

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 11 OCTOBER 2016 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	*	George Johnson
	John Beckett		Linda Kemeny
	Mike Bennison		Colin Kemp
	Liz Bowes		Eber Kington
*	Natalie Bramhall		Rachael I Lake
	Mark Brett-Warburton		Yvonna Lay
	Ben Carasco		Ms D Le Gal
	Bill Chapman		Mary Lewis
	Helyn Clack		Ernest Mallett MBE
	Carol Coleman		Mr P J Martin
	Stephen Cooksey		Jan Mason
	Mr S Cosser		Marsha Moseley
	Clare Curran		Tina Mountain
*	Graham Ellwood		Christopher Norman
	Jonathan Essex		John Orrick
	Robert Evans		Adrian Page
*	Tim Evans		Karan Persand
	Mel Few		Chris Pitt
	Will Forster		Wyatt Ramsdale
	Mrs P Frost		Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
	Denis Fuller	*	Denise Saliagopoulos
	John Furey		Tony Samuels
	Bob Gardner	*	Pauline Searle
	Mike Goodman		Stuart Selleck
	David Goodwin		Michael Sydney
	Michael Gosling		Keith Taylor
	Zully Grant-Duff		Barbara Thomson
	Ramon Gray		Chris Townsend
	Ken Gulati		Denise Turner-Stewart
	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

54/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Bramhall, Mr Ellwood, Mr Tim Evans, Mrs Hicks, Mr Johnson, Mrs Searle, Mrs White and Mr Witham.

55/16 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 12 July 2016 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

56/16 ELECTION OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR [Item 3]

The Chief Executive formally reported that Mr Wyatt Ramsdale was duly elected as the new County Councillor for the Farnham South division following the by-election held on 18 August 2016.

57/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

She informed Members of the death of former County Councillor, Mr Richard Butcher, who was the County Councillor for Caterham Hill from 1989 until 1992. Members stood in silent tribute.

Recent events that were mentioned:

- Her hospice fundraising event, which so far had raised £18,000 to support to hospices of Surrey. The Chairman's Surrey Cow Parade cow was yet to be auctioned but had so far achieved a bid of £10,000 and therefore, nearly £30,000 has been raised.
- The official opening of Woking Fire Station
- Volunteer Reception where Members' nominated 'local heroes' were honoured at an evening reception last month
- She had taken part in the Service for the Judiciary in Guildford, hosted by the High Sheriff, on Friday 7 October
- HRH Countess of Wessex had visited Moor House School in Oxted, a specialist school for children and young people with speech and language difficulties, on Monday 10 October to open the three new residential houses
- On Wednesday 12 October, that she would receive, on behalf of the county, the Military of Defence 'Employer Recognition Gold Award'. Surrey was the only Council to receive the Gold award and joined organisations such as the Royal Bank of Scotland, Nationwide & Keir Group in receiving this award.
- She welcomed Cllr Michael Ensor, Chairman of East Sussex Council to the meeting.
- The Vice-Chairman had officially opened: Camberley Library's new services, Cranmere Primary School's new building and nursery school and the 'Surrey Prepared' conference in Leatherhead which had focused on community resilience in the event of flooding.

Finally, she informed Members that the authority was in the process of recruiting a new Independent Person to assist the authority and Members in allegations and investigations about councillor conduct and asked Members to publicise this role if they knew of any potentially suitable candidates.

58/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

There were none.

59/16 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 6]

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

Members raised the following topics:

- He was asked how long it would be before this local authority ceased to exist and that there was a three southern counties Mayor.
- Mrs Watson welcomed the initiative to integrate health and social care and declared that she would be willing to work with the Leader to move it forward, for the benefit of Surrey residents.

60/16 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROGRESS REPORT [Item 7]

The Leader presented the Surrey County Council Progress Report, the fourteenth of the Chief Executive's reports to Members. He said that included in the report were some outstanding examples of Surrey County Council achievements.

Members made the following comments:

- The report highlighted the excellent work of the County Council, particularly for Looked After Children and young care leavers. It was hoped that this work would help enable them to achieve a good start in life.
- The Health and Social Care Integration Plans would be a topic for a future Member seminar, and that Borough / District councillors would be invited.
- Congratulations to the Chief Executive and his wife on their wedding which had taken place in July at County Hall.
- Attention was drawn to one of the case studies concerning the Streets Ahead programme in Elmbridge and the need to secure Government funding for these projects.
- That the innovative work being undertaken to divert and reduce the number of women being prosecuted in the criminal justice system was welcomed.
- Members enjoyed the case studies.
- A request that the Leader kept all Members informed about the progress being made in the Children's Service, as the implementation of changes following the Ofsted report from June 2015 came to fruition.
- The importance of recognising the quality of staff at the County Council and that staff were thanked for their work.

RESOLVED:

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

61/16 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 8]

Notice of 18 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix B.

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

(Q1) Mr Robert Evans drew attention to the following indices in the Prudential Survey on the Quality of Retirement Index: (i) Disability Free Life Expectancy, (ii) Access to Health Care, and (iii) Crime Levels, and asked the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health to consider options to improve these areas for Surrey residents. The Cabinet Member made reference to the Health and Wellbeing Board, which she considered had done an excellent job in the last two years. She agreed to take the points raised by Mr Evans into account when the Surrey Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy was refreshed.

(Q2) Mr Kington asked the Leader of the Council for details of any opposition Member who had requested that the Council produced a summary version of the Annual report. **Mr Young** asked the Leader of the Council if he agreed that the booklet reflected the views of all councillors.

The Leader of the Council said that the County Council has a duty to produce this information and considered that it was a useful document for Members to use when engaging with residents in their divisions.

(Q4) Mrs Watson said that she remained concerned about certain aspects of risk relating to the County Council's investment in commercial buildings and their residual value. She asked the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience for more information. The Cabinet Member provided a detailed response, including stating that capital appreciation was not taken into account in these assessments.

(Q5) Mr Forster expressed disappointment that nearly £10K had been spent on fifty Blackberry devices which were now not used and asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing for the current location of the devices. She agreed that the outcome for their use had been disappointing and confirmed that the devices were held by the Council but were unsaleable.

(Q6) Mr Forster considered that it was unacceptable that Surrey residents had such short notice to alterations to the bus service provision in North West Surrey. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning sympathised with the situation, which he said was not the fault of the County Council. He said that Abellio had decided to terminate nine bus services with effect from 31 December 2016. The County Council had now re-tendered the routes but the timescales were challenging and there would be insufficient time for a full consultation. However, he provided assurance that he would be working to obtain a satisfactory solution for Surrey residents.

(Q7) Mr Beardsmore requested that the Leader of the Council re-considered his response and said that he had already approached his MP to press for a more balance transition for changes to state pension arrangements for this group of women.

(Q8) Mr Sydney said that he had not seen a copy of the tender documents which had probably been drawn up several months after officers' visit to the farm in

January 2016. It was his view that the farm buildings must be repaired by September and that the Council was not acting in the best interest of its farming community. The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience disagreed, stating that she did value the work of Surrey's farming communities. She said that Property Services officers were doing everything they could to expedite this issue, which was complex.

(Q9) Mr Hussain asked the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health for assurance that the ambulance station in Knaphill, a very congested area, would not close until a risk assessment had been undertaken. The Cabinet Member confirmed that she had written to Northwest Surrey CCG and hoped for a robust reply, which she would share with him.

(Q10) Mr Essex asked whether this Council would consider linking up with other County Councils to ensure that the Government provided adequate funding for Adult Social Care because the Council needed a better deal for its residents.

Mr Mallett was concerned about the lack of clarity in relation to the revenue losses being proposed by Government and asked the Leader for a table setting out gains / losses, which could be circulated to Members.

The Leader of the Council said that there would be an opportunity for Members to make their views known on the Government's proposed four year settlement offer later in the agenda. He also confirmed that he would continue to lobby Government for a better funding deal for Surrey and that the Budget meeting in February 2017 would be the right time to consider options.

(Q11) Mr Young asked the Leader of the Council, who agreed, that all Members of the County Council should abide by the Council's new Customer Promise.

(Q12) Mr Robert Evans invited the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to accompany him on a cycling trip across North West Surrey so that he could experience the issues relating to cycling, including some disjointed cycling lanes. The Cabinet Member said that officers were currently working on developing new standards for a cycling infrastructure so that funding could be secured to develop high quality and joined up cycle routes. He agreed to accept Mr Evans' invite.

(Q14) Mr Beardsmore requested that the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience provided him, outside the meeting, with details relating to the number of tenants in Surrey's investment properties that had a Grade A credit rating and also to include the length of their tenancy agreements. She agreed to this request.

(Q15) Mr Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning whether the fixed term, one year appointment of an enforcement officer could be made a permanent appointment. The Cabinet Member explained that this officer would be co-ordinating with Boroughs and Districts to consider the issue of fly-tipping. He confirmed that whilst it was a Criminal Act and a serious issue, the number of incidents so far had not increased since the introduction of charges at the Community Recycling Centres.

(Q16) Mr Young asked the Leader of the Council if all Members should abide by the Seven Principles of Public Life and in particular, those relating to Openness and Leadership. The Leader read out the seven Nolan Principles and informed him that a copy of them was on the wall in the Cabinet room. He hoped that all Members would abide by them and he would ask the Democratic Services Lead Manager to re-circulate them to all Members.

(Q17) Mr Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence to clarify the differing percentage figures in paragraph 2 of his written response, which he did.

(Q18) Mr Young expressed his thanks to the Surrey Arts team and in particular to key officers within the team and invited the Leader of the Council to add his appreciation. The Leader referred Members to his response, in which he had already expressed his thanks.

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

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning: Concern was raised about Abellio's decision to downsize their operation for bus service provision in Surrey, particularly in the Weybridge / Walton / Esher area. The Cabinet Member was urged to work closely with Elmbridge Borough Council to mitigate the impact. He acknowledged the challenging issue and said that negotiations were still on-going with Abellio and agreed to keep all Members informed of the outcome.

A request was also made to have further discussions with St Peter's hospital in relation to the bus service no. 557.

On future proposals for rail schemes, when asked whether any work had been undertaken on the actual spare capacity and demand against it, the Cabinet Member confirmed that there was very little spare capacity on Surrey's rail lines. He also informed Members that work on various proposals for a southern rail access to Heathrow airport from Surrey should be completed in November and would be shared widely with Members.

That since the changes made at the Community Re-cycling Centres, there had been an increase in the number of complaints relating to bonfires so did the Cabinet Member have any suggestions to help residents? He responded by advising of the importance of working together with both boroughs and the police to resolve this issue.

Deputy Leader – agreed to discuss Mrs Lake's question concerning MIPIM UK outside the meeting.

Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing – in relation to the Ofsted inspection (31 August – 1 September 2016), the Cabinet Member confirmed that the County Council was maintaining a sharp focus on those areas where it was known that further sustained improvement was required and this was monitored through the Improvement Board.

Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding was asked how Members could suggest schemes for inclusion in the Pavement Horizon programme. The Cabinet Member informed the County Council that an email was sent to all Members in May inviting their suggestions.

62/16 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 9]

There was one local Member statement, from Mrs Pat Frost, concerning traffic congestion in Farnham.

63/16 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 10]

Item 10(i)

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

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

'Council recognises:

- i) the important role that the County Council's youth centres have to play in providing positive activities and support for young people to help overcome their problems, as well as a safe space for them to meet and socialise;
- ii) the role that youth centres play in providing early help and preventative support for children and young people that Ofsted has identified as lacking in Surrey, following its report into Surrey's Childrens' Services published in June 2015.

Council regrets:

- i) the poor use of County Council resources in maintaining youth centres that are closed for many hours a week and the reduction in budget that the Youth Service has suffered in recent years.

Council calls for:

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing to urgently review Youth Service provision in the county with a view to extending youth centre opening hours where appropriate, and consideration being given to either voluntary providers or other community organisations sharing buildings so that greater and more efficient use is made of County Council resources.'

Mrs Watson made the following points:

- The important role of youth centres because they provided a safe place for young people.
- The Ofsted report into Surrey's Children Services in June 2015 and its comments relating to youth provision.
- The reduction in the youth service budget and the £200k underspend.
- That the Council's youth centres were only open for a limited number of hours, which could result in difficulties in meeting young people's needs - she considered that the centres should be open for longer.
- Vacancies within the service were also an issue.
- Missing IT equipment and the need to ensure that resources were not misused.

- Finally, she urged the Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing to review the current arrangements and extend the opening hours of its youth centres.

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

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing made the following points:

- That she was disappointed that this motion was on the agenda because the County Council had moved away from a 'place based' youth provision – she highlighted the positive outcomes achieved and gave reasons for rejecting the motion.
- The county had a low rate of both NEETs and first time entries into the criminal justice system.
- There had been an increase in the number of apprenticeships.
- Surrey's youth service had received both national and international recognition and the service had received visitors from other authorities wishing to learn from the Surrey model.
- During the re-commissioning of services, officers had ensured that the views of the young people had been included and had shaped the service provision.

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

- Agreement with the views of the Cabinet Member.
- The importance of celebrating the success of the youth services
- Consideration of the proposed budget reductions had been undertaken by a cross party review, which had included Members and young people
- It was 'community' youth work because the County Council worked closely, and in partnership, with Boroughs, Districts and faith groups
- The operational changes to the service had caused some problems
- The youth service budget should have been fully used
- The importance of working with voluntary providers
- Staffing issues and whether there was a specific staff recruitment programme in place
- That there was much positive work being undertaken – it was the staff rather than youth centres who did youth work
- In debating this issue, the County Council could re-assure its residents that it had a modern approach to youth service provision
- The under-utilised buildings could be earmarked for Early Help Hubs, as part of a joined up family support service
- The importance of continuing to provide a Value for Money youth service provision, despite budget pressures
- Reference to the Internal Audit report on Surrey Youth Centres, which highlighted areas of concern within the service
- That the motion was not about requesting additional funding for the service, it was about using resources effectively to provide early help and preventative support for young people.

The motion was put to the vote with 7 Members voting for and 50 Members voting against it. There were 10 absentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

Item 10(ii)

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

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

'This Council notes that Surrey County Council is now recognised by the minerals industry, the nature conservation organisations and other councils as being a lead in best practice achieved through restoration-led planning and enhancement of mineral sites.

This Council believes that it is vital that such full restoration following mineral operation, as a temporary use of sites, is an important part of the way we plan to protect and enhance our Green Belt and countryside going into the future.

This Council agrees to ensuring such proactive approaches and high standards are supported and sustained on all sites across Surrey County Council in the future.'

Mr Essex made the following points:

- This motion was about what happened after the mineral operation had ended because there should be a pro-active enforcement approach to the restoration of these sites
- Acknowledgement that the processes did not always go according to plan and he illustrated this point with two examples in his area
- That Surrey County Council was recognised as being a lead in best practice for restoration led minerals planning and county officers had been recognised for their work.

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

Six Members spoke on the motion and made the following comments:

- The motion was supported
- That restoration and enhancement of mineral sites should always be part of these planning applications and their consent
- The Surrey style / approach had been recognised and the restoration programme had been underpinned by four key principles
- The need to work closely with local committees / Members to achieve the best results
- Although the processes generally worked well, there were still problems with some landowners, a particular issue in the Molesey area was highlighted by the local Member and drawn to the attention of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
- The motion was about going forward and the adoption of good practice for restoration led minerals planning.

The motion was put to the vote and unanimously supported.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council notes that Surrey County Council is now recognised by the minerals industry, the nature conservation organisations and other councils as being a lead in best practice achieved through restoration-led planning and enhancement of mineral sites.

This Council believes that it is vital that such full restoration following mineral operation, as a temporary use of sites, is an important part of the way we plan to protect and enhance our Green Belt and countryside going into the future.

This Council agrees to ensuring such proactive approaches and high standards are supported and sustained on all sites across Surrey County Council in the future.

64/16 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 11]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 14 July and 20 September 2016.

Recommendations on a Policy Framework Document

A Formation of Spelthorne Joint Committee

RESOLVED:

1. That it be agreed to establish the Spelthorne Joint Committee to deal with both executive and non-executive functions from 1 December 2016 in place of the current Local Committee in Spelthorne, which will cease to function from that date.
2. That the following changes to the scheme of delegation be approved:
 - to delegate the executive functions to the Spelthorne Joint Committee as set out in Appendix A of the submitted report
 - to delegate the non-executive functions to the Spelthorne Joint Committee as set out in Appendix A of the submitted report
 - the advisory functions that will come under the remit of the Spelthorne Joint Committee as set out in Appendix A of the submitted report.
3. That the functions that Spelthorne Borough Council has agreed to delegate to the Spelthorne Joint Committee, as set out in Appendix A of the submitted report, be noted.
4. That the Spelthorne Joint Committee Terms of Reference, including the Standing Orders under which it will operate, as set out in Appendix A of the submitted report be agreed, and authority be delegated to the Director of Legal, Democratic and Cultural Services to agree to any minor amendments to the Terms of Reference that may be required.
5. To recommend the appointment of a Chairman of the newly formed Spelthorne Joint Committee from 1 December 2016 (refer to item 12).

AJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.35pm and resumed at 1.45pm with all those present who had been in attendance at the morning session except for Mrs Barton, Mr Beckett, Mrs Clack, Mrs Coleman, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Goodwin, Mr Kington, Ms Le Gal, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mountain, Mr Norman, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mr Young and Mrs Young.

Reports for Information / Discussion

- **Financial Sustainability and Budget Planning 2017 – 2022**

The Cabinet at its meeting on 20 September 2016 considered this report and agreed that prior to the Leader taking a decision on whether to accept or decline the Government's four year settlement offer, it would welcome the views of all Members.

Members made the following comments:

- That the proposed final Local Government settlement for Surrey was the worst one that Members had seen.
- That Surrey was handicapped by the formula and its calculation, which did not support the demographic changes in the county.
- The recent Member seminar on the financial issues facing the Council had been well received by Members.
- The County Council needed to publicise to its residents the reasons for declining the Government's four year settlement and that the fourth year of the settlement would be a negative RSG for the Council.
- That this Council was an important provider of revenue for the Conservative Government.
- The Authority should refuse the offer, however, there were concerns about any possible adverse implications for the Council.
- That this Council should work with other County Councils and submit one joint response to Government.
- A request for an update on the Government's Fair Funding Review, the changes to Business Rates and also the Better Care Fund.
- Members were aware that many of Surrey's Boroughs and Districts Councils were likely to accept their offers.
- There had been meetings at County Hall to discuss the county's financial pressures, with several Surrey MPs and the Cabinet.
- Paying over £17m in the fourth year of the settlement would not be regarded favourably by Members and residents.
- Usually a four year settlement would be preferable due to the certainty of funding but not this time because this settlement would result in funding cuts.
- That the Leader should try and negotiate a better four year settlement because he had previously been successful in his funding negotiations with Government.
- That the Council should be protecting services for Surrey residents.
- It appeared that Central Government was not prioritising the funding for Local Government.
- That this Council required an additional £24m per year for Adult Social Care (ASC).
- If the County Council accepted the deal, then there would be the assumption that the Council could manage with less funding in the future.
- The importance of continuing to lobby for a fair deal for Surrey.

- Due to their Scrutiny Board work, all Members were aware of the budget savings required.
- This settlement related to the RSG and not other funding streams received by the Council.
- That a previous 'black hole' in the ASC budget had been met from Reserves. However, this action was not sustainable.
- If the County Council was given flexibility to set its own council tax precept, there could be a possibility that it could consider accepting the four year settlement.

Based on the views of the Members who spoke, the sentiment amongst the Council was to decline the Government's four year settlement offer.

The Leader thanked Members for their comments and said that he would reflect on their views before taking a decision on Wednesday 12 October whether to accept or decline the Government's four year settlement.

- **Quarterly Report on Decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements (July – September 2016)**

RESOLVED:

That the above reports were received and noted.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 14 July and 20 September 2016 be adopted.

65/16 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN FOR SPELTHORNE JOINT COMMITTEE [Item 12]

The Chief Executive announced that he had received one nomination, Denise Saliagopoulos, for Chairman of the Spelthorne Joint Committee.

It was:

RESOLVED:

That Mrs Saliagopoulos be appointed as Chairman of the Spelthorne Joint Committee, with effect from 1 December 2016 and for the remainder of this council year.

66/16 APPOINTING AN EXTERNAL AUDITOR [Item 13]

The Leader of the Council introduced the report, which recommended that the Council's external auditor was appointed through opting into a sector led appointment provided by Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd.

RESOLVED:

That opting in to the sector led appointment for the appointment of the Council's external auditors be approved.

67/16 APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL [Item 14]

The Chairman of the Council introduced the report and informed Members that she had chaired the interview panel for the positions on the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel. She drew attention to the update on the successful candidates tabled at the meeting (Appendix D).

RESOLVED:

1. That the appointment of the Independent Remuneration Panel members, Carolyn Deakins (Chairman), Paul Eaves and Bryan Ingleby, agreed by the Appointments Panel, be approved.
2. That the Terms of Reference of the Independent Remuneration Panel, as set out in the Annex to the submitted report, be approved.

68/16 WELLBEING AND HEALTH SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 15]

The Chairman of the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board presented this report. He also drew Members' attention to the Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs) and said that Surrey was covered by three STPs: Surrey Heartlands, Frimley and Sussex & East Surrey. He said that all Members of the Council would be welcome to attend the next meeting of the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board on 10 November 2016, where there would be presentations on the STPs.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board be noted.

69/16 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 16]

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

[Meeting ended at: 2.40pm]

Chairman

County Council – 11 October 2016

Leader of the Council's Statement

Madam Chairman, it is good to be back here with Members again and thank you to everyone for your kind wishes, cards and messages of support during the past few months - I really did appreciate it.

Can I also pay tribute to my Deputy, Peter Martin, for bridging the gap and holding the fort so well in my absence. As you may be aware, I had major heart surgery over the summer. When I was in the hospital, I had to face up to the possibility that I might not actually survive the operation. That is always a reality! Suddenly life could have stopped. In that moment, everything that mattered to me became clearer and I thought about what was really important to me. My wife, Anne, my family, my friends, being part of my local community and my role as a Councillor and as a Rotarian.

I had the chance to take stock of everything I was doing and everything I still hoped to achieve. I reflected on all of the decisions that led me here, all of the challenges and decisions that lie ahead. I know how life can take unexpected turns, and how, for some of us, it can change in an instant.

That is why I am so passionate that this Council is there to do the things that our residents expect from this Council and there when they suddenly need our support and our services. Just as importantly, that we strive to continue to improve our residents' lives day in, day out.

As individuals, each and every one of us has our own story and our own reason for becoming a councillor. We all share a genuine dedication to serving our residents and to making Surrey a better place to live and work.

It is now almost twenty five years since I became a Tandridge District Councillor but my drive to do the very best for those I represent is as strong today as it was way back in 1992. Experience has taught me that we are always going to be stronger and more effective as a team and that we make the best decisions after listening to everybody's views.

As I stand here, five years to the day after I made my first statement as the Leader of this Council, it is the right time to reflect on what we have achieved together so far. And also to understand the challenges that lie ahead of us.

Over the past five years, this County Council has delivered two international events:

Firstly, the Olympic road races during the London 2012 Olympics. It was not only a privilege to watch world top cyclists racing for glory across Surrey's magnificent countryside but we also honoured our promise to deliver a cycling legacy – the Ride London-Surrey Classic is now firmly embedded in the international cycling calendar.

Secondly, we hosted Her Majesty the Queen and the Prime Minister for a celebration of the 800th anniversary of the sealing of the Magna Carta on the Runnymede Meadows. It was a fantastic event commemorating our rich history and the fact that modern democracy was born right here, in Surrey.

These achievements show our vision, our talent and they demonstrate what is possible when we work together as ONE TEAM.

But what I am most proud of are the improvements that we, as the County Council, have made to the services our residents rely on - the ones that make a real difference in their day to day lives.

- We created 16,000 extra school places over the last 6 years – that is the equivalent of 38 large primary schools and we have plans for a further 11,000 extra school places by 2020. At the same time working with Surrey Teachers we raised standards across our schools – 93% of Surrey Schools are now rated either outstanding or good.
- We helped thousands of older people to carry on living in their own homes – 8,500 in the last year alone. This means the health service can free up essential resources while also ensuring our residents aren't being trapped unnecessarily in their hospital beds.
- We renewed hundreds of miles of the county's roads under Project Horizon and we are now well underway with the work to resurface our pavements.
- We bucked the national trend for library closures and kept all of our libraries open. Book loans are up 10% against national figures and we have achieved the milestone of two million junior fiction issues for the first time.
- And we delivered superfast broadband to an extra 86,000 properties which wouldn't otherwise have got it.

These are incredible achievements and there are many, many more which you can find in the booklet – 'More than 50 things Surrey County Council achieved in 2015-16'. But what is really impressive is that we did all of this whilst making savings of over £400m.

We should all feel incredibly proud of what we have achieved. Working together with our district and boroughs partners, our business community, the health and education services and alongside many of Surrey's volunteers, we created a stronger county. We could not have achieved any of this success without working as ONE team for Surrey and I believe it is much more important that we work together during difficult times.

I have stated that great challenges lie ahead of us. When I last addressed this Council, I made it clear that there was a limit to how much longer we can continue using efficiencies alone in order to bridge our funding gap. This year we forecast to make savings of over £80m. However, our capacity to make these savings is quite simply being outstripped by increasing demand and the rising cost of providing council services. We have squeezed the orange dry and there is nothing left.

As our population increases and ages, it is clear that we need to provide essential services for more and more residents, both young and old.

- The cost of providing adult social care services for the additional vulnerable residents in need of support, amounts to an additional £24m each year.
- The funding gap for Special Educational Needs services is expected to be £24m a year by the end of this decade.
- And the cost of creating the 11,000 extra school places required will amount to £30m.

We know increased demand is here to stay and that means we have to think very carefully about our financial sustainability, this year and in the coming years. This is absolutely our number one priority.

Members will no doubt be aware that as part of the Local Government Funding Settlement announced last Christmas, Councils were offered the chance to accept a four year financial deal from Government.

Under item 11 of this meeting, all Members have the opportunity to discuss our response. The Government requires our answer by the 14 October. Thus, it is crucial to hear Members' thoughts on this offer and I will be listening very carefully to comments across the chamber so we can all be sure that this decision is taken in the best interests of our residents.

Ensuring our finances remain sustainable also means we have to think carefully about how we choose to deliver our services, and with whom. This is particularly true for health and social care because keeping people healthy extends far beyond the individual responsibilities of today's separate health and care services. Especially when both of these services are feeling the significant strain of increasing demand and rising costs.

Having just had a major operation, I have never been more appreciative of the NHS. It is a highly-valued institution that plays a hugely important part in all of our lives. So it is important to make sure our health and care services are integrated and sustainable, because, at one stage or another, we will all rely on them. That is why I am pleased to announce that, following conversations with the Secretary of State for Health and the Head of NHS England, we are ready to move forward with devolved arrangements for the greater integration of health and social care through the Surrey Heartlands initiative. This will enable health and social care services to genuinely share their expertise, working across traditional boundaries and making the best use of their resources to deliver services locally. It is a big step towards the long-term sustainability of our health and care services.

Madam Chairman, the Prime Minister has laid out her vision.

- A vision for a fairer country.
- A vision for a society that works for everyone.
- And of course, that vision must mean Surrey residents too.

She has promised that great change is going to come and I am looking forward to that. I believe local Leaders can work with Government to achieve a society that works for everyone but only if government allows locally elected Leaders and Members to make local decisions about local services in order to meet the needs of local people, which, after all, is what residents believe they elected us to do.

Over the last 5 years, I am delighted that we have already improved the day to day lives for hundreds of thousands of Surrey residents. But the simple fact is that this Council needs long-term financial sustainability in the face of growing demand. Government needs to fund the growing gap of social care or alternatively allow the Council the ability to fund properly the social care needs of our residents.

So my ask of Government and our 11 Surrey MPs is this:

- **Work with us** to create a society that works for everyone in Surrey.
- **Help us** mend Surrey's creaking and overstretched infrastructure.
- **Provide us** with financial sustainability so that we can continue to meet the needs of Surrey's residents.
- **Or allow** us the freedom and responsibility to tackle the growing demand needs of local residents.
- **Trust us** to make the right choices for our County.

Then as ONE TEAM – we **will** play our part in delivering a society that works for everyone in Surrey.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 11 OCTOBER 2016

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

MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

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

A recent survey by Prudential rated Surrey only 10th in the *Quality of Retirement Index*. What ideas or plans are being considered by the Council to improve things for pensioners and to move Surrey up this scale?

Reply:

Thank you for your question in relation to the recent Prudential survey on the Quality of Retirement Index and the plans in place in Surrey to improve things for pensioners. It is great you have such an interest as it highlights the important issue of the health and wellbeing of retired older people in Surrey.

Whilst the Prudential Survey has helped to raise awareness of the quality of life experienced by retired people, as a comparable index we prefer to use the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). This provides a more robust theoretical methodology to measure relative deprivation, which is a key indicator for determining the quality of life of Surrey residents. The IMD ranks Surrey 150 out of 152 councils, London Boroughs, unitary authorities and metropolitan districts, where 152 is considered the least deprived. Therefore, Surrey is considered in the top three of the least deprived areas to live in the country which is a good overarching indicator that the quality of life in Surrey is high.

Older adults in Surrey are living longer and healthier lives in 2012 - 14 compared to 2009 – 11 and Surrey has one of the highest life expectancies in the country¹. By 2020 there will be 20,000 more older people and they will make up 1 in 5 of the population.

In order to meet the changing needs of our residents as they age, it is vital that there is a good supply of activities, services and support available in our towns and villages to help people stay active and healthy throughout their whole life.

In Surrey, we have a wide programme of work supporting improvements in older adults' health and wellbeing. Below you will find an overview, signposting to more detailed reports where available.

The [Surrey Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy](#)² prioritises "improving older adults' health and wellbeing" setting out the outcomes we hope to see through the work we do:

1. Older adults will stay healthier and independent for longer
2. Older adults will have a good experience of care and support
3. More older adults with dementia will have access to care and support

¹ <http://www.phoutcomes.info>

² <http://www.healthysurrey.org.uk/about-us/health-and-wellbeing-strategy/>

4. Older adults will experience hospital admission only when needed and will be supported to return home as soon as possible
5. Older carers will be supported to live a fulfilling life outside caring.

In support of this the Surrey Better Care Fund and the broader work to integrate health and social care services have agreed three strategic aims:

- Enabling people to stay well - maximising independence and wellbeing through prevention and early intervention for people at risk of being unable to manage their physical health, mental health and social care needs
- Enabling people to stay at home - integrated care delivered seven days a week through enhanced primary and community services which are safe and effective and increase public confidence to remain out of hospital or residential/nursing care
- Enabling people to return home sooner from hospital - excellent hospital care and post-hospital support for people with acute, specialist or complex needs supported by a proactive discharge system which enables a prompt return home

The Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board receives regular updates on progress towards achieving the outcomes of this priority, with the latest update being presented to the [Board in September 2016](#)³. This update sets out what we are trying to achieve in Surrey to improve the health and wellbeing of older adults; an update on the actions that we are taking jointly and the next steps; and how we are [tracking the progress/ impact](#)².

In Surrey we wish to recognise the many ways older people contribute to society and their local communities, and to build on the opportunities for improving the wellbeing of local people as they age. That's why we have a programme of work called [Living and Ageing Well in Surrey](#)⁴, working closely with partners in health, borough and district councils, voluntary, community and faith organisations, and local people with shared guiding principles and values: to make Surrey the best possible place to live and age well.

[Surrey's Commitment to Ageing Well](#)⁵ is a public statement of intentions setting out what organisations, groups of people and individuals aim to do to support people in Surrey to age well. By pledging support we can make positive changes for people in their local area and create healthy and vibrant communities fit for a population with older people than ever before.

Examples of some of the community projects and opportunities for older adults to engage in their communities include: Walking/ other sports or exercise groups; volunteer centres; intergenerational opportunities (e.g. working in schools); dementia awareness training and dementia champions; Wellbeing Cafes; and social prescribing projects.

Borough and District Councils also have an important role in older adults' health and wellbeing and the quality of life of retired people in Surrey. They offer a range of services such as housing support and adaptations, social isolation, community

³ <http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=328&MIId=5053&Ver=4>

⁴ <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/social-care-and-health/care-and-support-for-adults/support-to-stay-home/living-and-ageing-well-in-surrey>

⁵ http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/19807/CS2444-Ageing-Well-Commitment_WEB.pdf

transport, shopping services, handyman services and meals on wheels. These all contribute to the quality of life of older adults and improve the quality of retirement.

As you can see there is a wide range of activity happening in Surrey to improve the quality of life of older adults, supporting them to enjoy a happy and healthy retirement.

For further information please contact: Victoria Heald, Health and Wellbeing Programme Manager, Adult Social Care and Public Health
Email: victoria.heald@surreycc.gov.uk

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(2) MRS HELENA WINDSOR (GODSTONE) TO ASK:

The 2015/16 Annual Report was presented to Members in the form of a high quality printed book. A second booklet in the same style, titled 50 things we achieved in 2015/16 was delivered with the agenda for the 11 October 2016 County Council meeting. What were the costs of publishing and distributing these two items?

Reply:

The 2015-16 corporate Annual Report of the council was produced in line with good practice, endorsed by the council's auditors Grant Thornton, and based on a model used by many corporate organisations following professional accountancy conventions and the guidance of the International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC). The Annual Report provides performance highlights across the council's range of services over the last year and describes the context in which the council operates, its responsibilities and the major challenges it faces. Also in the report are audited financial statements, which the council is statutorily required to publish and are included as part of the main report for reasons of greater transparency and accessibility.

In addition, at the request of Members, the council also produced a summary version of the Annual Report, entitled More Than 50 Things We Achieved Last Year, which can be used as a reference for Members when engaging with their residents about the services provided by the council. The total cost of publishing and distributing the two publications to Members, MPs, partner organisations, businesses, libraries and other interested parties was £4,067.80.

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

(3) MRS JAN MASON (WEST EWELL) TO ASK:

In response to my question at a previous Council Meeting on the future Project Horizon Programme, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding stated that a provisional date for the new five year programme will be available in October. Can he now give me a date for the provision of this information.

Reply:

This information will be available and emailed to all Members on 1 November 2016.

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

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

The County Council is currently investing in commercial buildings - warehouses and offices outside Surrey for investment purposes – as set out in the Member Questions to the Cabinet on 20 September 2016.

The County Council is exposed to the counter-party risk of the tenant continuing to pay the rent on the warehouses and offices during the terms of the various leases, to interest rate risk if the funding has not been obtained on a fixed rate basis, to the risk that the dilapidation clauses will not ensure that the offices and warehouses are reinstated into current condition at the end of the leases, to the risk that the insurance purchased may not cover a potential loss, and to the property values at the maturity of the loan in order to be able to refinance or repay the sum borrowed to purchase the property at loan maturity.

Can the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience, in light of the County Council's previous problematic investments in Icelandic banks in recent years, confirm that the credit rating of the tenant counter-parties for each of the buildings purchased are "investment grade" and if not confirm how the credit risk will be managed by the County Council, confirm that the current lease terms match the debt repayment terms, i.e. that the tenants' rent fund the interest on the County Council's loans to the loan maturities without any contributions required from the County Council, confirm whether the loans obtained to acquire the properties have been obtained on a fixed rate basis or whether floating rate loans have been swapped onto a fixed rate basis and if not how the interest rate risk will be managed, confirm whether there is any residual exposures to the landlord (the County Council) which are not covered by the dilapidations clauses, confirm that the insurances obtained will cover every potential loss including terrorism cover, confirm the basis for the residual value calculations which will underpin the County Council's ability to repay the amounts borrowed at the maturity of the loans and confirm that such calculations take into account that property prices are currently at or close to all time highs and that property values of such offices and warehouses, which are based on the discounted cash flows of the tenant's rent, are likely to be lower in the future as interest rates rise from their current all-time lows?

Can the Cabinet Member also disclose the current and projected internal costs for managing this portfolio over the life of the leases and what effect these costs will have on the anticipated investment return?

Reply:

The Investment Strategy was agreed by Cabinet in July 2013 as one of a series of responses to improve the financial resilience of the Council in the longer term. The portfolio consists of property investments which have been made by the Council in order to deliver economic regeneration or to provide for long-term future service use, whilst delivering an investment return. These assets provide flexibility in the estate whilst producing a net revenue. The Council has also provided its subsidiary company, Halsey Garton Property Ltd, with equity and debt financing to facilitate the purchase of assets for their investment return. The portfolio of property investments therefore consists of assets held by the Council together with those owned by the Property Company. The Council is developing a mixed and diversified portfolio in order to manage the inherent economic and market risks.

The performance of the portfolio across the Council and the Property Company is managed and monitored to avoid an over-reliance upon single tenants or types of tenants in terms of their impact as a percentage of the total portfolio. Investment property assets are let to a variety of tenants in a number of different industry sectors, these range in size from local businesses to large PLCs. The covenant of each tenant is evaluated at the time of purchase and the asset is priced in accordance with this covenant together with a number of other factors, for example the length of the lease and the location, such that the returns available are commensurate with risk.

The Council funds its capital & investment expenditure through the use of reserves, capital receipts and prudential borrowing. The Council undertakes required borrowing in accordance with the conditions of the Prudential Code, which requires the borrowing to be affordable, sustainable and provide value for money. As the Council does not hypothecate borrowing, the use of receipts or the utilisation of cash resources against individual projects or acquisitions, we assume that all the Council's activities in progressing the Investment Strategy will increase the Council's requirement to borrow. All investments are therefore required to demonstrate a return in excess of the opportunity cost of capital which is calculated with reference to the Council's interest payable on equivalent borrowing and the statutory minimum revenue provision (MRP) that sets aside funds for the repayment of the borrowing. The Council only undertakes fixed rate borrowing and is therefore not exposed to interest rate risk in the way expressed in the question. The Treasury Management Strategy agreed by full Council each year provides further information about the way in which borrowing is undertaken.

All properties owned by the Council and the Property Company are insured on normal commercial terms and tenant leases are provided on a fully repairing basis except where tenants are taking a short-term lease pending redevelopment, thus all insurance costs are the responsibility of the tenants. All investment opportunities are progressed based upon a robust business case which takes into account due and proper consideration of the balance between risk and reward. A number of scenarios are evaluated for each asset purchase to understand the impact of any potential tenant void and to consider the likelihood of other occupiers taking up the vacant space. There will be occasions when a tenant triggers their break clause or vacates at the end of their lease resulting in a potential letting void. In these circumstances there will be a revenue loss position on these particular assets. However, this will be offset by the net revenue income produced by other assets in the property portfolio. As a backstop position the Council's Revolving Investment and Infrastructure fund is available to meet revenue costs should there be the unlikely situation of an overall net loss on the portfolio and therefore the Council and its services are protected.

The key purpose of the Investment Strategy is to deliver an ongoing net income stream to the Council to provide a source of funding to support services and in doing so, we are taking a long-term view of capital values. We ensure that the forecast income received from the investment is sufficient to pay any interest costs and deliver a net return. As we are not reliant upon capital appreciation we can therefore decide to retain or sell assets at the right time for the Council.

The Investment Portfolio is managed by a small team of staff who are supplemented by external specialist advisors when required. The Council makes an appropriate charge to the property company for the professional services provided, to ensure that the full cost of the activity is recovered and that there is no subsidy. The overall investment returns are reported each month as part of the Finance & Budget Monitoring report provided to Cabinet and future anticipated net returns are considered as part of the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan.

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES WELLBEING

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

Following on from the recent audit report into Surrey Youth Centres, could the Cabinet Member confirm:

- (i) what was the purchase cost of the 55 BB Playbook devices that were not returned to SCC?
- (ii) that an up to date inventory of assets has now been completed?
- (iii) how much was spent on purchase cards that contravened SCC rules and guidance on appropriate spending?
- (iv) what, if any, disciplinary action has been taken as a result of this audit?

Reply:

1. What was the purchase cost of the 55 BB Playbook devices that were not returned to SCC?

As this is an IMT question I have sought a response from them.

The Youth Attendance Application was developed to work using BlackBerry WiFi only PlayBooks which connected to the SCC PSN network using the BlackBerry Bridge software on a separate BlackBerry handheld device. At the time of development BlackBerry was the only Mobile Device/Infrastructure that was approved by CESG to be used to connect to PSN networks. The service purchased 50 WiFi Only PlayBooks and 50 BlackBerry Handheld devices to enable each Youth Centre to have the application connected. The cost of these 50 devices was £9,100.

Prior to this, Surrey were working with Northgate and BlackBerry on a mobile project for the Adults service and 50 of the 16GB WiFi only BlackBerry PlayBooks were provided by BlackBerry to enable this project to proceed. The development of this mobile application was not completed by Northgate and the BlackBerry PlayBooks were re-assigned to be additional spares and hot swaps for the Youth Attendance Application that had already been rolled out and was being used by staff in the youth centres.

Due to the issues with the connectivity where two devices had to be used together to allow the staff to use the application, and the limited development and support of the BlackBerry PlayBook devices (the devices were pulled from sale and no further support and development was completed) it was decided to replace them with Apple iPads which had by then been approved by CESG to connect to PSN network using Good initially and MobileIron currently to provide the connectivity.

The BlackBerry PlayBook devices were reviewed to see if they could be reused for any other services in the authority and there was no uses found for the devices due to:-

- WiFi only connectivity using the BlackBerry Bridge software.
- Requirement for additional devices to provide connectivity.
- Poor performance due to the way that web traffic is serviced through the BlackBerry infrastructure.
- Limited and very poor application store.
- Lack of development of applications for BlackBerry (Suppliers only developing for iOS/Android and Windows).
- Device support including hardware and software no longer available.

An investigation was done into looking to get the devices sold to recoup cost and it was found that there was no market for BlackBerry PlayBooks (due to the above reasons) and that the money that could be recouped would be far less than the cost of returning/wiping and selling the devices so the service was not asked to return the Playbooks.

2. That an up to date inventory of assets has now been completed?

The service can confirm that we undertake a rolling programme of asset checks on a six monthly basis. We currently have two centres that have fallen outside of this parameter - The Street Youth Centre in Caterham and Ashford Youth Centre. These were last checked in January and February 2016 respectively. These two asset checks are due for completion by the end of October.

3. How much was spent on purchase cards that contravened SCC rules and guidance on appropriate spending?

£31.03 on refreshment costs and toll charges as part of a work visit to youth centres in the North West that had been set up as an employee run mutual. These were legitimate costs but should have been reimbursed through a travel expenses claim.

4. What, if any, disciplinary action has been taken as a result of this audit?

No disciplinary action has been taken as a result of the audit. The audit was undertaken within the context of considerable change. The youth service was brought back in house leading to a change in management and restructure of the service that was completed in November 2015. We have acknowledged that the criticism from audit is primarily of management and we have implemented a plan to rectify the areas of weakness with new policies and procedures to ensure that our financial and resource management is in line with SCC best policy and practice. This is being undertaken with the support of internal audit and has been scrutinised by the Council Overview Board (COB). The service will be subject to a further inspection by audit to ensure that the Management Action Plan is implemented and will then be subject to a further review by COB later in 2017.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Will the Cabinet Member give an update on what measures are being taken to cover Abellio's withdrawal of bus routes in North West Surrey?

Reply:

On 2 September 2016, Surrey County Council and Abellio jointly issued a statement concerning changes to some services currently operated by Abellio in north Surrey, as part of the company's decision to downsize their activities in the county. This was sent to the media and affected Divisional Members, amongst others. It included details of nine services which Abellio currently run under contract with substantial financial support from the Council, from which the company has sought resignation for commercial and operational reasons from 31 December 2016. This is their prerogative. The nine services are: 81 Woking-Barnsbury (Sundays only), 436 Woking-Brooklands (Sundays only), 458 Kingston-Staines, 514 Kingston-Addlestone, 515 Kingston-Guildford, 555 Heathrow Airport-Hersham, 556 Woking-Chertsey, 557 Woking-Sunbury Tesco and 663 Walton-Esher High School.

Beforehand, there were extensive discussions between the Council and the company as to the least-disruptive way to manage the situation, as well as independent scrutiny for the Council of Abellio's costs, revenues and subsidy levels required. This decision was solely Abellio's and the statement made it clear that the Council's focus would be on engaging alternative bus companies to provide replacements. Although the above bus services would no longer feature Abellio's involvement, it has never been suggested that these services would be disappearing completely. Were they to do so, the potential impact on many bus users is of course recognised, along with hardship that could result if key strategic bus services were to be just abandoned.

For this reason, the Council is leading a process to obtain new operators for the services. Plans for this have been formulated and engagement has been launched with all companies currently approved by the Council for running supported bus services in Surrey, in advance of discussions. Expressions of interest are now being received. This cannot result in immediate clear outcomes, but it is expected that by mid-autumn, it will be possible to advise the public and Members of what the new arrangements will be. Until that time, it is unfortunately not possible to give further information on future timetables and frequency of specific services, but the Council will use all endeavours to secure the best possible outcome within the funding budget available.

The timescale involved does not allow a full public consultation, but officers are sharing information with, and receiving feedback from, the North West Surrey Bus Users Group. This organisation is considered to be a local voice for all bus users in the area where Abellio services operate and represents its members and others when considering potential bus service changes, as it did in 2015 as part of the ongoing Local Transport Review.

Updates regarding the future service pattern will be advised to local Members and published in due course on www.surreycc.gov.uk/buses whilst final service details are also expected to appear in printed form and be distributed from around early December.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

The change in state pension arrangements for women will have a serious and harmful effect on many older women working in the county. The claimed £418 extra income they get when they retire will not offset the losses accrued from retiring six years later. Although the legislation for this has been around for some while, most women have only been made aware of the changes very recently and it has caused some serious problems for the way some of them have planned for their future over many years. Will the Leader of the Council take this issue to Government and strongly urge a more balanced transition from the previous system to the new one?

Reply:

I appreciate these concerns. However, in light of the fact that state pensions are a national issue, I recommend the best course of action is for the Member to raise these concerns directly with his Member of Parliament, Kwasi Kwarteng.

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

(8) MR MICHAEL SYDNEY (LINGFIELD) TO ASK

Agricultural Tenants

Our tenants at Bysse Court Farm, where they are successful dairy farmers, have spent much of the last seven years grappling with the shortcomings of our property management service.

On 19 January this year they were visited by five officers, who were tasked with assessing some farm buildings. The consensus of the team was that one of the barns was in a dangerous condition as was a workshop area. They said that, based on their survey, the property management department would prepare specifications upon which contractors would be invited to tender for the needed repairs to make the building safe. The tenants made it clear that they would need to have the building work completed by September this year as it was needed for wintering cattle and storing winter feed. This was accepted.

By July there had been no perceptible activity, apart from one or two visits by officers the purpose of which was unclear.

The tenant asked me for my help and I drew your attention to this problem. Your intervention resulted in some action, but it was not until late August that we learned that tender documents were sent out to contractors. In September I asked for information as to when the work began on the tender documents. To date I have not received a reply. You kindly informed me in early September that all was in hand and that it was planned to undertake the work in October.

There was a visit yesterday by a group including officers from the County and the selected contractor. The tenant was told that work could commence in three weeks; effectively the end of October. They said that there had been a delay in locating a source for tiles. The tenant pointed out that it had been agreed in January that the roof repair would be in metal sheeting so that tiles were not required. They asked the visitors to look at their own report from that meeting which would record this decision. There was some hesitation from which it became clear that the report of the meeting had not been found.

This is but one example of the problems which the County is creating for its tenants.

Are you still of the belief that our property services management is capable of providing a serious and professional service to our countryside tenants and if so how do you justify this view and may you let me have the answer to the question which I have asked about the progress of tender documents.

Reply:

Bysse Court Farm is owned by SCC and is currently tenanted. In the 2016/17 property planned maintenance programme there are works relating to building roof replacement. The two projects in particular are for replacement of Barn Roof and Workshop (machinery store) roof. These are fairly major, high cost projects and do require liaising with tenant and specialist site visits.

The contractor tender for the works to the barn roof was returned and contract awarded in September 2016. We are currently discussing a mutually convenient project start date with the tenant for this work.

The workshop roof is more complex and is in design. We still anticipate that both projects will be delivered as part of the 2016/17 planned maintenance programme

budget.

Management of the Rural Portfolio of properties is not dissimilar to management of other portfolios, for example, Operational Buildings. Specialist skills are retained in-house in the form of a qualified Rural Surveyor but where other specialist skills are required they are procured through the marketplace as necessary.

I am confident that the Property Team are doing everything they can to expedite these works as soon as possible.

MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

(9) MR SAJ HUSSAIN (KNAPHILL AND GOLDSWORTH WEST) TO ASK:

On the 20 September 2016, South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAMB) announced their intention to close the ambulance station in Knaphill in six weeks time, with the staff and vehicles transferring to Ottershaw. There has not been any consultation with local residents or ward Councillors on the reasoning behind this decision and the implications for patient safety.

I call upon the Council to make representations for the closure of the Knaphill Ambulance station to be suspended until there has been a full independent risk assessment on the implications for patients' safety.

Reply:

In my capacity as Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health, I will ask Northwest Surrey CCG, who are the lead Commissioner for SECAMB, to confirm that an independent risk assessment of patient safety has been undertaken and that they are satisfied with the outcome and decision. I will make sure the response I receive is made available to Members.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

I understand that the 2016/17 settlement from the Government announced a Better Care Fund totalling £3.3bn by 2019/20, of which £800m is coming from removal of New Homes Bonus funding to councils and £1.8 billion from increasing council tax by a further 2%: the so called adult social care levy.

I understand that the Government calculates that Surrey's additional adult social care need (according to the Relative Needs Formula for adult social care) is for an additional £55m up until 2019/20, of which £53.5m is due to come from Surrey council tax payers and £1.5m from the Government.

In light of this, please can you confirm:

- Firstly, how much New Homes Bonus: (a) Surrey County Council and (b) the Borough and District Councils in Surrey are expected to lose as a result of this change.
- Secondly, how Surrey County Council's estimates of additional need for care funding over this period compares with that from the Government.

Reply:

The growth in demand for our adult social care services is the largest factor in the financial challenge facing this Council. This growth in demand alone increases the cost to the council by around £24m per year – totalling nearly £100m per year by 2019/20. That is why it was welcome news last year when the Chancellor announced an improved Better Care Fund to be phased in from 2017/18, with a value rising to £1.5bn nationally by 2019/20. Based on the government's Relative Needs Formula for adult social care, Surrey's share would be £25m in 2019/20. Whilst this would not plug this funding gap, it would – along with the flexibility to raise £12m per year from the adult social care precept – go some way helping the hard pressed finances of the Council.

However, there are stings in the tail. First, over half of the improved Better Care Fund - £800m – will be funded from the New Homes Bonus, which is a grant currently paid to local authorities. It is estimated that the County Council will lose £2.5 m in New Homes Bonus by 2019/20. For the county of Surrey as a whole, the district and borough councils could lose nearly £10m.

The second sting is one you know about. Due to the redistributive methodology used for the improved Better Care Fund, the County Council will only receive £1.5 m. This falls way short of what is really needed and this administration will continue to work with our MPs to reach a fairer distribution.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(11) MR ALAN YOUNG (CRANLEIGH AND EWHURST) TO ASK:

Does the Leader believe that the Council's new Customer Promise should apply to all Members of this Council, including the Leader, in their interactions with residents, officers and one another?

Reply:

Our Customer Promise, which was adopted by Cabinet in March 2015 has been created to provide the Council with a focus on improving resident experience in Surrey. Building on the Customer Promise, managers across the Council have been engaged in promoting a customer focused culture with residents and service users at its heart. I believe that all of us should have the interests of Surrey residents in mind in all our interactions, after all that is why we, as councillors, are here to serve.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Does Surrey have up-to-date statistics for the numbers of pedestrians and cyclists injured on the county's roads?

How many of these can be attributed to the rather confusing and disjointed cycle lane structure?

Reply:

The table in Appendix A shows the number of pedestrian and cyclist casualties recorded by the police in Surrey over recent years, by severity.

It is not possible to say whether an individual pedestrian or cyclist casualty could be attributed directly to “confusing or disjointed cycle lane structure”, as this would be hard to define, and it would be impossible to say whether the incident might have happened irrespective of the presence of different types of dedicated cycle infrastructure.

Detailed analysis of the 627 cycling casualties taking place in 2013 showed that the single most common type of collision is when a vehicle exits a side road or other ‘give way’ junction into the path of the casualty (30%). The next most common is when the casualty crashes but there is no other road user involved (22%), resulting from a variety of reasons including a slippery surface, colliding with kerb or parked car, or road surface irregularity to name a few.

Implementation of improved cycling infrastructure is a vital part of achieving the aim of the Surrey Cycling Strategy to get “more people cycling, more safely”. A key part of this is to provide cycling infrastructure that is of high quality, safe and secure, comfortable and well maintained, continuous and is available where people want to go to.

There continues to be a large amount of investment in highway, public transport, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure in Surrey as a result of the funding from Local Enterprise Partnerships for major schemes. In all, eight schemes have been awarded £34m of funding and these contain significant cycling and pedestrian infrastructure improvements, which are due to be delivered in the coming years. Further business cases are being developed for submission to the Local Enterprise Partnerships for a further five major schemes that are also likely to contain significant cycling and pedestrian infrastructure improvements, with a value approaching £22m.

The Drive SMART Partnership has also provided funding towards cycle safety campaigning that includes messages to cyclists about sharing paths considerately with pedestrians, positioning carefully when sharing roads with vehicles, and messages to motorists about sharing roads carefully with cyclists and looking out for them at junctions.

It is expected that with continued investment in improved infrastructure, road safety campaigning and enforcement in partnership with Surrey Police, the risk of cycling casualties will reduce while the amount of cycling increases.

New standards for cycle infrastructure

Officers are currently working on developing new standards for developing cycling infrastructure, supporting the Surrey Cycle Strategy’s objective to ‘**improve infrastructure for cycling** by securing funding to develop high quality, joined up cycle routes, taking account of international best practice, utilising off road and quiet streets, and separating cyclists from motorised traffic on busy roads where feasible’. We have started a dialogue with designers from Transport for London and the City of Cardiff to learn from their designers about the current best practice in cycling infrastructure and what is suitable for Surrey. This will allow us to build infrastructure that is fit for purpose, will keep cyclists safe and encourage more people to cycle for local trips. As part of the development of local cycling plans in each district and borough we are reviewing existing infrastructure, and where substandard, unclear or disjointed, highlighting this for future improvement when funds are available.

Appendix A

Year	Pedestrian casualties					Cycling casualties				
	Killed	Serious	Killed or Serious	Slight	Total	Killed	Serious	Killed or Serious	Slight	Total
2007	10	73	83	297	380	2	60	62	319	381
2008	10	82	82	294	376	1	49	50	371	421
2009	10	75	85	317	402	2	78	80	392	472
2010	9	78	87	306	393	4	94	98	355	453
2011	10	85	95	295	390	1	106	107	422	529
2012	2	82	84	261	345	2	121	123	438	561
2013	5	93	98	264	362	1	144	145	482	627
2014	10	88	98	327	425	4	162	166	482	648
2015	9	117	126	317	443	3	136	139	447	586
2016	5*	43**	48**	184**	232**	1*	79**	80**	252**	332**

* To the end of August

** To the end of July

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES WELLBEING

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

On 14 September 2016, the Children's Society published a report stating that young people leaving care in England are facing financial hardship because of a lack of help from local authorities. The Children's Society said that almost half of councils were failing to offer financial education, which left many care leavers struggling to adapt and ending up homeless. It has called on local authorities to offer more specialised help for care leavers' transition into adult life. Please will the Cabinet Member confirm what steps Surrey County Council is taking to improve support for care leavers?

Reply:

Surrey Care Leavers' Service have 485 young people over 18 within the service. Through our Corporate Parenting Strategy we have recognised the importance of ensuring our Care Leavers have the right support in place as they move to being independent adults, with the skills and support to be successful in whatever they choose to do.

In recognition of the needs of these young adults we provide a range of services to help and support them, including a team of Personal Advisors who are their allocated caseworkers, supported accommodation ranging from continued placement with their foster carer post-18 to support with independent tenancies at a time that is right for them, financial support as they continue with education or training, and access to health care, including a newly commissioned mental health service specifically for careleavers, hosted through Surrey and Borders Partnership as part of our CAMHS pooled budget contract.

We offer a bespoke service as we recognise an individual approach is required for each Care Leaver.

Outcomes for our Care Leavers are monitored nationally through a range of performance indicators, with an annual performance table of local authorities being

provided to check on progress. For our Care Leavers we have shown improvements across all the indicators, although final figures are not released nationally until October 2016. Provisionally, our records show that the numbers of our Care Leavers who are engaged in education, employment and training now stands at 60% (55% in 2015) and the numbers living in suitable accommodation has improved from 82% in 2015 to 93% in 2016. The 2016 data includes all those who are aged 17-21 who are Care Leavers.

We are pleased with this progress and are working hard to sustain and improve our support through our collective responsibility as corporate parents.

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

**(14) MR IAN BEARDSMORE (SUNBURY COMMON AND ASHFORD COMMON)
TO ASK:
2nd question**

Of the investment properties currently owned by Surrey, how many are:

- (i) fully let and what is the duration of those rental streams
- (ii) partially let, what is the duration of those income streams and what is the proportion of the property currently unlet
- (iii) completely unlet.

Reply:

All investment property assets are currently fully let with the exception of the upper floors of two properties which are subject to conversion proposals from office space to residential use. Tenants are in occupancy on leases due to expire between 3 years and 25 years.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

The new Surrey Fly-tipping Strategy produced in June 2016 reported an increase of 91 incidents of fly-tipping (up to 6,851) in 2014/15 compared to a year earlier, and notes that this cost Surrey County Council and Surrey's Boroughs and Districts £0.9m that year, but did not estimate the additional cost to private landowners. It also predicted a 60% increase in the tonnes fly-tipped in 2015/16. Its main aim is stated as to 'stimulate a change in behaviour amongst residents, businesses and landowners that helps reduce the amount of fly-tipping in Surrey' with one additional post budgeted for one year only.

In light of this can you please provide:

- Figures on the incidence of fly-tipping over each of the past 12 months, and how this compares to the equivalent months a year earlier.
- What percentage of the reported fly-tipping incidents were on public as opposed to private land; and
- The costs, for the last reported year, to deal with fly-tipping that fell to Surrey County Council and the costs that fell to Surrey's District and Borough Councils.

Reply:

Q1. Figures on the incidence of fly-tipping over each of the past 12 months, and how this compares to the equivalent months a year earlier.

The latest dataset that we can extract from the waste dataflow system is from the period April 2015 - March 2016. We are unable to provide the data on fly-tipping incidents from April 2016 - September 2016 at this stage, as the fly-tipping data is submitted following the end of each quarter and is then validated thereafter by the WDF validation team. We are unable to provide a breakdown by month from the system and can only do this by quarter. Please see **Table 1** below for a quarterly breakdown of fly-tipping incidents from April 2015 – March 2016, and for the same period a year earlier.

Table 1 total number of fly-tipping incidents reported by District and Borough Councils via the Waste Data Flow reporting system

Period	Apr - Jun	Jul - Sep	Oct - Dec	Jan - Mar	Total
Apr 15 - Mar 16	1620	1868	1779	2183	7450
Apr 14 - Mar 15	1769	1709	1628	1745	6851

The County Council, as the Waste Disposal Authority, does have more timely access to the fly-tipping tonnage data that comes into our Waste Transfer Stations from District and Borough Councils for disposal. Please see **Table 2** below for a monthly breakdown of fly-tipping tonnages received at our Waste Transfer Stations for the past 12 months compared to a year earlier.

Table 2 Total fly-tipping tonnages received at Waste Transfer Stations for disposal

Month	Reporting period	
	October 15 - September 16	October 14 - September 15
Oct	468.50	262.00
Nov	326.70	246.08
Dec	279.58	185.42
Jan	334.72	224.80
Feb	276.64	272.44
Mar	263.90	340.28
Apr	279.06	414.22
May	291.56	327.20
Jun	278.44	438.54
Jul	353.90	413.40
Aug	260.96	398.44
Sep	282.74	499.76
Total	3,696.70	4,022.58

Q2 What percentage of the reported fly-tipping incidents were on public as opposed to private land?

The only breakdown we can give for fly-tipping by location is based on what District and Borough Councils report to WDF. Please see **Table 3** for a breakdown by location type for the latest available period April 2015 – March 2016 compared to a year earlier. We are aware that not all fly-tipping incidents that occur on private land are reported to District and Borough Councils, as the responsibility and cost for clearance and disposal sits with the private landowner, manager or occupier.

Table 3 number of fly-tipping incidents reported by location type by District and Borough Councils via the Waste Data Flow reporting system

Incident by location type	Apr 15 - Mar 16		Apr 14 - Mar 15	
	Number of incidents	Percentage of Incidents	Number of incidents	Percentage of Incidents
Agricultural Incidents	25	0.34%	32	0.47%
Back Alleyway Incidents	218	2.93%	223	3.25%
Commercial / Industrial Incidents	19	0.26%	28	0.41%
Council Land Incidents	2121	28.47%	1942	28.35%
Footpath / Bridleway Incidents	1132	15.19%	728	10.63%
Highway Incidents	3377	45.33%	3497	51.04%
Other (unidentified) Incidents	370	4.97%	216	3.15%
Private / Residential Incidents	167	2.24%	141	2.06%
Railway Incidents	2	0.03%	2	0.03%
Watercourse / Bank Incidents	19	0.26%	42	0.61%

Q3 The costs, for the last reported year, to deal with fly-tipping that fell to Surrey County Council and the costs that fell to Surrey’s District and Borough Councils.

Please see **Table 4** for a summary of the estimated costs to deal with fly-tipping for the last reported year, April 2015 – March 2016.

Table 4 Estimated fly-tipping collection, enforcement action and disposal costs for April 2015 – March 2016

Type of cost	Estimated cost	Information source
Total D&B Incident clearance cost	£483,000	Waste Data Flow
D&B Enforcement cost (for carrying out investigations and further actions)	£138,000	Waste Data Flow
SCC Highways clearance cost	£100,000	SCC Highways via Kier
SCC disposal cost	£444,000	Disposal contractor Suez
Total cost	£1,165,000	

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

**(16) MR ALAN YOUNG (CRANLEIGH AND EWHURST) TO ASK:
2nd question**

Does the Leader believe that it is important that he and all Members of this Council adhere to the Seven Principles of Public Life?

Reply:

Not only do I believe that they should, I know that it is a requirement placed on us all in the Surrey County Council Member Code of Conduct.

MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE, WELLBEING AND INDEPENDENCE

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

The recent King's Fund report, "Social Care for Older People: Home Truths" found that over the last five years, the number of older people receiving social care help by local authorities fell by over 25% as the spending by councils on adult social care fell by 11% in real terms over this period. In addition it found that 37% of care staff were found to have no recognised qualification. What are the equivalent figures for adult social care commissioned by Surrey County Council?

Reply:

Number of Older People receiving social care support:

The 26% decrease in the number of Older People supported by local authorities stated in the report was based on information from a statutory return gathered nationally, until 2013/14. This return measured the total number of contacts each local authority received relating to social care, including referrals for assessment that did not result in a funded package of care. The equivalent figure for Surrey was a decrease of 12%. A more reliable measure of the number of people supported though, certainly in terms of the impact on the budget, is the change in the actual number of funded packages of care. This presents a very different picture. Overall there was a 15% increase in the total number of Older People council funded care services for the period in question.

Older People social care expenditure:

The 9% national reduction in Older People social care expenditure in real terms stated in the Kings Fund report does not match the trend in Surrey. Adult Social Care (ASC) remains one of the Council's biggest budget pressures. The equivalent trend in Surrey was an increase in real terms of 12% on the Council's expenditure on Older People social care between 2009/10 and 2014/15. This demonstrates the significant pressure the Council faces in terms of ASC provision.

Social Care Workforce:

The Council does not hold comparable data on the Adult Social Care Workforce in Surrey. Nationally, and in Surrey, the workforce is diverse including qualified professional staff and unqualified staff, working within councils and the independent care sector e.g. registered Home Care Agencies and Care Homes. Home Care

services and Residential/Nursing homes are regulated by the Care Quality Commission and this includes oversight of appropriate staff qualification and training.

There is a comprehensive learning and development programme for Surrey County Council Adult Social Care staff to ensure they have the necessary competencies. The council's Adult Social Care contracts require providers to deliver services via appropriately qualified and trained staff.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(18) MR ALAN YOUNG (CRANLEIGH AND EWHURST) TO ASK:

3rd question

Will the Leader join me in congratulating Callum Mitchell on winning the Surrey Young Musician of the Year Award, supported through the Surrey Members' Allocation Fund, and express his support and encouragement for all young musicians in the county.

Reply:

I am delighted to express my support and encouragement for all Surrey's young musicians and to offer them my and the Council's congratulations. I am particularly proud of the work in this county to provide opportunities for children and young people living in challenging circumstances. Surrey Arts are acquiring an international reputation for leading the way in musical inclusion. This summer our UP! Orchestra opened the National Paralympic Day and Liberty Festival at the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, just a few days before the start of the Rio 2016 Paralympic Games. The Surrey Youth Choir has a fantastic reputation and was resident at York Minster for three days in August. We also have some fantastic music charities, the Orpheus Trust and Rythmix to name just two. Surrey recognises and nurtures musical talent in its young people and I am sure that all Members will join me in applauding their achievements.

CABINET MEMBER UPDATES TO FULL COUNCIL

NAME: Peter Martin

PORTFOLIO: Economy and Prosperous Places

MEETING DATE: October 2016

MIPIM UK 2016

All Surrey boroughs and districts are working with the county council to showcase the county at this year's MIPIM UK exhibition at London Olympia (19-21 October). MIPIM UK is the UK's largest exhibition and conference for property professionals. It provides a market place for UK and international investors to meet, discuss opportunities and do business.

The event is a chance for Surrey to demonstrate that it is 'open for business'. Surrey, under the banner of Invest in Surrey, will have a stand at the exhibition and will showcase opportunities for investment in the county. This is the second year that Surrey has participated.

We are working with a number of private sector partners, the Local Enterprise Partnerships and Surrey's universities to promote the county. Included in the eleven sites and premises to be marketed at the exhibition are Longcross, Guildford town centre regeneration and the county council's property development programme.

Surrey Inward Investment Programme

This initiative is part of the Surrey Inward Investment Programme to promote Surrey nationally and internationally as a place to do business, encourage inward investment and further investment from businesses already located in the county and to retain existing firms.

The result of the referendum on membership of the European Union gives new impetus to this activity to demonstrate to existing and potential new businesses Surrey's strengths as a place to operate. Through the Inward Investment Programme we have an opportunity to work more collaboratively, including with the Department for International Trade, on the potential challenges presented by this uncertain economic environment.

Through the programme Surrey's local authorities are also working together to improve relationships with Surrey's businesses. Most inward investment successes come from foreign owned companies already located in an area expanding. Encouraging business growth and retaining existing business is a key aim of the programme. Both have been given added impetus by the decision to leave the EU.

CABINET MEMBER UPDATE TO FULL COUNCIL

NAME: Clare Curran

PORTFOLIO: Children and Families Wellbeing

MEETING DATE: 11 October 2016

Children's Improvement Plan

Safer Surrey is making a positive difference

It is encouraging that having strengthened leadership in Children, Schools and Families, improved partnership working, and implemented new ways of working earlier in the year we are now making positive progress on the quality of our day-to-day work with children and families.

Recent progress has been strongly linked to how teams are embedding the Safer Surrey approach into their practice. The evidence - including recent feedback from Ofsted - is that [Safer Surrey](#) provides a robust framework for practice and helps secure better outcomes for children through its emphasis on the voice of the child and clear communication.

Safer Surrey is applicable beyond just social care, and partner agencies are embracing the approach and working with us to develop it further.

I am attaching a hard copy guide to Safer Surrey which I hope all Members will find informative and helpful. An information session for Members is also being arranged.

MASH launched on 5 October 2016

Another important partnership initiative is the new Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) located at Guildford Police station. This was successfully launched on 5 October 2016. It brings together around 90 practitioners from across different agencies, providing a single "front door" for any concerns members of the public or agencies have about children in Surrey.

Improvement focus for the next 12 months

The most recent Ofsted monitoring inspection (31 August – 1 September 2016) highlighted the good progress made over recent months and we will now be building on this to tackle those areas where we know further sustained improvement is required. You can find the full report from the recent Ofsted visit on their [website](#).

The Council's Improvement Board considered the Ofsted feedback on 29 September 2016 and addressed the specific issue raised on unallocated cases. Immediate action was taken in response to Ofsted's concern to ensure the children identified were appropriately supported and we have procedures in place to ensure this cannot happen again.

A refreshed version of the Council's Improvement Plan will be published shortly setting out the key strategic actions for the next 12 months such as embedding the Safer Surrey approach and developing a more co-ordinated Early Help offer with our partners.

CABINET MEMBER UPDATE TO FULL COUNCIL

NAME: Denise Le Gal

PORTFOLIO: Business Services and Resident Experience

MEETING DATE: October 2016

The development of the Orbis partnership is progressing well. Brighton and Hove City Council (BHCC) are taking a paper to their policy resources and growth committee on the 13 October that will recommend that BHCC join the Orbis Partnership and this will commence the next phase of work to establish benefits and opportunities for Orbis incorporating Brighton.

At an operational level we have put in place a number of contracts across the partnership which have direct links and requirements around provision of apprenticeships and employment, for example, security and cleaning contracts which are directly meeting social value objectives.

We have also been leading work at a national level to design a self assessment framework for public and private sector organisation to assess and develop approach to social value. Alongside this we are finalising the social value measurement framework for Orbis to ensure we can quantify the tangible benefits delivered to our residents. We have already signed two contracts that deliver social value in a way that is measurable.

Along with the Chief Executive, I was also delighted to open the inaugural 'We Are Surrey' event, hosted by Canon on 28 September. This event brought together public, voluntary and third sector organisations with local businesses, big and small, to further discuss and explore opportunities for providing much needed support for local communities through the social value agenda being driven by the County Council.

CABINET MEMBER UPDATE TO FULL COUNCIL

NAME: Helyn Clack
PORTFOLIO: Wellbeing and Health
MEETING DATE: October 2016

Public Health Update

Integrated Sexual Health Services

The Cabinet agreed to award a contract for Integrated Sexual Health Services to Central and North West London NHS Trust. This contract will have a focus on young people, men who have sex with men, sex workers, and Surrey's Black African population.

This contract will help to deliver £2m of savings annually over the three years. Please see the link to the full cabinet papers.

<http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=120&MIId=4591&Ver=4>

Independent Director of Public Health Report 2015-16

This year's report focuses on Children and Young People and takes a life course approach that reflects the importance of universal service provision as well as the need for more targeted interventions. The report has been discussed at the September Health and Wellbeing Board and will be presented at CCG Clinical Executives and Borough and District level Health and Wellbeing Boards over the next few months. The report can be accessed here:

<http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/Resource.aspx?ResourceID=1705>

Improving Children's Community Health Services across Surrey

The outcome of the procurement process for children's community health services will be made public on 17 October following the decision by the Committee in Common on the 5 October.

The total contract value for this service is: £83,594,238. SCC has committed to £40,069,600 across the life of the contract. The aim of this investment is to ensure maintenance of the school nurse and health visitor involvement as lead professionals. There will also be additional investment for the *Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH)*, ensuring community health service involvement within its processes.

Child Obesity – the national plan and local activity

Published by HM Government on 18 August with the aim of reducing the numbers of obese children by 2026. Surrey County Council will use the plan as a framework for the development of the Surrey Healthy Weight Strategy for Children, Young People and Families. Engagement with colleagues in the council, boroughs and districts, health and schools will take place to discuss how the delivery of the actions within the national strategy can be maximised.

The Council will maximise the use of its contracted Healthy Weight services, including Alive n Kicking, School Time Obesity Programme (STOP) and HENRY and by working closely with Active Surrey relevant and local physical activity opportunities can be dovetailed.

CABINET MEMBER UPDATE TO FULL COUNCIL

NAME: John Furey

PORTFOLIO: Highways, Transport and Flooding

MEETING DATE: October 2016

Highways Update

The first half of the year has seen road schemes undertaken covering a distance of over 52 miles. During this time we have also been carrying out schemes for Pavement Horizon which has seen over 13 miles of pavements treated.

We are now completing the work required to provide provisional scheme lists for the next five years for all of our key highway assets – roads, pavements, drainage, structures, traffic signals, embankments and safety barriers.

Members have had the opportunity over the summer to suggest schemes for inclusion into the programmes for roads, pavements, structures and drainage. In order to further acknowledge Member insight of local needs, I have agreed to officer proposals for a change to the prioritisation process for roads and pavements.

The changes below will enable greater Member influence while still ensuring that funds are used to support our Asset Management Strategy and that all schemes are based on sound technical assessments.

Pavements – Schemes promoted by Members over the summer will be awarded an additional 50 points which will be added to their score from the technical assessment. N.B. only schemes which are near town/village centres, schools, hospitals etc. will be prioritised.

Roads – 80% of the funding will be allocated solely against technical assessment. Then, each Committee will be advised of the next highest assessed roads in their District. The Committee will be able to decide which of the suggested roads will be added to the five year programme.

Note – all Members suggested pavements or roads will continue to benefit from a full technical assessment

Modelling suggests that the above changes will see Member promoted pavements prioritised over the next five making up almost a quarter of the programme, 10% more Member promoted schemes than without this approach. Local committees will also have more influence over which of the high scoring road schemes are carried out in their area.

The provisional lists for all key highway assets will be circulated to all Members on 1 November. The lists will show which schemes we are planning to carry out during 2017/18 and will give an indication of the schemes that we aim to carry out over the following 4 years. Officers will be consulting with Members in the next 6 months to identify which roads schemes will make up the final 20% of each local committees programme. Officers will also discuss with local committees which of the schemes on the year 2-5 list are of particularly high priority locally so that they can consider whether these schemes can be included in the early years of the programme without compromising safety critical schemes.

CABINET MEMBER UPDATE TO FULL COUNCIL

NAME: Mel Few

PORTFOLIO: Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence

MEETING DATE: October 2016

I am delighted to report that the new Adults Social Care "liquid logic" computer programme was successfully brought on line on Monday 27 September on time and within budget. The project was approved by Cabinet last year and was delivered by a team lead by Adult Social Care staff supported by IMT staff. Initial reaction from the users of the system have been very encouraging with comments such as "much easier, quicker and enabling more accurate recording to be made". I would like to thank the project leader, Toni Carney and her team for this achievement. This system will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of all the front line staff.

Discussions and engagement with the newly formed "strategic transformation project" are ongoing with developments in the Surrey Heartland STP being the most advanced.

From Wednesday 5 October, all new safeguarding concerns for adults will be processed by the MASH. This will mean that all relevant information held by partner agencies regarding an individual/s will have been available to assist in speedy decision making before arriving in locality teams. The Surrey MASH will be the largest and first integrated Adult and Children's MASH in the country and will be unique thanks to the on-site involvement of clinicians from the mental health service. Moving forward, the MASH will provide faster, safer response times and, over time, make a significant contribution to the prevention agenda.

The annual safeguarding report from the independent Chairman has been received and it is pleasing to note that there has been a reduction in the number of safeguarding events recorded over the year. The Adults Safeguarding Board is now an official body under the Care Act of 2014 with all partners working towards the safeguarding of the vulnerable in Surrey.

CABINET MEMBER UPDATE TO FULL COUNCIL

NAME: Richard Walsh

PORTFOLIO: Localities and Community Wellbeing

MEETING DATE: October 2016

Surrey Arts

Surrey Hills Project

Ali Clarke has been leading on a project with Surrey Hills Arts. Surrey Hills Arts is a partnership between Surrey Arts, Surrey County Council and the Surrey Hills. It aims to engage and inspire people with the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and its unique natural, cultural and industrial heritage through the arts.

Over the summer some striking looking sculptures have been installed along the Greensand Way. Five sculptors and designers were commissioned to create sculptural benches at viewpoints at Gibbet Hill, Reynards Hill, Holmbury Hill, Winterfold and Hascombe Hill. Funded through the Mittal Foundation, this project has worked with landowners to open up hidden views along the Greensand Way, improve access, creatively engage local communities and commission artists to interpret the views through art, poetry and sound. www.inspiringviews.org

The 2016 Big Draw Festival - Steam Powered at Surrey Arts Wardrobe

Surrey Arts Wardrobe have taken part in the Big Draw Festival 2016. With this year's theme of 'Steam', Surrey Arts Wardrobe has opened its doors with lots of activities for all ages and abilities ranging from solar print fashion designs to still hat blocks and vintage suitcases to costume life drawing. The event was open to all and a great opportunity to look around the costume collection.

Breaking the Bubble Music Development Day 2016 - 19 October

Breaking the Bubble is an innovation project formed in partnership between Surrey Music Hub, Sound Hub (Kent) and Sound City (Brighton and Hove) and is supported by Arts Council England and the Department for Education. Following on from last year's successful conference, Surrey Arts will be working with partners to facilitate another music development day to investigate musical progression for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEN/D).

The SEN/D Music Development Day will provide a platform to discuss issues relating to musical progression for young people with SEN/D, and will stimulate and generate practical ideas and conversation, around issues of musical progression for young people with SEN/D.

CABINET MEMBER UPDATE TO FULL COUNCIL

NAME: Mike Goodman
PORTFOLIO: Environment and Planning
MEETING DATE: October 2016

Buses

Local Transport Review (LTR)

We are on track to deliver the required £2m MTFP saving, with £1.7m delivered and the remaining £230K to be delivered in year 3 (September 2017). The LTR has been well managed, with good Member oversight meaning this year's changes came into effect on 3/4 September, impacting a small number of people as planned.

Abellio

A commercial business decision by Abellio to down size their Surrey operation is a new pressure, with the company resigning from contracts and reducing commercial services. The impact on residents is being managed by pushing back Abellio's implementation date from October to 1 January. This is allowing the SCC team to work with alternative providers to plan and procure alternative provision, as far as the available budget will allow, and of course keep residents informed.

Rail

CR2

We continue to work with the scheme promoters to identify the optimum configuration of Crossrail 2 services for Surrey, understand the best use of released capacity and provide an evidence base for design development and further consultation. The next public consultation by the scheme promoters on the development of the scheme is planned to launch on 27 October.

North Downs Line

This line has lacked investment and a clear strategy; yet there is substantial potential for future growth that will support our own growth agenda as this unique orbital railway links key areas of employment and growth, including Gatwick, Redhill, Guildford, the Blackwater Valley, Reading and potentially Oxford. With Great Western Rail we continue to press Government / the Minister to commit to an advanced programme of investment, including electrification and additional services.

Access to Airports

We are completing a review of the various proposals for a southern rail access to Heathrow Airport from Surrey. This will advise us on the preferred option(s) that we should be supporting and the costs, benefits, issues and opportunities arising from these options so we can secure the best outcome for Surrey in terms of connectivity to Heathrow Airport. Our work will be completed in November and will be shared widely with all Members.

Rail Strategy

Rail strategy work links with our 3SC devolution ambition. The rail schemes, for example, supported by many authorities in the SE as they attempt to bridge the infrastructure deficit widely recognised in the South East of England.

Changes to the operation of our community recycling centres (CRCs)

A series of changes have been made to the way that our community recycling centres are operated. At the beginning of April 2016, reduced opening hours were introduced at all community recycling centres (CRCs) and five of the fifteen CRCs were closed one extra day per week. In addition we introduced a revised van permit scheme. On 1 September charges for non-household waste comprising construction waste, soils, plasterboard and tyres were introduced at nine of the community recycling centres where facilities remain for receipt of these types of materials. The results of these changes will be evaluated over the next few months, however initial data indicates that there has been a reduction in the amount of material brought to our community recycling centres.

CABINET MEMBER UPDATE TO FULL COUNCIL

NAME: Linda Kemeny

PORTFOLIO: Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement

MEETING DATE: October 2016

School Places

I would like to start by acknowledging the hard work of our officers in School Place Commissioning, Property and School Projects, Planning and Finance, involved in delivering over 3,000 extra school places last month. That is a total of 16,000 school places created in Surrey over the past six years, enough to fill over 500 classrooms. This tremendous achievement is helping us keep pace with rising pupil numbers and will ensure that all children and young people in Surrey continue to have access to a good education. We know that a further 11,000 school places will still be needed over the next five years and work is ongoing to meet this demand with plans already in place for a further 1,500 school places for next year. In addition, the Government has approved four free schools in Surrey that together will deliver over 3,000 more places from 2017.

School Improvement

I would also like to recognise the commitment and hard work of the Headteachers, governors, staff and students in our schools and education services who, working together, have raised the number of Surrey schools judged by Ofsted to be 'Good' or 'Outstanding' to 93%. This is another fantastic achievement and I congratulate all those schools. It provides a really strong foundation for us to move forward and shape the next phase of the county's education system together.

Surrey Education in Partnership

Changes in legislation, national education policy, and the anticipated reduction in local authority funding mean that we need to find a new, sustainable way to work with schools and other providers of education to ensure they receive the support they need. The Government has set out its vision for a schools-led system and this Council – under its Education in Partnership programme – will work closely with stakeholders to ensure that all children and young people in Surrey continue to have access to high quality, inclusive and sustainable education and training. To do this, we will listen to our colleagues across the education system and are inviting all schools, groups of schools, and local partnerships to give us their views. We will be sending out invitations in the next few days through the Area Education Officers to get dates in diaries for these conversations to discuss the challenges ahead and we are encouraging schools to talk to us about their priorities.

2016 Results – Early Indications for Key Stages 1 & 2

Finally, I would like to recognise the achievement of our pupils and schools at the end of a very challenging academic year, which saw huge changes to both curriculum and assessment. Our Key Stage 2 results are significantly above the national average, with almost 60% of pupils achieving the new, higher expected standard this year. A new system of testing was also introduced at Key Stage 1, and our results for all subjects are in the top 25% of all authorities nationally. I will share further results across all key stages as soon as they are available.

This page is intentionally left blank

MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

11 OCTOBER 2016

**UPDATE TO ITEM 14 – APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT
REMUNERATION PANEL**

An interview panel consisting of the Chairman of the Council and the Leaders of the Residents' Association/Independent Group and the Surrey Opposition Forum has completed its interviews for the three positions on the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP). The Panel has appointed a Chairman and two other members to the IRP, and brief details of each the successful candidates are set out below:

CAROLYN DEAKINS (Chairman)

Senior Civil Service background, with wide experience across a range of Government Departments in policy, delivery and programme management roles. Trustee and Chairman of the New Haw Library Community Partnership.

PAUL EAVES

Consultancy and Senior Civil Service background, with a focus on data analytics, marketing, digital technologies and strategic planning. Active as a volunteer, including supporting Meadow Primary School and Stoneleigh Library.

BRYAN INGLEBY

Background in public sector chartered accountancy, working for the National Audit Office (including experience of working with the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority on design of the MP's allowances scheme) and other national organisations as their audit director.

In line with recommendation (a) of the Council report, the Council is asked to ratify the appointment of the Independent Remuneration Panel members as set out above.

This page is intentionally left blank