public Affairs and Community Relations Team.

Depending on the response to my letter, I may further correspond with the National Air Traffic Services (NATS) or the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) to seek any necessary detailed information and to explore the possibility of a resolution. I am aware that Heathrow Airport have publicly acknowledged that there is a problem with the Compton Route relating to easterly departures as the route involves an 180 degree turn, which is apparently difficult for modern aircraft to navigate. This means that aircraft consistently fail to stay on this particular track.

I would also suggest that Ian Beardsmore consider approaching the Spelthorne Borough Council representative on the Heathrow Community Noise Forum, Councillor Colin Davis, regarding this matter if he has not done so already.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(6) MR ERNEST MALLETT (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK:

In view of the large public opposition to car parking charges at Newlands Corner would the Cabinet Member say what weight is being given to these in any final decision on this matter?

Is the Cabinet Member aware that it is common practice among the Borough/Districts to maintain parkland and commons car parks free, as it also for the Royal Parks such as Richmond and Bushy Parks and for National Trust general woodland and parkland areas?

Reply:

As the Cabinet Report set out, we are funding these improvements at Newlands Corner in order to enhance the facilities at the site, create a destination that is more appropriate for this key site in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and to encourage a wider range of people to visit throughout the week. The car parking charges are necessary to create an income stream that will help to fund management of the countryside. We understand that they are unpopular but with evidence from other countryside sites we are sure that they will achieve our aim of generating an income and that people will get used to them. A decision has been made to recommence the car parking charges. However, we will continue to listen to the public's views on the proposed improvements to the site. The play trial designer is working with members of the public to develop the trial play pieces and the outline drawings of the new building will be available for public comment in the New Year.

Cabinet have agreed that the charges will not be made until the improvements to the cafe, and toilets and the family play trail have been installed.

Although some countryside car parks are free, The National Trust and the Forestry Commission both charge for parking on sites such as Hindhead, Boxhill, Ranmore Common and Alice Holt and several local authorities also charge for parking where they provide extra facilities such as a cafe and toilets. The charges we are proposing are set at a level that compares favourably with those of the National Trust and Forestry commission.

Length of stay	Newlands Corner	Alice Holt	National Trust – Box Hill and Hindhead
20 minute short stay	Free	£1.80	£4.00
Up to 1 hr	£1.00	£1.80	£4.00
Up to 2 hrs	£2.00	£3.00	£4.00
Up to 3 hrs	£3.00	£4.50	£4.00
Up to 4 hrs	£4.00 (maximum	£6.00	£4.00
Over 4 hrs	charge)	£8.00	£4.00

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

After a consultation exercise which started in July, why does the Cabinet Member not yet have detailed costed proposals for the public to understand the new restrictions on days and hours of operation of the Community Recycling Centres, and the level of charges for specialist materials? Without this, how can he be confident that he can achieve his savings target?

Reply:

The proposals to reduce opening times, to fit with demand and levels of charges for non-household materials, have been costed. Implementation of the proposals has also been costed. The proposals and associated costs then formed the basis of the savings target of £1.8m. This information was then used to inform the public consultation and resulting reports and recommendations to Cabinet.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(8) MR BILL BARKER OBE (HORSLEYS) TO ASK:

Who is responsible for monitoring air quality in Surrey? Where are the areas of highest pollution and are the results publicly available? Can residents be assured that no new school would be built in an area of high pollution?

Reply:

Who is responsible for monitoring air quality In Surrey?

Borough and Districts are responsible for monitoring local air quality. Areas of poor air quality are declared Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA), and once declared the local authority is required to publish further assessments of existing and likely future air quality within 12 months. Authorities are then required to publish Updating and Screening Assessment reports every 3 years. All districts and boroughs in Surrey have published air quality management reports and assessments which are available on their websites, regardless of whether they have declared AQMAs. A list of all local authorities with declared AQMAs are published on the DEFRA [website](#).

In addition to AQMAs, local authorities select other sites within their areas to monitor air quality that are likely to be representative of residential exposure and areas where road traffic would expect to have higher levels of pollutants, with the requirement to declare AQMAs.

Where are the areas of highest pollution and are the results publicly available?

To create a ranked list, 12 month mean levels of NO₂ have been used for the 12 months of most recent data respective to each district and borough. The ranking therefore focuses on elevated NO₂ levels (i.e. average over 12 months of above 40_{µg/m3}) which is the EU maximum limit. Note that these sites are where static diffusion tubes are located and therefore are not necessarily declared AQMAs.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Borough/District</u>	<u>Most recent NO₂ 12 month average</u>	<u>Year of data</u>
<u>1</u>	<u>Brighton Road, Hooley</u>	<u>Reigate and Banstead</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>The Parade, Sunbury Cross</u>	<u>Spelthorne</u>	<u>58.7</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>London Road, Staines</u>	<u>Spelthorne</u>	<u>58.4</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>Opposite Cafe Rouge, Farnham</u>	<u>Waverley</u>	<u>56.9</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>Railway Crossing, Vicarage Road,</u>	<u>Runnymede</u>	<u>55.9</u>	<u>2012</u>

	<u>Egham</u>			
<u>6</u>	<u>Outside Prezzo, Weybridge</u>	<u>Elmbridge</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>7</u>	<u>Horley / Gatwick Airport, roads related to A23</u>	<u>Reigate and Banstead</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>8</u>	<u>M25 Junction 11</u>	<u>Woking</u>	<u>54.7</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>9</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>Roundabout Copsem Lane/A3</u>	<u>Elmbridge</u>	<u>51.8</u>
<u>10</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>Bottom of Wrecclesham Road – A325 Farnham</u>	<u>Waverley</u>	<u>50.4</u>

NOTE: List derived from latest available data from each Borough and District using NO₂ diffusion tube data, including the authority applied adjustment factor.

NOTE: *Figures in italics are awaiting update from relevant borough*

Can residents be assured that no new school would be built in an area of high pollution?

Borough and district councils are responsible for designating Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) which indicate existing air quality problems. The County Council has adopted a Local List for the Validation of Planning Applications which sets out the information required to accompany any planning application. It specifies that an air quality assessment be provided for any substantial school development in an AQMA, and the need to take full account of air quality issues would be reflected in advice at pre-application stage.

Air quality is a factor which would be given weight in planning decisions. It is, however, only one of many considerations which may be relevant in any given case. The weight given to air quality should be considered against the weight to be given to other environmental policies and designations. For example, a new school located to avoid higher air pollution levels arising from traffic generation in urban areas may be more likely to involve a Green Belt location and itself give rise to more and longer car journeys unless located close to the population it is intended to serve. National planning policy requires that great weight be given to the need to create, expand or alter schools in response to the growing demand for places. While most AQMAs are very localised, the whole of the borough of Spelthorne is a designated area. Nevertheless, provision for additional school places must be made for Spelthorne residents.

For these reasons, air quality, while an important consideration, may not be considered an absolute constraint on new school development.

MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

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

Following through on the proposed in-year ring-fenced budget reductions from Central Government to the Public Health service, could you please confirm what the anticipated service implications will be for the Council.

Reply:

The Surrey Public Health team is funded directly by the public health grant received from the Department of Health. In 2015/16 the total public health grant was £35.5 million (£22 per head of population).

The grant allocation for Local Authorities is calculated according to a formula that aims to represent variations in need. However, due to historical patterns of funding allocation, Local Authorities do not currently receive their target grant allocation according to this formula. Surrey is one of four local authorities whose current grant allocation is more than 40% below the target level of funding.

In the Summer of 2015 the Government announced a national public health budget reduction of 6.2%. For Surrey this equated to £2.2 million.

The November 2015 Comprehensive Spending Review announced average annual real-terms savings of 3.9% over the next five years in the Public Health budget. In real cash terms this translates into a further reduction of 9.6% in addition to the above savings made in 2015/16. Nationally the savings will be phased in at 2.2% in 16/17, 2.5% in 17/18, 2.6% in each of the two following years, and flat cash in 20/21.

Public Health also has funding pressures which come from increases in Surrey County Council MTFP savings, to be delivered through 'shadow funding' existing spend in other departments. As the public health grant is 'ring fenced' this means that Surrey County Council has to demonstrate that the whole allocation is spent on services and functions that contribute towards public health outcomes. Public Health are therefore not able to contribute to MTFP savings via the usual way as we need to account for the whole allocation. The identified 'savings' for Public Health in the MTFP is £1m, £2m and £3m respectively for the three years beginning 2015/16.

In order to achieve these identified savings services are currently being reviewed and prioritised to inform reductions in provision which will be implemented through contract variation and re-commissioning of services.

However we do not yet know the implications for individual local authorities of the recent announcements as this will depend on political decisions about the funding formula and pace of change (how fast we move from historic spend to the formula based target shares).

The spending review did clarify that the ring fence on Public Health spending in local government will be maintained for the next two years until 2017/18.

The Government has announced it will consult councils in relation to the future funding of Public Health spending from additional funding which arises as a result of the proposed reform of business rates.

MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

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

In 1297 King Edward I sent a copy of Magna Carta to Robert de Glamorgan, then High Sheriff of Surrey. By the 1930s it was in the possession of the King's School in Bruton, Somerset who sold it to Australia in 1952.

What communication has Surrey County Council had with the Government of Australia regarding the return Surrey's own copy of the Magna Carta?

Reply:

In August 2014, as part of planning arrangements for the 800th anniversary, I wrote to the Australian Government's High Commissioner in London regarding the 1297 Inspeximus Magna Carta that is now owned by the Australian Government.

Although it refers to Surrey, it is held in the Parliament House Art Collection in Canberra where it is prominently displayed and interpreted as the centre piece of their permanent exhibition in Parliament House on democracy and the development of the Rule of Law. It is an extremely valuable document and, given both its rarity and that it is part of their art collection, we were realistic about any opportunity to seek its return to Surrey - but we did enquire about a getting a full facsimile copy.

Because of the budget available for the Magna Carta programme in 2015 officers were subsequently asked not to conclude negotiations on this until some of the costs of Surrey's other major commitments were known.

In the debrief report to Residents Experience Board on 19 November 2015, you will note that there is an action under Next Steps, to continue to pursue the possibility of obtaining a facsimile copy of the 1297 Surrey County Inspeximus issue of Magna Carta, held by the Australian Parliament. A sum (estimated) has been reserved in the remaining balance for this purpose.

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

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

Essex County Council was recently successful in achieving an improvement in its Ofsted rating for Children's Services from inadequate to good whilst significantly reducing its reliance on agency social workers. What action is Surrey County Council taking to emulate Essex County Council to improve its Children's Services to a good rating by Ofsted and at the same time reduce its numbers of agency social workers?

Reply:

Surrey County Council has been actively working to strengthen its approach to recruitment and retention of social workers. This is multi-faceted and includes learning from other authorities.

Peer learning

Learning from others has to date included a range of visits to local authorities, most recently to the London Boroughs of Greenwich, Kingston and Richmond. A visit is arranged to Oxfordshire County Council during the week this week and a visit is being arranged to Essex County Council in the New Year. The Director of Children's Services has already been in contact with her counterpart in Essex to share thinking prior to this visit.

Staffing:

It is highly likely that most local authorities will always require good quality locum staff to supplement their permanent workforce; this is becoming a market workforce reality. Surrey has been working to ensure that it continues to encourage and increase its permanent workforce and is also able to support good quality locums so there is adequate capacity to meet demand and keep children safe. Thus attention is being given to the recruitment and retention of both permanent and locum staff. Key activities include:

- Running a national recruitment campaign
- Developing a recruitment and retention strategy
- Expanding Surrey's Academy for first year Social Workers
- Further development of Surrey job pages
- Improving and streamlining our application processes
- Reviewing our 'Surrey Offer'
- Undertaking exit interviews and analysis
- Further developing our pay and reward offer
- Developing career pathways for non-social work qualified children's workforce
- Strengthening our learning opportunities and expectations

Partnership working

Partnership working is a growing strength in the County, strategically and operationally. This is manifest in a range of settings including partnership engagement through the Improvement Board. Board membership includes police, health, schools and the Chair of the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board. This provides the opportunity for support and challenge as well as partnership sharing of learning. Partnership learning and support adds value to a range of activities from workforce development to the identification and support of those at risk of child sexual exploitation.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

(12) MR MICHAEL SYDNEY (LINGFIELD) TO ASK: 2nd question

I have sent you a document listing a number of aspects of the County's handling of the plan to convert the Lingfield Library to the so called Community Partnership model, with accompanying documentary evidence.

I do not want to go over the content of the report which I am sure you have now read and absorbed.

In the report I have asked you for three undertakings. These are:

1. That you ask the Audit Department to make a study of this project and report back to you on their findings.
2. That you ensure that there are no further changes in the management of and future planning of the Lingfield Library until the Audit Department's study is received.
3. That you raise with the Leader an invitation to the Chairman of Lingfield Parish Council for a public meeting to be held in Lingfield, as was promised by the then Assistant Chief Executive, Susie Kemp, and confirmed by the Leader of the Council, at the Public Meeting held in Lingfield in June 2014.

Reply:

I am of course well aware that Lingfield Library is a subject close to Mr Sydney's heart and he has made his views about its future known to me over the last few months.

The community partnership model for libraries is exactly that – local people working in partnership with the council to secure the future of a local service. CIPFA report that 272 public libraries have closed since 2010. Our successful partnerships with local communities means that, in Surrey, not a single library has closed and our 9 established CPLs are performing well.

Given previous Cabinet decisions, the success of the CPL model and the ongoing work in connection with Lingfield library, I do not consider it would be appropriate for me to give any of the undertakings Mr Sydney requests.

The Council's Internal Audit team has very recently completed an audit of the CPL initiative. Members of the Audit and Governance Committee will recall that the findings were reported to them at yesterday's meeting and I have asked that a copy of the report be forwarded to Mr Sydney.

Later this month the Leader and I are meeting representatives of the prospective board of trustees for the Guest House Trust and will be discussing with them how we can work with them and with the wider community to progress proposals for a community partnered library in Lingfield.

As Mr Sydney is aware SCC has instructed a firm of solicitors, specialising in charity work, to establish whether part of that trust's funds could contribute towards paying a staff member for the library. The trust fund does not currently allow for this and the recommended way forward was an application to the Charity Commission to vary the terms of the trust. That application was made back in September and has not proved plain sailing, with the most recent email from the Charity Commissioners flagging a delay whilst they consider the relevance of recent case law. Without knowing the outcome of the application to the Charity Commission, I cannot see what a public meeting would achieve at this time.

When we have a clearer indication of the likelihood of the application succeeding we can engage with the local community to brief them on this and how we then take forward future arrangements for Lingfield library.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

**(13) MR ERNEST MALLET (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK:
2nd question**

Would the Cabinet Member say what weight is being given to the public protest about the proposed charges and shortening of hours at Community Recycling Centres?

What calculations have been done of the possible added cost of fly tipping and the environmental inconvenience that this brings?

If residents decide to drip-feed rubble and other DIY material into wheelie bins, will this not deprive the Council of the opportunity to recycle various quantities of this material and therefore increase landfill or other disposal costs?

Reply:

Surrey County Council consulted on proposed changes to the service for 11 weeks over the summer. As a result of views received from the public, site closures are now not being considered, charging for non-household waste has been adapted to allow small amounts to still be deposited free of charge, and reducing opening hours to fit with demand has been accepted as the public indicated that this was a more acceptable change to the service. We are aware that any change is difficult and not everyone will be happy, but we believe that we have responded appropriately and have adapted proposals in a sensitive manner to fit with the feedback we have received from the residents.

Surrey County Council has analysed fly tipping tonnages and costs over the past five years and is already working in partnership with all 11 Districts and Boroughs, Surrey Police, the Environment Agency and Trading Standards to develop a fly tipping strategy which will reduce current levels of fly tipping across the county.

Most residents are aware that rubble is not accepted in their wheelie bins. All 11 Districts and Boroughs in Surrey already prohibit this material from being deposited in wheelie bins. Rubble found in wheelie bins is not collected, as it is not household waste and can damage the collection vehicles.

In addition, Surrey County Council will allow for small amounts of rubble to be deposited for free in order to avoid the potential for some residents to drip feed rubble into their wheelie bins. Surrey County Council has also decided to allow small gas bottles and asbestos to continue to be accepted for free.

Any resident carrying out substantial DIY works will require a skip or will be able to take the material to a site that can weigh their material and charge for it. Using the wheelie bin to dispose of rubble from large scale DIY works would not be practical and would very likely result in collection crews refusing to collect the bin.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Please can you confirm what investment Surrey intends to make to achieve our 70% recycling target across Surrey and confirm that there are no plans to reduce funding for Surrey's districts and boroughs in the form of the level of recycling credit received for each tonne of waste collected by them for recycling.

Reply:

The Surrey Waste Partnership, which is made up of all 12 local authorities in the county, has recently updated its strategy and adopted a 70% recycling and recovery target to be achieved by 2019/20. The target includes the recovery of certain materials where this is the preferable option for dealing with that material, for example recovering energy from wood that isn't clean enough to recycle. 2014/15 saw a slight increase on 2013/14, taking Surrey's recycling and recovery rate to 60%, meaning that more work is required from all of Surrey's authorities if we are to meet this challenging target.

Recycling rates across the county have remained fairly static for the past three years and the Surrey Waste Partnership is working hard to turn this around. All 12 partner authorities have developed action plans aimed at delivering the aims of the joint strategy and progress is regularly monitored by the partnership. From a resourcing perspective, SCC has committed to match funding for a dedicated Surrey Waste Partnership communications team for the next three years in order to engage with the public in new and innovative ways and has a small team of officers who work with district and borough colleagues to deliver countywide kerbside improvement projects.

It is estimated that delivering the actions set out in the new joint waste strategy could save the Surrey taxpayer up to £8m per year. However, it has been acknowledged by Surrey Chief Executives that the current way in which the partner authorities work together is unlikely to deliver this saving. The Surrey Waste Partnership is therefore looking at new models of how we can work together most effectively and progress will be reported to Cabinet early next year.

CABINET MEMBER UPDATES TO FULL COUNCIL- 8 December 2015

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

Autumn Statement: Local Growth Fund Update

In 2013 the Government announced the creation of a £12bn Local Growth Fund. Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) were invited to bid for funding to support capital projects, specifically infrastructure projects that would unlock economic growth or skills capital projects. Two rounds of bidding were completed prior to February 2015, with Surrey securing over £50m for projects for 2015-2021.

In the recent Autumn Statement, the Government confirmed its commitment to deliver the £12bn for the Local Growth Fund and the indicative allocations already made to LEPs. This means that the funds for projects such as the Meadows Gyrotory in Camberley and resilience schemes on the A22 and A24 have been fully secured and the projects will continue to progress as planned.

Approximately half of the Local Growth Fund has already been allocated to LEPs. We understand that just over £6bn is available to support projects from 2017 – 2021 and Government is likely to issue a call in Spring 2016 (round 3). The Department for Transport has increased its investment in the Local Growth Fund, and as such, transport projects are likely to remain an important element of any future deals.

Work is underway with both Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) to ensure that Surrey is well prepared for the next round including working with all districts and boroughs to start the process of identifying suitable projects which can then be developed into detailed business cases where appropriate.

Growth Hub

The Autumn Statement set out Government proposals to provide further funding for 'Growth Hubs', which are managed by the LEPs and provide support to businesses. Surrey County Council is directly involved in the delivery of the Enterprise M3 Growth Hub and working with partners to help businesses unlock their potential for growth. £12m will be made available for LEPs in 2016/17 and 2017/18. Although the process for accessing the fund is unclear, it is likely to be on a competitive basis. We will work with both LEPs to help secure funding to support the ongoing development of the Hubs in the Surrey area.

Enterprise Zone

The Government has also announced the creation of an Enterprise Zone for the Enterprise M3 LEP, part of which falls within Surrey. Longcross Park in Runnymede has been allocated Enterprise Zone status, alongside Basing View in Basingstoke and Whitehill and Borden. Businesses located on Enterprise Zones will benefit from business rate incentives, while the local area will retain 100% of the business rates.

NAME:	Mel Few
PORTFOLIO:	Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence

Cabinet approves 2 papers to support further integration with Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG'S

- Progressing the Integration of Health and Social Care in Surrey:
 - Approval to continue exploring and implementing individual programmes with the objective of increasing the integration of Adults Social Care and Health
 - The paper highlighted accelerated progress with two CCG's (Surrey Heath and North East Hants & Farnham CCG) in the integration of services too date.
 - Details progress on other CCG integration programmes.
- East Surrey Integrated Reablement Unit:
 - Approval to invest £1.7m in a new Integrated Health Unit in partnership with East Surrey CCG and East Surrey Hospital with the objective of ensuring vulnerable elderly receive focused reablement to reduce the time spent in hospital and the time taken to full recovery enabling early return to their homes.

Benchmarking studies commence between Surrey, Hampshire and Oxfordshire Adult Services

- In an effort to ensure that Surrey's Adults Services costs are in line with comparative authorities, Hampshire and Oxfordshire have agreed to share both financial information and practices with us.
- Work has commenced and the expectations are that any potential savings or changes in work practices will be available for incorporation into the budget for 2016/17.

Future provision for accommodation with care and support

- A paper was presented to and received support from the Social Services Board on 25 November 2015 outlining the strategic direction for the provision of Accommodation with Care and Support for both elderly and residents with learning difficulties.
- Following on from the paper to the Social Services Board the Cabinet will be discussing the paper including requesting approval to proceed with detailed site investigations to give effect to this strategy.
- Finally, I take this opportunity of advising members that Dave Sargeant who has been associated with the Adult Social Service portfolio for 32 years will retire at the end of December. I am confident that all members who have been

involved with the Service will recognise his contribution over the years and wish him well in his retirement. On a personal note I thank Dave for his support, advice and resilience in handling me with care, over the last 3 1/2 years.

- I also confirm that the People, Performance and Development Committee at its meeting on Friday 27 November 2015 agreed to Helen Atkinson being appointed as head of the combined Adults and Public Health services and look forward to working with her in the new role which has as one of its main areas of focus being progressing integration with health and Adult Services.

NAME:	Denise Le Gal
PORTFOLIO:	Business Services and Resident Experience

Business Services continues to make real progress in developing partnership arrangements that bring improvements and efficiencies to Surrey County Council, and ultimately benefit the residents we serve, by managing and reducing our overall costs.

Examples include:

- The development of the Orbis partnership between Surrey and East Sussex Councils for the delivery of business services continues to evolve, and other local authorities have showed an interest in joining the Orbis Partnership.
- The Supplier Portal, our simple, secure and efficient way for managing procurement and standardising the approach we take to the supplier market has been endorsed by the Federation of Small Businesses (FSB), and by January will have grown to include a total of 21 public sector authorities in the South East region. This demonstrates the commitment of Surrey County Council to the economic prosperity of our local area.
- Delegation of pensions administration services from the London 'Tri Borough' arrangement (of LB Westminster, LB Kensington & Chelsea and LB Hammersmith & Fulham) to the Orbis partnership; recognition of our high quality transaction business operations. There are further prospective opportunities being explored.

NAME:	Mike Goodman
PORTFOLIO:	Environment and Planning

Newlands Corner

Newlands Corner is owned by the Albury Estate with the Access managed through an Agreement by SCC. SCC have then commissioned SWT to deliver that access management. The site received over 500,000 visits per annum and has the potential to be a key site for engaging people in outdoor activities. The Newlands Corner Project is in two phases. Phase 1 to improve the visitor facilities that exist on site and install a new family play trail while re commencing car parking charges to generate an income stream to fund the management of the site. Ever tightening budgets mean that it is now more important than ever that the Countryside Estate becomes financially self sufficient. Phase 2 will involve the redevelopment of the visitor facilities to provide improved visitor centre, with indoor cafe, better toilets, community space and a small retail outlet for local Surrey produce. An indicative location is included in the masterplan for the site, however no design has yet been drawn. The Architects are currently working on the background research to produce three draft designs by early in the New Year. These will be displayed on site and on our website to allow the public to feedback on location and design.

Surrey Rural Strategy

Surrey's Rural Strategy ran until 2015 and is now under review following engagement with a wide stakeholder group. SCREF (Surrey Countryside and Rural Enterprise Forum) is leading on the review and will take ownership of the Strategy. It is vital that Surrey's rural issues and needs are reflected in policies, delivery and funding, and that rural areas are not disadvantaged by access to services. At the SCREF Conference earlier this year we held a workshop to hear views about the future of rural Surrey. Delegates told us that rural Surrey should have vibrant rural communities, a dynamic rural economy and a healthy rural environment. A Task Group has analysed the information from the workshop and that forms the basis of a new Rural Strategy for Surrey.

Please complete the 'survey monkey' questionnaire on the link below. You can complete the whole survey or select the sections that are most relevant to you. The survey will close on Monday 4 January 2016. Please do also forward the link on to contacts in your Division with an interest in rural Surrey,

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/BNKJ5G5>

Rail

There are three priority options identified in the 2013 Surrey Rail. Taking each in turn:

Crossrail 2 scheme assessment was completed in October. It provides an evidence base for our response to Crossrail 2 design development and the consultation that commenced on 27 October and runs until 8 January. It will also be used in our work 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.

An all Members' seminar on Crossrail 2 took place on 9 November 2015.

A **North Downs Line** lobbying document has been produced that summarises a series of investments in infrastructure, services and stations over the short, medium and long term. Key for us is prioritising the North Downs Line for investment in Control Period 6 (post 2019), and we are working with Network Rail on the detail of this.

Access to Airports work continues with regular liaison meeting with Heathrow Airport, chaired by the Deputy Leader. We are firmly of the view that Government should lead and co-ordinate the establishment of a clear framework to deliver transport infrastructure to accommodate anticipated passenger growth at both Heathrow and Gatwick Airports and especially relating to any new runway to ensure it is in the right place at the right time. We have requested that the requirement for a Southern Rail Access remains high on Network Rails' priorities.

Finally, turning to **Camberley**, we have commissioned Arup to help us understand how best to influence key decision makers in the rail industry regarding access to London from Camberley, Bagshot and Frimley. This was identified as a main adequacy issue for rail in Surrey in the Rail Strategy, given a poor level of service and relatively long journey times from these stations to London. This work will be completed by the end of January.

Community Recycling Centres (CRCs)

On 24 November, Cabinet approved the implementation of a number of cost-saving measures at our community recycling centres. The changes were agreed following a public consultation , which took place between July and September this year.

Cabinet agreed a number of proposed actions including a reduction to opening hours and at some sites, opening days, as well as the introduction of charges for some wastes and the establishment of reuse shops.

The detail of the changes are being worked up with our contractor SUEZ and will be put before the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board at their meeting on 26 January 2016.

The proposed changes, will be introduced as soon as operationally possible in 2016 and are expected to result in savings of £1.8 million per year.

NAME:	John Furey
PORTFOLIO:	Highways, Transport and Planning

Section 19 reports and their availability to members

In October, we published "Section 19" reports for the flooding that occurred in 2013/14. A Section 19 report is a report that a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) must publish after becoming aware of a flood event that has taken place in its area. This is required under the Flood and Water Management Act (2010). It is not the purpose of these reports to hold individual risk management authorities to account for the flood events of 2013/14. This is not what is set out by the legislation - the reports instead look at the natural conditions that contributed to the flooding, the impacts of it and what the relevant risk management authorities did in response.

A total of 13 reports have been published - one for each District and Borough, along with two bespoke reports for the severe flooding events that took place around the River Ash and Caterham Bourne. These reports have made a number of recommendations around data sharing and partnership working between Local Authorities in Surrey, with the result being that should a similar event on the scale of the 2013/14 floods take place again, the county will be better prepared and more resilient. Copies of the reports are available on the SCC [website](#).

Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee –funding

On the 25 November, the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee voted to increase the Levy contributions by 1.99% in 2016/17 from £10,708,950 to £10,922,058, an increase of £213,108 shared across 54 LLFA's, including SCC. This is in line with the decision made in January of this year to give consent to the capital programme of work over the next 6 years and an agreement to increase the Thames Levy by 1.99% over the course of this period. Over the 6 year programme (including this year) Surrey benefits from approx £43.9M investment from FDGiA and Levy (although a good deal of this will be for the RTS).

Sustainable Drainage Systems

Since 16 April of this year SCC has been a statutory consultee to the planning process regarding the management of surface water on major developments, with Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) becoming a material consideration for Local Planning Authorities (LPA) when determining these planning applications. SuDS use techniques which are designed to more closely mimic natural drainage systems; such as allowing rainwater to soak into the ground or be stored in features such as ponds and then discharge into watercourses.

National SuDs standards are in place, which if followed, ensure that surface water from new developments does not increase the risk of flooding. There are variations in the discharging of this SuDS consultee duty across the LLFAs due to ambiguities in the national guidance and local policies, but SCC is providing a detailed technical appraisal against the national standards for most major applications we are consulted upon. We are currently dealing with around 30-40 applications per month and find that a significant number still fail to provide full evidence that the national standards are being adhered to, though this is steadily improving.

We now have a team in place whose full-time role is to assess SuDS applications across the county. Officers from this team are working closely with the Development Managers across the LPAs to ensure an efficient, proportionate and robust response is provided within the 21 day statutory consultation period. Alongside other LLFA's in the Thames area we will be developing more formal guidance for LPA's and developers to improve SuDS uptake within developments and ensure a consistent approach to assessing and responding to applications.

Pothole Update

From 1 January 2015 SCC's term highway contractor Kier has completed the permanent repair of approximately 55,000 potholes improving the condition of Surrey's road network and ensuring a robust defence against third party claims for damage to vehicles and persons due to the condition of the road network. In addition, during the same period, a further 10,000 non-pothole (for example paving, kerbs, signs, gullies, footpaths, street furniture) permanent repairs have been completed through Kier's 'Project Safety Defect'.

This equates to over 5,000 potholes and 950 non-pothole repairs being permanently repaired every month within 20 days of identification, with the highest risk defects repaired within between 24 hours and 5 days of identification.

On average Kier's works crews permanently repair 25 dangerous potholes per hour on the Surrey road network.

Since January, 99.19% of the repairs have been completed to, or above the expected quality standards meaning that less than 1% of all defects have required additional work once completed, this has resulted in less disruption to the road network with follow up repairs for failed works almost completely eradicated. (Data source Lot 1 KPI 5).

NAME: Richard Walsh
PORTFOLIO: Localities and Community Wellbeing

Libraries

Although, we already have good Wi-Fi in all our libraries, there is scope for improvement in the public areas. Surrey Libraries successfully bid for £36,000 and is one of 68 authorities across England to receive funding from the Arts Council initiative to enhance free Wi-Fi to library users.

There have been just over 400,000 visits to the libraries web pages since April 2015; 37,000 visits to our app; and 1,181 new people signed up to Overdrive e-books.

"Experience Guildford" Customer Service Awards 2015 / category Service providers - Finalist..... 'Guildford library'

Surrey Arts

In what is a huge tribute to our fantastic young people and the Surrey Arts team our UP! Orchestra of Unlimited Potential has been short-listed for the very prestigious Best Musical Initiative Award at the 2016 Music Teacher Awards for Excellence -- the Oscars of the Music Education World. The awards will be announced on 25 February 2016.

Heritage

As part of the Surrey Heritage 'Surrey in the Great War' lottery funded project there are thirty-four enthusiastic volunteers working as newspaper indexers and delving through twelve Surrey newspapers for the years between 1914 and 1922 to help us to identify how the Great War affected the county. All the information will be made available on the following website:

<http://www.exploringsurreypast.org.uk/themes/subjects/military/surreys-first-world-war/remembers/>

Tourism

An investment of £50,000 from Surrey Growth Fund, SCC was made for a replacement website for 'Visit Surrey'. This was needed because the old website was no longer user friendly. The site has enjoyed a 30% growth per annum over the last four years and the new website now has over 800,000 unique visits - and is the main marketing tool (top in Google searches) for the promotion of the county's tourism economy. The Surrey visitor economy is worth £2billion in turnover, employing 35,000 people.

NAME:	Linda Kemeny
PORTFOLIO:	Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement

At my meetings with headteachers and chairs of governors this term, as well as school funding, Ofsted inspections, and special needs support, discussion has focused on new 'Assessments without Levels' introduced by the Department for Education from this academic year, to replace the familiar gradings across Key Stages 1 and 2. Children in all year groups from year 1 to year 6 will be taught the new national curriculum with an associated new model of assessment which removes the concept of levels. By the end of each Key Stage, pupils will be expected to know, apply, and understand the issues, skills, and processes specified in the relevant study programme. The new national curriculum breaks down the study programmes into one- or two-year sections, and pupils are required to master specified age-related learning in the course of a year to ensure that they are fully able to access the curriculum in the following year.

This is based on a 'mastery' approach to learning which reflects whether pupils have achieved specific age related expectations. Teachers and governors are having to understand a new way of thinking whereby pupils are expected to be 'meeting the standard' or 'exceeding the standard' rather than achieving a level. The requirement is that the vast majority of pupils will meet the age related expectations by the end of the academic year. The model is based on the theory that any pupil given high quality teaching and enough time can learn to 'master' the expected standard. The objective of teaching in this way is to create a deeper understanding of the subject being taught. For example, the Ofsted School Inspection Handbook published in August states that evaluating the effectiveness of a school's work in maths will consider how pupils develop depth of understanding and readiness for the next stage.

This new approach requires teachers to adapt their planning and teaching practice so that time and resources are used differently for pupils who require more time, and to deepen and extend learning for those who have met all the objectives quickly. Evidence of learning has to be gathered so that judgments can be made on whether pupils are on track to meet end of year standards. Schools are free to set their own assessment policy and, according to Ofsted, inspectors will not expect to see any specific frequency, type, or volume of marking and feedback; these will be for schools to decide.

In KS4, a new grading of 1 (lowest) to 9 (highest) will replace GCSE A*-G grades for English from 2016, for Maths from 2017, and for other subjects from 2018. Grade 1 will roughly equal the midpoint of the current grade 'G' to the midpoint of 'F', with the new top grade 9 being equivalent to the top two-thirds of an A* grade, generally increasing the difficulty to achieve top GCSE grades.

NAME:	Helyn Clack
PORTFOLIO:	Wellbeing and Health

Cabinet Decisions

Closer integration between local authorities and the NHS in the provision of health and social care is the most effective means of achieving sustainability in the face of rising demand without compromising on the quality of services delivered. At its meeting on 24 November, the Cabinet agreed a number of recommendations to move towards ever closer integration between health and social care in Surrey, including:

- Working with CCGs to design and implement contracts for the delivery of health visiting, school nursing, Parent Infant Mental Health and CAHMS Community Nursing contracts.
- Jointly fund and operate a 22 bed reablement unit at East Surrey Hospital.
- Approving a framework for supporting the integration of health and social care in Surrey.

Comprehensive Spending Review

The outcomes of the Comprehensive Spending Review announced by the Chancellor in the Autumn Statement have wide-ranging implications for healthcare funding in England. Significantly, reductions were announced in funding for Public Health with local authorities being required to find savings of 6.2% from public health budgets in 2015/16. For Surrey, this equates to savings of £2.2million this year. The spending review identified that there will be an average annual real-terms savings of 3.9% over the next five years. This is understood to translate into a further reduction of 9.6% in addition to the above savings made in 2015/16. Nationally it is known that the savings will be phased in at 2.2% in 16/17, 2.5% in 17/18, 2.6% in each of the two following years and flat cash in 20/21.

To achieve these and additional savings of £5.1million over the next five years to help fund wider Public Health projects and meet the MTFP, services are being reviewed and prioritised to inform reductions in provision which will be implemented through contract variation and re-commissioning of services. Public Health budgets will, however, be ring-fenced for the next two years and consultation will be undertaken with councils in relation to the possible future funding of Public Health through money which arises as a result of the proposed reform of business rates.

Other key health related announcements from the Autumn Statement include:

- An extra £10 billion a year in funding for the NHS in real terms to meet the Government's commitment to fully fund the NHS Five Year Forward View.
- An additional £1.5 billion for the Better Care Fund.
- Every part of the country to have a plan for integration by 2017 with implementation by 2020.

The Health and Wellbeing Board

Since the last meeting of the Council, the Health and Wellbeing Board has had two informal meetings during which members considered some of the pressing issues facing the health and social care community in Surrey and discussed ways in which the Board can use its position to alleviate these challenges. This included a workshop to identify areas that the Board can address to overcome the main challenges facing residents as they enter the health and social care system. Members also received a presentation on the progress that has been made to date via the workforce enabler group of the Better Care Fund, a body comprised of health and social care representatives with the aim of addressing challenges relating to workforce in Surrey.

The Health and Wellbeing Board has also agreed some changes to the way that it operates which will come into effect throughout 2016 and early 2017. Significantly, a refresh of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) was approved with the changes including the adoption of a life-course approach as well as the addition of self-supporting chapters. It was further agreed that the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy will also be revised once the JSNA refresh is completed in Autumn 2016.